



## JUDICIAL COUNCIL OF CALIFORNIA

455 Golden Gate Avenue · San Francisco, California 94102-3688

[www.courts.ca.gov](http://www.courts.ca.gov)

---

# REPORT TO THE JUDICIAL COUNCIL

For business meeting on: February 20, 2015

---

Title	Agenda Item Type
Judicial Council: Implementation of Judicial Council Directives on Judicial Council Staff Restructuring	Information Only
Submitted by	Date of Report
Executive and Planning Committee Hon. Douglas P. Miller, Chair	February 13, 2015
	Contact
	Martin Hoshino <a href="mailto:martin.hoshino@jud.ca.gov">martin.hoshino@jud.ca.gov</a>

---

### **Executive Summary**

The chair of the Executive and Planning Committee (E&P) presents this informational report on the implementation of the Judicial Council Directives on Staff Restructuring, as approved by the Judicial Council on August 31, 2012. The Judicial Council Staff Restructuring Directives specifically direct the Administrative Director to report to E&P before each council meeting on every directive. This informational report provides an update on the progress of implementation efforts.

### **Previous Council Action**

The Judicial Council approved directives presented by E&P on August 31, 2012. These directives reaffirmed Judicial Council authority over the staff to the Judicial Council, restructured the staff agency, and endorsed a plan for monthly monitoring of the implementation of the directives by E&P. The last report to the Judicial Council on implementation efforts was provided by E&P at the December 12, 2014, Judicial Council meeting.

### **Implementation Progress**

The staff to the Judicial Council offices continue to progress in implementing the Restructuring Directives in accordance with the timelines for implementation approved by the Judicial Council.

Since the December 2014 council meeting, no directives were reported as complete.

**Attachments**

1. *Status Report: Judicial Council Directives on Staff Restructuring*

**STATUS REPORT**  
**JUDICIAL COUNCIL DIRECTIVES**  
**ON STAFF RESTRUCTURING**

February 20, 2015

#	Directive *	Timeline	Status	Status Updates
1	<p>The Administrative Director of the Courts operates subject to the oversight of the Judicial Council. E&amp;P recommends that the Judicial Council direct the Administrative Director of the Courts to report to E&amp;P before each Judicial Council meeting on each item on this chart approved by the Judicial Council.</p> <p><a href="#">SEC Recommendation</a>  The Administrative Director must operate subject to the oversight of the Judicial Council and will be charged with implementing the recommendations in this report if so directed.</p>	For immediate implementation (Ongoing)	Completed	Activity Reporting and Proposal Form submitted to the Judicial Council for the October 26, 2012, Judicial Council Meeting.
2	<p>E&amp;P recommends that the Judicial Council take an active role in overseeing and monitoring the AOC to ensure transparency, accountability, and efficiency in the AOC's operations and practices.</p> <p><a href="#">SEC Recommendation</a>  The Judicial Council must take an active role in overseeing and monitoring the AOC and demanding transparency, accountability, and efficiency in the AOC's operations and practices.</p>	For immediate implementation (Ongoing)	Ongoing	

\* This document retains the wording presented by the Judicial Council's Executive and Planning Committee approved by the Judicial Council on August 31, 2012.

#	Directive *	Timeline	Status	Status Updates
3	<p>E&amp;P recommends that the Judicial Council promote the primary role and orientation of the AOC as a service provider to the Judicial Council and the courts for the benefit of the public.</p> <p><a href="#">SEC Recommendation</a></p> <p>The primary role and orientation of the AOC must be as a service provider to the Judicial Council and the courts.</p>	For immediate implementation (Ongoing)	Ongoing	
4	<p>E&amp;P recommends that the Judicial Council, in exercising its independent and ultimate governance authority over the operations and practices of the AOC, must ensure that the AOC provide it with a comprehensive analysis, including a business case analysis, a full range of options and impacts and pros and cons, before undertaking any branch-wide project or initiative. In exercising its authority over committees, rules, grants, programs and projects, the Judicial Council must ensure that the AOC provide it with a full range of options and impacts, including fiscal, operational, and other impacts on the courts.</p> <p><a href="#">SEC Recommendation</a></p> <p>In exercising its independent and ultimate governance authority over the operations and practices of the AOC, the Judicial Council must demand that the AOC provide it with a business case analysis, including a full range of options and impacts, before undertaking any branch-wide project or initiative. In exercising its authority over committees, rules, grants, programs, and projects, the Judicial Council must demand that the AOC provide it with a full range of options and impacts, including fiscal, operational, and other impacts on the courts.</p>	For immediate implementation (Ongoing)	Ongoing	

\* This document retains the wording presented by the Judicial Council's Executive and Planning Committee approved by the Judicial Council on August 31, 2012.

#	Directive *	Timeline	Status	Status Updates
5	<p>E&amp;P recommends that the Judicial Council conduct an annual review of the performance of the Administrative Director of the Courts (ADOC). The review must take into consideration input submitted by persons inside and outside the judicial branch.</p> <p><a href="#">SEC Recommendation</a></p> <p>The Judicial Council must conduct periodic reviews of the performance of the Administrative Director of the Courts. These reviews must take into consideration input submitted by persons inside and outside the judicial branch.</p>	For initiation October 2013	Ongoing	

\* This document retains the wording presented by the Judicial Council's Executive and Planning Committee approved by the Judicial Council on August 31, 2012.

#	Directive *	Timeline	Status	Status Updates
6	E&P recommends that the Judicial Council direct the Rules and Projects Committee, consistent with its responsibility under rule 10.13 of the California Rules of Court, to establish and maintain a rule-making process that is understandable and accessible to justice system partners and the public, to consider SEC Recommendation 6-8 and report on any changes to the rule-making process to the Judicial Council.	RUPRO to propose a timeline to return to the council to present its recommendations.	Completed	<p>RUPRO will continue to address this directive on an ongoing basis. Most recently, on behalf of RUPRO, Justice Hull attended the meetings of the executive committees of the Trial Court Presiding Judges and Court Executives Advisory Committees to summarize RUPRO's actions to address this directive and seek their input on the effect of the changes. As it does annually, through the process for review and approval of annual agendas, RUPRO applied priority levels to rules and forms proposals when RUPRO approved annual agendas of advisory groups that it oversees. RUPRO considered whether there is an urgent need for proposals and whether they will provide significant benefits to the courts and public. Since January 2013, actions by RUPRO related to this directive include directing two advisory groups to submit proposals to the Presiding Judges and Court Executive Officers for early input on the proposals, including requesting information about fiscal and operational impacts.</p> <p>RUPRO will, as part of annual agenda review, continue to review all advisory body proposals for rules and forms under RUPRO policies in effect at that time (the current policy is to give priority to proposals that are statutorily required or promote cost savings or efficiencies). The RUPRO Chair will continue to meet with TCPJAC Executive Committee on an ongoing basis to discuss the issues identified in this directive.</p>

#### SEC Recommendation

The AOC must develop a process to better assess the fiscal and operational impacts of proposed rules on the courts, including seeking earlier input from the courts before proposed rules are submitted for formal review. The AOC should establish a process to survey judges and court executive officers about the fiscal and operational impacts of rules that are adopted, and recommend revisions to the rules where appropriate. The AOC should

\* This document retains the wording presented by the Judicial Council's Executive and Planning Committee approved by the Judicial Council on August 31, 2012.

#	Directive *	Timeline	Status	Status Updates
	recommend changes in the rules process, for consideration by the Judicial Council, to limit the number of proposals for new rules, including by focusing on rule changes that are required by statutory changes.			

\* This document retains the wording presented by the Judicial Council's Executive and Planning Committee approved by the Judicial Council on August 31, 2012.

#	Directive *	Timeline	Status	Status Updates
7	E&P recommends that the Judicial Council direct the Administrative Director of the Courts to propose a procedure to seek the fully informed input and collaboration of the courts before undertaking significant projects or branchwide initiatives that affect the courts. The AOC should also seek the input of all stakeholder groups, including the State Bar.	ADOC to propose a procedure for Judicial Council approval at the October 2013 council meeting.	Completed	<p>Directives 7-13, 21, 40, 91, and 145 have been combined as part of a broader review and policy discussion relating to the development of a cost-benefit analysis proposal for the AOC. After a review of existing internal processes, AOC staff have developed general guidelines that seek to ensure that all elements within each of these 10 directives were adequately addressed. A process for approval of branchwide projects and other significant initiatives was developed to ensure an appropriate evaluation is completed, which can include a full and comprehensive cost-benefit analysis, as necessary. That evaluation will include the input and collaboration of all stakeholders, a complete analysis of scope, accurate cost estimates and funding streams and associated controls, documentation of the decision-making processes, and the full transparent consideration of fiscal, operational, and other impacts to the courts and stakeholders.</p> <p>The AOC fully recognizes the value of implementing guidelines to effectively coordinate and manage important branchwide projects. The new "Guidelines for the Administration of Branchwide Projects and Initiatives" have been reviewed and approved by the Administrative Director of the Courts and will be implemented as the official AOC process in the coming weeks. These guidelines will be presented to the Judicial Council at its December 2013 meeting. At this time, having addressed the matters in each, the AOC will close Directives 7-13, 21, 40, 91, and 145.</p>

#### SEC Recommendation

The AOC must seek the fully informed input and collaboration of the courts before undertaking significant projects or branch-wide initiatives that affect the courts.

---

\* This document retains the wording presented by the Judicial Council's Executive and Planning Committee approved by the Judicial Council on August 31, 2012.



#	Directive *	Timeline	Status	Status Updates
8	E&P recommends that the Judicial Council direct the Administrative Director of the Courts to develop a procedure to first employ a comprehensive analysis, including an appropriate business case analysis of the scope and direction of significant projects or initiatives, taking into account the range of fiscal, operational, and other impacts to the courts and stakeholders.	ADOC to propose a procedure for Judicial Council approval at the October 2013 council meeting.	Completed	<p>Directives 7-13, 21, 40, 91, and 145 have been combined as part of a broader review and policy discussion relating to the development of a cost-benefit analysis proposal for the AOC. After a review of existing internal processes, AOC staff have developed general guidelines that seek to ensure that all elements within each of these 10 directives were adequately addressed. A process for approval of branchwide projects and other significant initiatives was developed to ensure an appropriate evaluation is completed, which can include a full and comprehensive cost-benefit analysis, as necessary. That evaluation will include the input and collaboration of all stakeholders, a complete analysis of scope, accurate cost estimates and funding streams and associated controls, documentation of the decision-making processes, and the full transparent consideration of fiscal, operational, and other impacts to the courts and stakeholders.</p> <p>The AOC fully recognizes the value of implementing guidelines to effectively coordinate and manage important branchwide projects. The new "Guidelines for the Administration of Branchwide Projects and Initiatives" have been reviewed and approved by the Administrative Director of the Courts and will be implemented as the official AOC process in the coming weeks. These guidelines will be presented to the Judicial Council at its December 2013 meeting. At this time, having addressed the matters in each, the AOC will close Directives 7-13, 21, 40, 91, and 145.</p>
	<a href="#">SEC Recommendation</a> The AOC must first employ an appropriate business case analysis of the scope and direction of significant projects or initiatives, taking into account the range of fiscal, operational, and other impacts to the courts.			

\* This document retains the wording presented by the Judicial Council's Executive and Planning Committee approved by the Judicial Council on August 31, 2012.

#	Directive *	Timeline	Status	Status Updates
9	E&P recommends that the Judicial Council direct the Administrative Director of the Courts to develop a procedure for developing and communicating accurate cost estimates for projects, programs, and initiatives.	ADOC to propose a procedure for Judicial Council approval at the October 2013 council meeting.	Completed	<p>Directives 7-13, 21, 40, 91, and 145 have been combined as part of a broader review and policy discussion relating to the development of a cost-benefit analysis proposal for the AOC. After a review of existing internal processes, AOC staff have developed general guidelines that seek to ensure that all elements within each of these 10 directives were adequately addressed. A process for approval of branchwide projects and other significant initiatives was developed to ensure an appropriate evaluation is completed, which can include a full and comprehensive cost-benefit analysis, as necessary. That evaluation will include the input and collaboration of all stakeholders, a complete analysis of scope, accurate cost estimates and funding streams and associated controls, documentation of the decision-making processes, and the full transparent consideration of fiscal, operational, and other impacts to the courts and stakeholders.</p> <p>The AOC fully recognizes the value of implementing guidelines to effectively coordinate and manage important branchwide projects. The new "Guidelines for the Administration of Branchwide Projects and Initiatives" have been reviewed and approved by the Administrative Director of the Courts and will be implemented as the official AOC process in the coming weeks. These guidelines will be presented to the Judicial Council at its December 2013 meeting. At this time, having addressed the matters in each, the AOC will close Directives 7-13, 21, 40, 91, and 145.</p>

[SEC Recommendation](#)

The AOC must develop and communicate accurate cost estimates for projects, programs, and initiatives.

---

\* This document retains the wording presented by the Judicial Council's Executive and Planning Committee approved by the Judicial Council on August 31, 2012.

#	Directive *	Timeline	Status	Status Updates
10	E&P recommends that the Judicial Council direct the Administrative Director of the Courts to develop a procedure to apply proper cost and contract controls and monitoring, including independent assessment and verification, for significant projects and programs.	ADOC to propose a procedure for Judicial Council approval at the October 2013 council meeting.	Completed	<p>Directives 7-13, 21, 40, 91, and 145 have been combined as part of a broader review and policy discussion relating to the development of a cost-benefit analysis proposal for the AOC. After a review of existing internal processes, AOC staff have developed general guidelines that seek to ensure that all elements within each of these 10 directives were adequately addressed. A process for approval of branchwide projects and other significant initiatives was developed to ensure an appropriate evaluation is completed, which can include a full and comprehensive cost-benefit analysis, as necessary. That evaluation will include the input and collaboration of all stakeholders, a complete analysis of scope, accurate cost estimates and funding streams and associated controls, documentation of the decision-making processes, and the full transparent consideration of fiscal, operational, and other impacts to the courts and stakeholders.</p> <p>The AOC fully recognizes the value of implementing guidelines to effectively coordinate and manage important branchwide projects. The new "Guidelines for the Administration of Branchwide Projects and Initiatives" have been reviewed and approved by the Administrative Director of the Courts and will be implemented as the official AOC process in the coming weeks. These guidelines will be presented to the Judicial Council at its December 2013 meeting. At this time, having addressed the matters in each, the AOC will close Directives 7-13, 21, 40, 91, and 145.</p>

SEC Recommendation

The AOC must apply proper cost and contract controls and monitoring, including independent assessment and verification, for significant projects and programs.

---

\* This document retains the wording presented by the Judicial Council's Executive and Planning Committee approved by the Judicial Council on August 31, 2012.

#	Directive *	Timeline	Status	Status Updates
11	E&P recommends that the Judicial Council direct the Administrative Director of the Courts to develop a procedure to maintain proper documentation and records of its decision making process for significant projects and programs.	ADOC to propose a procedure for Judicial Council approval at the October 2013 council meeting.	Completed	<p>Directives 7-13, 21, 40, 91, and 145 have been combined as part of a broader review and policy discussion relating to the development of a cost-benefit analysis proposal for the AOC. After a review of existing internal processes, AOC staff have developed general guidelines that seek to ensure that all elements within each of these 10 directives were adequately addressed. A process for approval of branchwide projects and other significant initiatives was developed to ensure an appropriate evaluation is completed, which can include a full and comprehensive cost-benefit analysis, as necessary. That evaluation will include the input and collaboration of all stakeholders, a complete analysis of scope, accurate cost estimates and funding streams and associated controls, documentation of the decision-making processes, and the full transparent consideration of fiscal, operational, and other impacts to the courts and stakeholders.</p> <p>The AOC fully recognizes the value of implementing guidelines to effectively coordinate and manage important branchwide projects. The new "Guidelines for the Administration of Branchwide Projects and Initiatives" have been reviewed and approved by the Administrative Director of the Courts and will be implemented as the official AOC process in the coming weeks. These guidelines will be presented to the Judicial Council at its December 2013 meeting. At this time, having addressed the matters in each, the AOC will close Directives 7-13, 21, 40, 91, and 145.</p>
	<a href="#">SEC Recommendation</a> The AOC must maintain proper documentation and records of its decision making process for significant projects and programs.			

\* This document retains the wording presented by the Judicial Council's Executive and Planning Committee approved by the Judicial Council on August 31, 2012.

#	Directive *	Timeline	Status	Status Updates
12	E&P recommends that the Judicial Council direct the Administrative Director of the Courts to develop a procedure to identify and secure sufficient funding and revenue streams necessary to support projects and programs, before undertaking them.	ADOC to propose a procedure for Judicial Council approval at the October 2013 council meeting.	Completed	<p>Directives 7-13, 21, 40, 91, and 145 have been combined as part of a broader review and policy discussion relating to the development of a cost-benefit analysis proposal for the AOC. After a review of existing internal processes, AOC staff have developed general guidelines that seek to ensure that all elements within each of these 10 directives were adequately addressed. A process for approval of branchwide projects and other significant initiatives was developed to ensure an appropriate evaluation is completed, which can include a full and comprehensive cost-benefit analysis, as necessary. That evaluation will include the input and collaboration of all stakeholders, a complete analysis of scope, accurate cost estimates and funding streams and associated controls, documentation of the decision-making processes, and the full transparent consideration of fiscal, operational, and other impacts to the courts and stakeholders.</p> <p>The AOC fully recognizes the value of implementing guidelines to effectively coordinate and manage important branchwide projects. The new "Guidelines for the Administration of Branchwide Projects and Initiatives" have been reviewed and approved by the Administrative Director of the Courts and will be implemented as the official AOC process in the coming weeks. These guidelines will be presented to the Judicial Council at its December 2013 meeting. At this time, having addressed the matters in each, the AOC will close Directives 7-13, 21, 40, 91, and 145.</p>

[SEC Recommendation](#)

The AOC must identify and secure sufficient funding and revenue streams necessary to support projects and programs, before undertaking them.

---

\* This document retains the wording presented by the Judicial Council's Executive and Planning Committee approved by the Judicial Council on August 31, 2012.

#	Directive *	Timeline	Status	Status Updates
13	E&P recommends that the Judicial Council direct the Administrative Director of the Courts to develop a procedure to accurately report and make available information on potential costs of projects and impacts on the courts.	ADOC to propose a procedure for Judicial Council approval at the October 2013 council meeting.	Completed	<p>Directives 7-13, 21, 40, 91, and 145 have been combined as part of a broader review and policy discussion relating to the development of a cost-benefit analysis proposal for the AOC. After a review of existing internal processes, AOC staff have developed general guidelines that seek to ensure that all elements within each of these 10 directives were adequately addressed. A process for approval of branchwide projects and other significant initiatives was developed to ensure an appropriate evaluation is completed, which can include a full and comprehensive cost-benefit analysis, as necessary. That evaluation will include the input and collaboration of all stakeholders, a complete analysis of scope, accurate cost estimates and funding streams and associated controls, documentation of the decision-making processes, and the full transparent consideration of fiscal, operational, and other impacts to the courts and stakeholders.</p> <p>The AOC fully recognizes the value of implementing guidelines to effectively coordinate and manage important branchwide projects. The new "Guidelines for the Administration of Branchwide Projects and Initiatives" have been reviewed and approved by the Administrative Director of the Courts and will be implemented as the official AOC process in the coming weeks. These guidelines will be presented to the Judicial Council at its December 2013 meeting. At this time, having addressed the matters in each, the AOC will close Directives 7-13, 21, 40, 91, and 145.</p>
	<a href="#">SEC Recommendation</a> The AOC must accurately report and make available information on potential costs of projects and impacts on the courts.			

\* This document retains the wording presented by the Judicial Council's Executive and Planning Committee approved by the Judicial Council on August 31, 2012.

#	Directive *	Timeline	Status	Status Updates
14	E&P recommends that the Judicial Council direct the Administrative Director of the Courts to conduct a comprehensive review of the AOC position classification system as soon as possible. The focus of the review must be on identifying and correcting misallocated positions, particularly in managerial classes, and on achieving efficiencies by consolidating and reducing the number of classifications.	The Classification & Compensation Study is scheduled to be adopted by the Judicial Council at its meeting in April 2015; based upon the direction provided by the Judicial Council, the Executive Office will implement the plan accordingly and will provide an update to council at the October 2015 council meeting.	In Progress	<p>On September 9, 2013, the Executive and Planning Committee (E&amp;P) reviewed the methodology, criteria, and process used to score the Request for Proposal (RFP) bids, reviewed the final bid scoring and findings, and approved the awarding of the contract to the highest scored bidder.</p> <p>In October 2013, E&amp;P provided an update to the Judicial Council notifying them that the highest scored bidder was selected to conduct the classification and compensation study.</p> <p>In November 2013, Fox Lawson &amp; Associates was awarded the contract to conduct the Judicial Council's classification and compensation study. Four meetings were held with Fox Lawson &amp; Associates, members of the Human Resources (HR) staff, and the Executive Office to establish the specifics of the study, including methodology, timeline, and a review of the current classification and compensation system at the Judicial Council.</p> <p>In December 2013, communications were sent to all Judicial Council staff informing them of the beginning of the study and outlining the requirements, including completing employee Position Description Questionnaires (PDQ), which were due in February 2014.</p> <p>In January 2014, Judicial Council staff conducted information sessions at each Judicial Council office to answer employees' questions regarding the study.</p> <p>In April and May 2014, Fox Lawson completed meeting with approximately 20 occupational</p>

\* This document retains the wording presented by the Judicial Council's Executive and Planning Committee approved by the Judicial Council on August 31, 2012.

#	Directive *	Timeline	Status	Status Updates
				<p>panels across Judicial Council offices and locations, and will be scheduling regular updates to brief the Executive Office.</p> <p>In June 2014, the Judicial Council Human Resources office and Fox Lawson discussed the current progress of the study with the council. Fox Lawson also began a series of one-on-one phone interviews with a small number of employees. The purpose was to clarify specific information provided in the PDQs regarding essential duties.</p> <p>In July 2014, the Executive Office held all-staff meetings to update Judicial Council staff about the progress of the study and discussed the selected comparator markets.</p> <p>In August 2014, Fox Lawson met with the Internal Chairs and the Executive Office to discuss recommendations for the proposed classification structure. The Internal Chairs and the Executive Office briefed the Judicial Council in closed session.</p> <p>In September 2014, Fox Lawson took steps to draft classification specifications and finalized job description summaries for market survey.</p> <p>In October 2014, Fox Lawson continued to draft and finalize the classification specifications and initiated the market survey to begin the compensation phase of the study.</p> <p>All-staff meetings were held in November 2014 to communicate the current status of the Classification and Compensation Study. During the meeting, employees were provided with an overview of the new classification system and were given information on the appeals process.</p>

\* This document retains the wording presented by the Judicial Council's Executive and Planning Committee approved by the Judicial Council on August 31, 2012.



#	Directive *	Timeline	Status	Status Updates
---	-------------	----------	--------	----------------

In February 2015, employees are expected to be informed of their new classifications within the new structure and will have an opportunity to submit an appeal if they feel that their position has been incorrectly classified.

[SEC Recommendation](#)

The Executive Leadership Team must direct that a comprehensive review of the AOC position classification system begin as soon as possible. The focus of the review should be on identifying and correcting misallocated positions, particularly in managerial classes, and on achieving efficiencies by consolidating and reducing the number of classifications. The Chief Administrative Officer should be given lead responsibility for implementing this recommendation.

---

\* This document retains the wording presented by the Judicial Council's Executive and Planning Committee approved by the Judicial Council on August 31, 2012.

#	Directive *	Timeline	Status	Status Updates
15	The Administrative Office of the Courts must also undertake a comprehensive review of the AOC compensation system as soon as possible. The AOC must review all compensation-related policies and procedures, including those contained in the AOC Personnel Policies and Procedures Manual.	The Classification & Compensation Study is scheduled to be adopted by the Judicial Council at its meeting in April 2015; based upon the direction provided by the Judicial Council, the Executive Office will implement the plan accordingly and will provide an update to council at the October 2015 council meeting.	In Progress	<p>On September 9, 2013, the Executive and Planning Committee (E&amp;P) reviewed the methodology, criteria, and process used to score the Request for Proposal (RFP) bids, reviewed the final bid scoring and findings, and approved the awarding of the contract to the highest scored bidder.</p> <p>In October 2013, E&amp;P provided an update to the Judicial Council notifying them that the highest scored bidder was selected to conduct the classification and compensation study.</p> <p>In November 2013, Fox Lawson &amp; Associates was awarded the contract to conduct the Judicial Council's classification and compensation study. Four meetings were held with Fox Lawson &amp; Associates, members of the Human Resources (HR) staff, and the Executive Office to establish the specifics of the study, including methodology, timeline, and a review of the current classification and compensation system at the Judicial Council.</p> <p>In December 2013, communications were sent to all Judicial Council staff informing them of the beginning of the study and outlining the requirements, including completing employee Position Description Questionnaires (PDQ), which were due in February 2014.</p> <p>In January 2014, Judicial Council staff conducted information sessions at each Judicial Council office to answer employees' questions regarding the study.</p> <p>In April and May 2014, Fox Lawson completed meeting with approximately 20 occupational</p>

\* This document retains the wording presented by the Judicial Council's Executive and Planning Committee approved by the Judicial Council on August 31, 2012.

#	Directive *	Timeline	Status	Status Updates
				<p>panels across Judicial Council offices and locations, and will be scheduling regular updates to brief the Executive Office.</p> <p>In June 2014, the Judicial Council Human Resources office and Fox Lawson discussed the current progress of the study with the council. Fox Lawson also began a series of one-on-one phone interviews with a small number of employees. The purpose was to clarify specific information provided in the PDQs regarding essential duties.</p> <p>In July 2014, the Executive Office held all-staff meetings to update Judicial Council staff about the progress of the study and discussed the selected comparator markets.</p> <p>In August 2014, Fox Lawson met with the Internal Chairs and the Executive Office to discuss recommendations for the proposed classification structure. The Internal Chairs and the Executive Office briefed the Judicial Council in closed session.</p> <p>In September 2014, Fox Lawson took steps to draft classification specifications and finalized job description summaries for market survey.</p> <p>In October 2014, Fox Lawson continued to draft and finalize the classification specifications and initiated the market survey to begin the compensation phase of the study.</p> <p>All-staff meetings were held in November 2014 to communicate the current status of the Classification and Compensation Study. During the meeting, employees were provided with an overview of the new classification system and were given information on the appeals process.</p>

\* This document retains the wording presented by the Judicial Council's Executive and Planning Committee approved by the Judicial Council on August 31, 2012.

#	Directive *	Timeline	Status	Status Updates
---	-------------	----------	--------	----------------

In February 2015, employees are expected to be informed of their new classifications within the new structure and will have an opportunity to submit an appeal if they feel that their position has been incorrectly classified.

SEC Recommendation

The Executive Leadership Team must direct that a comprehensive review of the AOC compensation system be undertaken as soon as possible. All compensation-related policies and procedures must be reviewed, including those contained in the AOC personnel manual. AOC staff should be used to conduct this review to the extent possible. If outside consultants are required, such work could be combined with the classification review that is recommended above. The Chief Administrative Officer should be given lead responsibility for implementing this recommendation.

---

\* This document retains the wording presented by the Judicial Council's Executive and Planning Committee approved by the Judicial Council on August 31, 2012.

#	Directive *	Timeline	Status	Status Updates
16	<p>The AOC must overhaul current practices for its classification and compensation systems. The AOC must develop and consistently apply policies for classification and compensation of employees, by actions including the following:</p> <p>(a) A comprehensive review of the classification and compensation systems should be undertaken as soon as possible, with the goal of consolidating and streamlining the classification system.</p>	<p>The Classification &amp; Compensation Study is scheduled to be adopted by the Judicial Council at its meeting in April 2015; based upon the direction provided by the Judicial Council, the Executive Office will implement the plan accordingly and will provide an update to council at the October 2015 council meeting.</p>	In Progress	<p>On September 9, 2013, the Executive and Planning Committee (E&amp;P) reviewed the methodology, criteria, and process used to score the Request for Proposal (RFP) bids, reviewed the final bid scoring and findings, and approved the awarding of the contract to the highest scored bidder.</p> <p>In October 2013, E&amp;P provided an update to the Judicial Council notifying them that the highest scored bidder was selected to conduct the classification and compensation study.</p> <p>In November 2013, Fox Lawson &amp; Associates was awarded the contract to conduct the Judicial Council's classification and compensation study. Four meetings were held with Fox Lawson &amp; Associates, members of the Human Resources (HR) staff, and the Executive Office to establish the specifics of the study, including methodology, timeline, and a review of the current classification and compensation system at the Judicial Council.</p> <p>In December 2013, communications were sent to all Judicial Council staff informing them of the beginning of the study and outlining the requirements, including completing employee Position Description Questionnaires (PDQ), which were due in February 2014.</p> <p>In January 2014, Judicial Council staff conducted information sessions at each Judicial Council office to answer employees' questions regarding the study.</p> <p>In April and May 2014, Fox Lawson completed meeting with approximately 20 occupational</p>

\* This document retains the wording presented by the Judicial Council's Executive and Planning Committee approved by the Judicial Council on August 31, 2012.

#	Directive *	Timeline	Status	Status Updates
				<p>panels across Judicial Council offices and locations, and will be scheduling regular updates to brief the Executive Office.</p> <p>In June 2014, the Judicial Council Human Resources office and Fox Lawson discussed the current progress of the study with the council. Fox Lawson also began a series of one-on-one phone interviews with a small number of employees. The purpose was to clarify specific information provided in the PDQs regarding essential duties.</p> <p>In July 2014, the Executive Office held all-staff meetings to update Judicial Council staff about the progress of the study and discussed the selected comparator markets.</p> <p>In August 2014, Fox Lawson met with the Internal Chairs and the Executive Office to discuss recommendations for the proposed classification structure. The Internal Chairs and the Executive Office briefed the Judicial Council in closed session.</p> <p>In September 2014, Fox Lawson took steps to draft classification specifications and finalized job description summaries for market survey.</p> <p>In October 2014, Fox Lawson continued to draft and finalize the classification specifications and initiated the market survey to begin the compensation phase of the study.</p> <p>All-staff meetings were held in November 2014 to communicate the current status of the Classification and Compensation Study. During the meeting, employees were provided with an overview of the new classification system and were given information on the appeals process.</p>

\* This document retains the wording presented by the Judicial Council's Executive and Planning Committee approved by the Judicial Council on August 31, 2012.

#	Directive *	Timeline	Status	Status Updates
---	-------------	----------	--------	----------------

In February 2015, employees are expected to be informed of their new classifications within the new structure and will have an opportunity to submit an appeal if they feel that their position has been incorrectly classified.

SEC Recommendation

The AOC must commit to overhauling current practices for its classification and compensation systems. The AOC then must develop and consistently apply policies for classification and compensation of employees by actions including the following:

(a) A comprehensive review of the classification and compensation systems should be undertaken as soon as possible, with the goal of consolidating and streamlining the classification system.

---

\* This document retains the wording presented by the Judicial Council's Executive and Planning Committee approved by the Judicial Council on August 31, 2012.

#	Directive *	Timeline	Status	Status Updates
17	<p>The AOC must overhaul current practices for its classification and compensation systems. The AOC must develop and consistently apply policies for classification and compensation of employees, by actions including the following:</p> <p>(b) Priority should be placed on reviewing all positions classified as supervisors or managers, as well as all attorney positions, to identify misclassified positions and take appropriate corrective actions.</p>	<p>The Classification &amp; Compensation Study is scheduled to be adopted by the Judicial Council at its meeting in April 2015; based upon the direction provided by the Judicial Council, the Executive Office will implement the plan accordingly and will provide an update to council at the October 2015 council meeting.</p>	In Progress	<p>On September 9, 2013, the Executive and Planning Committee (E&amp;P) reviewed the methodology, criteria, and process used to score the Request for Proposal (RFP) bids, reviewed the final bid scoring and findings, and approved the awarding of the contract to the highest scored bidder.</p> <p>In October 2013, E&amp;P provided an update to the Judicial Council notifying them that the highest scored bidder was selected to conduct the classification and compensation study.</p> <p>In November 2013, Fox Lawson &amp; Associates was awarded the contract to conduct the Judicial Council's classification and compensation study. Four meetings were held with Fox Lawson &amp; Associates, members of the Human Resources (HR) staff, and the Executive Office to establish the specifics of the study, including methodology, timeline, and a review of the current classification and compensation system at the Judicial Council.</p> <p>In December 2013, communications were sent to all Judicial Council staff informing them of the beginning of the study and outlining the requirements, including completing employee Position Description Questionnaires (PDQ), which were due in February 2014.</p> <p>In January 2014, Judicial Council staff conducted information sessions at each Judicial Council office to answer employees' questions regarding the study.</p> <p>In April and May 2014, Fox Lawson completed meeting with approximately 20 occupational</p>

\* This document retains the wording presented by the Judicial Council's Executive and Planning Committee approved by the Judicial Council on August 31, 2012.



#	Directive *	Timeline	Status	Status Updates
				<p>panels across Judicial Council offices and locations, and will be scheduling regular updates to brief the Executive Office.</p> <p>In June 2014, the Judicial Council Human Resources office and Fox Lawson discussed the current progress of the study with the council. Fox Lawson also began a series of one-on-one phone interviews with a small number of employees. The purpose was to clarify specific information provided in the PDQs regarding essential duties.</p> <p>In July 2014, the Executive Office held all-staff meetings to update Judicial Council staff about the progress of the study and discussed the selected comparator markets.</p> <p>In August 2014, Fox Lawson met with the Internal Chairs and the Executive Office to discuss recommendations for the proposed classification structure. The Internal Chairs and the Executive Office briefed the Judicial Council in closed session.</p> <p>In September 2014, Fox Lawson took steps to draft classification specifications and finalized job description summaries for market survey.</p> <p>In October 2014, Fox Lawson continued to draft and finalize the classification specifications and initiated the market survey to begin the compensation phase of the study.</p> <p>All-staff meetings were held in November 2014 to communicate the current status of the Classification and Compensation Study. During the meeting, employees were provided with an overview of the new classification system and were given information on the appeals process.</p>

\* This document retains the wording presented by the Judicial Council's Executive and Planning Committee approved by the Judicial Council on August 31, 2012.

#	Directive *	Timeline	Status	Status Updates
---	-------------	----------	--------	----------------

In February 2015, employees are expected to be informed of their new classifications within the new structure and will have an opportunity to submit an appeal if they feel that their position has been incorrectly classified.

SEC Recommendation

The AOC must commit to overhauling current practices for its classification and compensation systems. The AOC then must develop and consistently apply policies for classification and compensation of employees by actions including the following:

(b) Priority should be placed on reviewing all positions classified as supervisors or managers, as well as all attorney positions, to identify misclassified positions and take appropriate corrective actions.

---

\* This document retains the wording presented by the Judicial Council's Executive and Planning Committee approved by the Judicial Council on August 31, 2012.

#	Directive *	Timeline	Status	Status Updates
18	<p>The AOC must overhaul current practices for its classification and compensation systems. The AOC must develop and consistently apply policies for classification and compensation of employees, by actions including the following:</p> <p>(c) The manner in which the AOC applies its geographic salary differential policy (section 4.2 of the AOC Personnel Policies and Procedures Manual) should be reviewed and, if maintained, applied consistently.</p>	<p>The Classification &amp; Compensation Study is scheduled to be adopted by the Judicial Council at its meeting in April 2015; based upon the direction provided by the Judicial Council, the Executive Office will implement the plan accordingly and will provide an update to council at the October 2015 council meeting.</p>	In Progress	<p>On September 9, 2013, the Executive and Planning Committee (E&amp;P) reviewed the methodology, criteria, and process used to score the Request for Proposal (RFP) bids, reviewed the final bid scoring and findings, and approved the awarding of the contract to the highest scored bidder.</p> <p>In October 2013, E&amp;P provided an update to the Judicial Council notifying them that the highest scored bidder was selected to conduct the classification and compensation study.</p> <p>In November 2013, Fox Lawson &amp; Associates was awarded the contract to conduct the Judicial Council's classification and compensation study. Four meetings were held with Fox Lawson &amp; Associates, members of the Human Resources (HR) staff, and the Executive Office to establish the specifics of the study, including methodology, timeline, and a review of the current classification and compensation system at the Judicial Council.</p> <p>In December 2013, communications were sent to all Judicial Council staff informing them of the beginning of the study and outlining the requirements, including completing employee Position Description Questionnaires (PDQ), which were due in February 2014.</p> <p>In January 2014, Judicial Council staff conducted information sessions at each Judicial Council office to answer employees' questions regarding the study.</p> <p>In April and May 2014, Fox Lawson completed meeting with approximately 20 occupational</p>

\* This document retains the wording presented by the Judicial Council's Executive and Planning Committee approved by the Judicial Council on August 31, 2012.

#	Directive *	Timeline	Status	Status Updates
				<p>panels across Judicial Council offices and locations, and will be scheduling regular updates to brief the Executive Office.</p> <p>In June 2014, the Judicial Council Human Resources office and Fox Lawson discussed the current progress of the study with the council. Fox Lawson also began a series of one-on-one phone interviews with a small number of employees. The purpose was to clarify specific information provided in the PDQs regarding essential duties.</p> <p>In July 2014, the Executive Office held all-staff meetings to update Judicial Council staff about the progress of the study and discussed the selected comparator markets.</p> <p>In August 2014, Fox Lawson met with the Internal Chairs and the Executive Office to discuss recommendations for the proposed classification structure. The Internal Chairs and the Executive Office briefed the Judicial Council in closed session.</p> <p>In September 2014, Fox Lawson took steps to draft classification specifications and finalized job description summaries for market survey.</p> <p>In October 2014, Fox Lawson continued to draft and finalize the classification specifications and initiated the market survey to begin the compensation phase of the study.</p> <p>All-staff meetings were held in November 2014 to communicate the current status of the Classification and Compensation Study. During the meeting, employees were provided with an overview of the new classification system and were given information on the appeals process.</p>

\* This document retains the wording presented by the Judicial Council's Executive and Planning Committee approved by the Judicial Council on August 31, 2012.

#	Directive *	Timeline	Status	Status Updates
---	-------------	----------	--------	----------------

In February 2015, employees are expected to be informed of their new classifications within the new structure and will have an opportunity to submit an appeal if they feel that their position has been incorrectly classified.

[SEC Recommendation](#)

The AOC must commit to overhauling current practices for its classification and compensation systems. The AOC then must develop and consistently apply policies for classification and compensation of employees by actions including the following:

(c) The manner in which the AOC applies its geographic salary differential policy (section 4.2 of the AOC personnel manual) should be reviewed and, if maintained, applied consistently.

---

\* This document retains the wording presented by the Judicial Council's Executive and Planning Committee approved by the Judicial Council on August 31, 2012.

#	Directive *	Timeline	Status	Status Updates
19	<p>The AOC must overhaul current practices for its classification and compensation systems. The AOC must develop and consistently apply policies for classification and compensation of employees, by actions including the following:</p> <p>(d) Given current HR staffing and expertise levels, the Administrative Director of the Courts is directed to consider whether an outside entity should conduct these reviews and return to the Judicial Council with an analysis and a recommendation.</p> <p><a href="#">SEC Recommendation</a></p> <p>The AOC must commit to overhauling current practices for its classification and compensation systems. The AOC then must develop and consistently apply policies for classification and compensation of employees by actions including the following:</p> <p>(d) Given current HR staffing and expertise levels, an outside entity should be considered to conduct these reviews.</p>	<p>Due date will be modified after September 2013 after the selection of a vendor for the AOC Classification and Compensations study as directed by the Judicial Council.</p>	Completed	<p>On September 9, 2013, the Executive and Planning Committee (E&amp;P) reviewed the methodology, criteria, and process used to score the Request for Proposal (RFP) bids, reviewed the final bid scoring and findings, and approved the awarding of the contract to the highest-scored bidder. The AOC is working with the successful bidder to develop and execute an agreement, expected to be finalized no later than October 31, 2013. If the parties are able to reach agreement, the contract start date will begin in October 2013 with an estimated end date of November 24, 2014. The study is expected to commence following the contract start date.</p> <p>In October 2013, E&amp;P will provide an update to the Judicial Council on the results of the Classification and Compensation study RFP, and outline next steps for the commencement of the organization-wide AOC Classification and Compensation study.</p>

\* This document retains the wording presented by the Judicial Council's Executive and Planning Committee approved by the Judicial Council on August 31, 2012.

#	Directive *	Timeline	Status	Status Updates
20	E&P also recommends that the Judicial Council direct the Administrative Director of the Courts to assess the results of the compensation and classification studies to be completed and propose organizational changes that take into account the SEC recommendation 7-75 and the analysis of the classification and compensation studies.	The Classification & Compensation Study is scheduled to be adopted by the Judicial Council at its meeting in April 2015; based upon the direction provided by the Judicial Council, the Executive Office will implement the plan accordingly and will provide an update to council at the October 2015 council meeting.	In Progress	<p>On September 9, 2013, the Executive and Planning Committee (E&amp;P) reviewed the methodology, criteria, and process used to score the Request for Proposal (RFP) bids, reviewed the final bid scoring and findings, and approved the awarding of the contract to the highest scored bidder.</p> <p>In October 2013, E&amp;P provided an update to the Judicial Council notifying them that the highest scored bidder was selected to conduct the classification and compensation study.</p> <p>In November 2013, Fox Lawson &amp; Associates was awarded the contract to conduct the Judicial Council's classification and compensation study. Four meetings were held with Fox Lawson &amp; Associates, members of the Human Resources (HR) staff, and the Executive Office to establish the specifics of the study, including methodology, timeline, and a review of the current classification and compensation system at the Judicial Council.</p> <p>In December 2013, communications were sent to all Judicial Council staff informing them of the beginning of the study and outlining the requirements, including completing employee Position Description Questionnaires (PDQ), which were due in February 2014.</p> <p>In January 2014, Judicial Council staff conducted information sessions at each Judicial Council office to answer employees' questions regarding the study.</p> <p>In April and May 2014, Fox Lawson completed meeting with approximately 20 occupational</p>

\* This document retains the wording presented by the Judicial Council's Executive and Planning Committee approved by the Judicial Council on August 31, 2012.

#	Directive *	Timeline	Status	Status Updates
				<p>panels across Judicial Council offices and locations, and will be scheduling regular updates to brief the Executive Office.</p> <p>In June 2014, the Judicial Council Human Resources office and Fox Lawson discussed the current progress of the study with the council. Fox Lawson also began a series of one-on-one phone interviews with a small number of employees. The purpose was to clarify specific information provided in the PDQs regarding essential duties.</p> <p>In July 2014, the Executive Office held all-staff meetings to update Judicial Council staff about the progress of the study and discussed the selected comparator markets.</p> <p>In August 2014, Fox Lawson met with the Internal Chairs and the Executive Office to discuss recommendations for the proposed classification structure. The Internal Chairs and the Executive Office briefed the Judicial Council in closed session.</p> <p>In September 2014, Fox Lawson took steps to draft classification specifications and finalized job description summaries for market survey.</p> <p>In October 2014, Fox Lawson continued to draft and finalize the classification specifications and initiated the market survey to begin the compensation phase of the study.</p> <p>All-staff meetings were held in November 2014 to communicate the current status of the Classification and Compensation Study. During the meeting, employees were provided with an overview of the new classification system and were given information on the appeals process.</p>

\* This document retains the wording presented by the Judicial Council's Executive and Planning Committee approved by the Judicial Council on August 31, 2012.



#	Directive *	Timeline	Status	Status Updates
---	-------------	----------	--------	----------------

In February 2015, employees are expected to be informed of their new classifications within the new structure and will have an opportunity to submit an appeal if they feel that their position has been incorrectly classified.

SEC Recommendation

The Administrative Director should make an AOC-wide assessment to determine whether attorneys employed across the various AOC divisions are being best leveraged to serve the priority legal needs of the organization and court users.

---

\* This document retains the wording presented by the Judicial Council's Executive and Planning Committee approved by the Judicial Council on August 31, 2012.

#	Directive *	Timeline	Status	Status Updates
21	E&P recommends that the Judicial Council direct the Administrative Director of the Courts to implement a formalized system of program and project planning and monitoring that includes, at minimum, a collaborative planning process that requires an analysis of impacts on the judicial branch at the outset of all projects; use of workload analyses where appropriate; and development of general performance metrics for key AOC programs that allow expected performance levels to be set and evaluated.	Completion by December 2013.	Completed	<p>Directives 7-13, 21, 40, 91, and 145 have been combined as part of a broader review and policy discussion relating to the development of a cost-benefit analysis proposal for the AOC. After a review of existing internal processes, AOC staff have developed general guidelines that seek to ensure that all elements within each of these 10 directives were adequately addressed. A process for approval of branchwide projects and other significant initiatives was developed to ensure an appropriate evaluation is completed, which can include a full and comprehensive cost-benefit analysis, as necessary. That evaluation will include the input and collaboration of all stakeholders, a complete analysis of scope, accurate cost estimates and funding streams and associated controls, documentation of the decision-making processes, and the full transparent consideration of fiscal, operational, and other impacts to the courts and stakeholders.</p> <p>The AOC fully recognizes the value of implementing guidelines to effectively coordinate and manage important branchwide projects. The new "Guidelines for the Administration of Branchwide Projects and Initiatives" have been reviewed and approved by the Administrative Director of the Courts and will be implemented as the official AOC process in the coming weeks. These guidelines will be presented to the Judicial Council at its December 2013 meeting. At this time, having addressed the matters in each, the AOC will close Directives 7-13, 21, 40, 91, and 145.</p>

#### SEC Recommendation

The AOC Executive Leadership Team must begin to implement a formalized system of program and project planning and monitoring that includes, at minimum, a collaborative planning process that requires an analysis of impacts on the judicial branch at the outset of all projects; use of workload analyses where appropriate;

\* This document retains the wording presented by the Judicial Council's Executive and Planning Committee approved by the Judicial Council on August 31, 2012.

#	Directive *	Timeline	Status	Status Updates
	and development of general performance metrics for key AOC programs that allow expected performance levels to be set and evaluated.			
22	E&P recommends that the Judicial Council direct the AOC to renegotiate or terminate, if possible, its lease in Burbank. The lease for the Sacramento North spaces should be reviewed and, if possible, renegotiated to reflect actual usage of the office space. The AOC should explore lower cost lease options in San Francisco, recognizing that the State Department of General Services would have to find replacement tenants for its space.	ADOC recommendations to the council at the 10/26/12, council meeting.	Completed	Activity Reporting and Proposal Form submitted to the Judicial Council for the October 26, 2012, Judicial Council Meeting.
	<p><a href="#">SEC Recommendation</a></p> <p>The AOC should renegotiate or terminate its lease in Burbank. The lease for the Sacramento North spaces should be reviewed and renegotiated to reflect actual usage of the office space. The AOC should explore lower cost lease options in San Francisco, recognizing that DGS would have to find replacement tenants for its space.</p>			

\* This document retains the wording presented by the Judicial Council's Executive and Planning Committee approved by the Judicial Council on August 31, 2012.

#	Directive *	Timeline	Status	Status Updates
23	E&P recommends that the Judicial Council direct the Administrative Director of the Courts to identify legislative requirements that impose unnecessary reporting or other mandates on the courts and the AOC. Appropriate efforts should be made to revise or repeal such requirements.	ADOC report to E&P identifying legislative requirements by December 2013.	Completed	<p>The Office of Governmental Affairs continues to identify statutory requirements that impose unnecessary reporting or other mandates and, on behalf of and at the direction of the Judicial Council, advocate for revising and/or repealing such requirements.</p> <p>OGA continues to work with Judicial council staff to identify legislatively mandated reporting requirements for the Judicial Council, AOC and the courts that are unnecessary, outdated, or overly burdensome. In 2012, OGA worked with AOC divisions to identify several such reporting requirements. OGA then recommended to the legislature that these requirements be repealed. One such reporting requirement was eliminated. OGA has once again asked AOC divisions to identify additional unnecessary, outdated, or overly burdensome reporting requirements. OGA will continue to take ideas for eliminating unnecessary reporting requirements to the PCLC to seek legislative action to eliminate these requirements. This is a ongoing duty that will continue on beyond the life of the directive.</p>
	<p><a href="#">SEC Recommendation</a></p> <p>The Office of Governmental Affairs should be directed to identify legislative requirements that impose unnecessary reporting or other mandates on the AOC. Appropriate efforts should be made to revise or repeal such requirements.</p>			

\* This document retains the wording presented by the Judicial Council's Executive and Planning Committee approved by the Judicial Council on August 31, 2012.

#	Directive *	Timeline	Status	Status Updates
24	On August 9, 2012, E&P directed the interim Administrative Director of the Courts and incoming Administrative Director of the Courts to consider the SEC recommendations on AOC organizational structure (recommendations 5-1–5-6, 6-1) and present their proposal for an organizational structure for the consideration of the full Judicial Council at the August 31, 2012, council meeting.	Interim and incoming ADOC to present proposed organizational chart and implementation proposal to the council for consideration at the 8/31/12, council meeting.  With council approval, an organizational design will be implemented by October 2012.	Completed	Activity Reporting and Proposal Form submitted to the Judicial Council for the October 26, 2012, Judicial Council Meeting.

#### SEC Recommendation

5-1. The AOC should be reorganized. The organizational structure should consolidate programs and functions that primarily provide operational services within the Judicial and Court Operations Services Division. Those programs and functions that primarily provide administrative services should be consolidated within the Judicial and Court Administrative Services Division. Other programs and functions should be grouped within an Executive Office organizational unit. The Legal Services Office also should report directly to the Executive Office but no longer should be accorded divisional status.

5-2. The Chief Operating Officer should manage and direct the Judicial and Court Operations Services Division, consisting of functions located in the Court Operations Special Services Office; the Center for Families, Children and the Courts; the Education Office/Center for Judicial Education and Research; and the Office of Court Construction and Facilities Management.

5-3. The Chief Administrative Officer should manage and direct the Judicial and Court Administrative Services Division, consisting of functions located in the Fiscal Services Office, the Human Resources Services Office, the Trial Court Administrative Services Office, and the Information and Technology Services Office.

\* This document retains the wording presented by the Judicial Council's Executive and Planning Committee approved by the Judicial Council on August 31, 2012.

#	Directive *	Timeline	Status	Status Updates
	<p>5-4. Other important programs and functions should be consolidated within an Executive Office organizational unit under the direction of a Chief of Staff. Those functions and units include such functions as the coordination of AOC support of the Judicial Council, Trial Court Support and Liaison Services, the Office of Governmental Affairs, the Office of Communications, and a Special Programs and Projects Office.</p>			
	<p>5-5. The Chief Counsel, manager of the Legal Services Office (formerly the Office of the General Counsel) should report directly to the Administrative Director depending on the specific issue under consideration and depending on the preferences of the Administrative Director.</p>			
	<p>5-6. The Chief Deputy Administrative Director position must be eliminated. If the absence of the Administrative Director necessitates the designation of an Acting Administrative Director, the Chief Operating Officer should be so designated.</p>			
	<p>6-1. The Administrative Director, the Chief Operations Officer, the Chief Administrative Officer, and the Chief of Staff should be designated as the AOC Executive Leadership Team, the primary decision making group in the organization.</p>			

\* This document retains the wording presented by the Judicial Council's Executive and Planning Committee approved by the Judicial Council on August 31, 2012.

#	Directive *	Timeline	Status	Status Updates
25	<p>E&amp;P recommends that the Judicial Council direct the Administrative Director of the Courts to require immediate compliance with the requirements and policies in the AOC Personnel Policies and Procedures Manual, including formal performance reviews of all employees on an annual basis; compliance with the rules limiting telecommuting; and appropriate utilization of the discipline system.</p> <p><a href="#">SEC Recommendation</a></p> <p>The AOC Executive Leadership Team must order immediate compliance with the requirements and policies in the AOC personnel manual, including formal performance reviews of all employees on an annual basis; compliance with the rules limiting telecommuting; and appropriate utilization of the discipline system.</p>	<p>Administrative Director of the Courts to provide final report to the council at the June 2013 Judicial Council meeting.</p>	<p>Completed</p>	<p>Status on implementation progress for this directive is included in the Activity Reporting and Proposal Form submitted to the Judicial Council for the June 28, 2013, Judicial Council Meeting.</p>

\* This document retains the wording presented by the Judicial Council's Executive and Planning Committee approved by the Judicial Council on August 31, 2012.

#	Directive *	Timeline	Status	Status Updates
26	<p>E&amp;P recommends that the Judicial Council direct the Administrative Director of the Courts to ensure that the AOC adheres to its telecommuting policy consistently and identifies and corrects all existing deviations and violations of the existing policy. The Administrative Director of the Courts must review the AOC telecommuting policy and provide the council with a report proposing any recommendations on amendments to the policy, by the December 13-14, 2012, council meeting. Based on a recommendation from the Executive and Planning Committee, the Judicial Council added an additional directive to the existing telecommute directives at the December 14, 2012, meeting to consider and report on alternatives for the telecommute policy, including whether this policy should remain in force and directed the ADOC to return to the council with a report and recommendations for the council's February 2013 meeting.</p> <p><a href="#">SEC Recommendation</a></p> <p>The AOC must adhere to its telecommuting policy (Section 8.9 of the AOC personnel manual). It must apply the policy consistently and must identify and correct all existing deviations and violations of the existing policy.</p>	<p>Administrative Director of the Courts to report to the Executive &amp; Planning Committee on the use of the amended telecommute policy for the period of June 2013 - August 2013. The Administrative Director of the Courts will provide a year-end report/evaluation to the Judicial Council once a final timeline has been determined by the Committee.</p>	Completed	<p>Judicial Council report presented to the Judicial Council for consideration at the April 25, 2014, Judicial Council Meeting.</p>

\* This document retains the wording presented by the Judicial Council's Executive and Planning Committee approved by the Judicial Council on August 31, 2012.



#	Directive *	Timeline	Status	Status Updates
27	<p>E&amp;P recommends that the Judicial Council direct the Administrative Director of the Courts to ensure that, with an appropriate individual employee performance planning and appraisal system in place, the AOC utilizes the flexibility provided by its at-will employment policy to address employee performance issues. The AOC's at-will employment policy provides management with maximum hiring and firing flexibility, and should be exercised when appropriate.</p> <p><u>SEC Recommendation</u></p> <p>6-4. With an appropriate individual employee performance planning and appraisal system in place, the AOC must utilize the flexibility provided by its at-will employment policy to address serious employee performance issues.</p> <p>7-36. The AOC's at-will employment policy provides management with maximum hiring and firing flexibility, and should be exercised when appropriate.</p>	<p>ADOC report to the council at the April 2013 meeting.</p>	<p>Completed</p>	<p>Status on implementation progress for this directive is included in the Activity Reporting and Proposal Form submitted to the Judicial Council for the April 26, 2013, Judicial Council Meeting.</p>
28	<p>E&amp;P recommends that the Judicial Council direct that the Administrative Director of the Courts require compliance with the AOC's existing policy calling for annual performance appraisals of all AOC employees (AOC Personnel Policies and Procedures Manual, section 3.9) and that performance appraisals are uniformly implemented throughout the AOC as soon as possible.</p> <p><u>SEC Recommendation</u></p> <p>The AOC's existing policy calling for annual performance appraisals of all AOC employees (AOC personnel manual, section 3.9) must be implemented uniformly throughout the AOC as soon as possible.</p>	<p>Administrative Director of the Courts to provide final report to the council at the June 2013 Judicial Council meeting.</p>	<p>Completed</p>	<p>Status on implementation progress for this directive is included in the Activity Reporting and Proposal Form submitted to the Judicial Council for the June 28, 2013, Judicial Council Meeting.</p>

\* This document retains the wording presented by the Judicial Council's Executive and Planning Committee approved by the Judicial Council on August 31, 2012.

#	Directive *	Timeline	Status	Status Updates
29	<p>E&amp;P recommends that the Judicial Council direct the Administrative Director of the Courts to develop an employment discipline policy to be implemented consistently across the entire AOC that provides for performance improvement plans.</p> <p><a href="#">SEC Recommendation</a></p> <p>A consistent employment discipline policy must accompany the employee performance appraisal system. Section 8.1B of the AOC personnel manual discusses disciplinary action, but is inadequate. A policy that provides for performance improvement plans and for the actual utilization of progressive discipline should be developed and implemented consistently across the entire AOC.</p>	<p>Administrative Director of the Courts to provide final report to the council at the June 2013 Judicial Council meeting.</p>	Completed	<p>Status on implementation progress for this directive is included in the Activity Reporting and Proposal Form submitted to the Judicial Council for the June 28, 2013, Judicial Council Meeting.</p>
30	<p>E&amp;P recommends that the Judicial Council direct the Administrative Director of the Courts to utilize the AOC's layoff process to provide management with a proactive way to deal with significant reductions in resources.</p> <p><a href="#">SEC Recommendation</a></p> <p>The AOC must utilize its layoff process to provide management with a proactive way to deal with significant reductions in resources.</p>	<p>Revised policy adopted May 18, 2012.</p>	Completed	<p>Activity Reporting and Proposal Form submitted to the Judicial Council for the October 26, 2012, Judicial Council Meeting.</p>

\* This document retains the wording presented by the Judicial Council's Executive and Planning Committee approved by the Judicial Council on August 31, 2012.

#	Directive *	Timeline	Status	Status Updates
31	E&P recommends that the Judicial Council direct that the Administrative Director of the Courts require the AOC leadership to develop, maintain, and support implementation of effective and efficient human resources policies and practices uniformly throughout the AOC.	The Administrative Director of the Courts will provide a report to the Judicial Council at the August 2014 meeting.	Completed	<p>The Human Resources Services Office (HRSO) has concluded its review of the Personnel Policies and Procedures Manual (Manual). In conducting its review, the HRSO focused on updating policies to reflect legislative and organizational changes to the Judicial Council since July 2011, while simultaneously addressing issues raised by related Judicial Council Directives. All policies were reviewed within different areas of the HRSO. The office also received feedback from the Legal Services Office.</p> <p>The Manual has been and continues to be a living document. While this review is comprehensive and is intended to be inclusive of recent changes to the organization and state/federal employment law, the HRSO fully expects to make continuing adjustments as it relates to business needs/practices, and constantly changing legal environments while ensuring that policies remain relevant and accurate.</p> <p>The updated Policy Manual will be presented to the Executive and Planning Committee for final review.</p>
<p><u>SEC Recommendation</u></p> <p>The AOC leadership must recommit itself to developing and maintaining effective and efficient HR policies and practices. The new Administrative Director, among other priority actions, must reestablish the AOC's commitment to implement sound HR policies and practices.</p> <hr/>				

\* This document retains the wording presented by the Judicial Council's Executive and Planning Committee approved by the Judicial Council on August 31, 2012.

#	Directive *	Timeline	Status	Status Updates
32	E&P recommends that the Judicial Council direct the Administrative Director of the Courts that a gradual, prioritized review of all HR policies and practices, including all those incorporated in the AOC Personnel Policies and Procedures Manual, should be undertaken to ensure they are appropriate and are being applied effectively and consistently throughout the AOC.	The Administrative Director of the Courts will provide a report to the Judicial Council at the August 2014 meeting.	Completed	<p>The Human Resources Services Office (HRSO) has concluded its review of the Personnel Policies and Procedures Manual (Manual). In conducting its review, the HRSO focused on updating policies to reflect legislative and organizational changes to the Judicial Council since July 2011, while simultaneously addressing issues raised by related Judicial Council Directives. All policies were reviewed within different areas of the HRSO. The office also received feedback from the Legal Services Office.</p> <p>The Manual has been and continues to be a living document. While this review is comprehensive and is intended to be inclusive of recent changes to the organization and state/federal employment law, the HRSO fully expects to make continuing adjustments as it relates to business needs/practices, and constantly changing legal environments while ensuring that policies remain relevant and accurate.</p> <p>The updated Policy Manual will be presented to the Executive and Planning Committee for final review.</p>
<p><u>SEC Recommendation</u></p> <p>A gradual, prioritized review of all HR policies and practices, including all those incorporated in the AOC personnel manual should be undertaken to ensure they are appropriate and are being applied effectively and consistently throughout the AOC.</p> <hr/>				

\* This document retains the wording presented by the Judicial Council's Executive and Planning Committee approved by the Judicial Council on August 31, 2012.

#	Directive *	Timeline	Status	Status Updates
33	<p>E&amp;P recommends that the Judicial Council direct the Administrative Director of the Courts to report back on the budget and fiscal management measures implemented by the AOC to ensure that the AOC's fiscal and budget processes are transparent.</p> <p>The Administrative Director of the Courts should develop and make public a description of the AOC fiscal and budget process, including a calendar clearly describing how and when fiscal and budget decisions are made. The AOC should produce a comprehensive, publicly available midyear budget report, including budget projections for the remainder of the fiscal year and anticipated resource issues for the coming year.</p>	<p>Final report on measures taken to implement a new approach to the budget process by April 2015.</p>	<p>In Progress</p>	<p>The JCC Finance Office has already implemented various improvements to the JCC's budgeting process, but additional improvements are still being developed. JCC staff are also working to implement other fiscal and budget processes, such as improved budget &amp; allocation reports and developing enhanced training options for division/office budget liaisons. As part of this process, the Finance Office staff will confer with other state entities on their respective practices. In addition, the Finance Office will build upon the DOF annual budget development calendar to more fully document the JCC fiscal and budget processes.</p> <p>A budget process survey was distributed to 23 executive branch departments as a tool to gather information regarding their internal budget and fiscal processes. A total of 16 departments/agencies responded to the survey including 7 which utilize CALSTARS. JCC Finance Office will review, evaluate and summarize the survey results and also develop recommendations for improvements that can be made to JCC processes. We expect this phase of the process will take until the June 2014 reporting period to be completed.</p> <p>Staff progress has been delayed due to workload associated with the audit of the Judicial Council authorized by the Joint Legislative Audit Committee and conducted by the California State Auditor. Additionally, process and schedule changes related to Department of Finance's implementation of the Financial Information System for California (also known as FI\$CAL) have contributed to the delay.</p> <p>Given that the California State Auditor's JCC (AOC) Audit Report includes findings and recommendations related to internal budget processes, additional time is necessary for staff to compare and consolidate the SEC and CSA recommendations, which along with the</p>

\* This document retains the wording presented by the Judicial Council's Executive and Planning Committee approved by the Judicial Council on August 31, 2012.

#	Directive *	Timeline	Status	Status Updates
	<p><a href="#">SEC Recommendation</a></p> <p>The AOC's fiscal and budget processes must be transparent. The Executive Leadership Team should require the Fiscal Services Office to immediately develop and make public a description of the fiscal and budget process, including a calendar clearly describing how and when fiscal and budget decisions are made. The Fiscal Services Office should be required to produce a comprehensive, publicly available midyear budget report, including budget projections for the remainder of the fiscal year and anticipated resource issues for the coming year. The Chief Administrative Officer should be given lead responsibility for developing and implementing an entirely new approach to fiscal processes and fiscal information for the AOC.</p>			budget survey responses, will provide the basis for defining the budget process and development of the budget calendar.
34	<p>E&amp;P recommends that the Judicial Council direct the Administrative Director of the Courts to require that all fiscal information must come from one source within the AOC, and that single source should be what is currently known as the Finance Division.</p> <p><a href="#">SEC Recommendation</a></p> <p>All fiscal information must come from one source within the AOC, and that single source should be what is currently known as the Finance Division (to become the Fiscal Services Office under the recommendations in this report).</p>	Immediate implementation with ADOC report to the council at the 10/26/2012, meeting.	Completed	Activity Reporting and Proposal Form submitted to the Judicial Council for the October 26, 2012, Judicial Council Meeting.

\* This document retains the wording presented by the Judicial Council's Executive and Planning Committee approved by the Judicial Council on August 31, 2012.

#	Directive *	Timeline	Status	Status Updates
35	<p>E&amp;P recommends that the Judicial Council direct the Administrative Director of the Courts to require that budget and fiscal tracking systems be in place so that timely and accurate information on resources available and expenditures to date are readily available.</p> <p><u>SEC Recommendation</u> Tracking systems need to be in place so that timely and accurate information on resources available and expenditures to date are readily available. Managers need this information so they do not spend beyond their allotments.</p>	<p>ADOC interim report to the council at the February 2013 meeting and final report at the June 2013 council meeting.</p>	Completed	<p>Status on implementation progress for this directive is included in the Activity Reporting and Proposal Form submitted to the Judicial Council for the June 28, 2013, Judicial Council Meeting.</p>
36	<p>E&amp;P recommends that the Judicial Council direct the Administrative Director of the Courts to require that budget and fiscal information displays be streamlined and simplified so they are clearly understandable.</p> <p><u>SEC Recommendation</u> Information displays need to be streamlined and simplified so they are clearly understandable.</p>	<p>ADOC interim report to the council at the February 2013 meeting and final report at the June 2013 council meeting.</p>	Completed	<p>Status on implementation progress for this directive is included in the Activity Reporting and Proposal Form submitted to the Judicial Council for the June 28, 2013, Judicial Council Meeting.</p>

\* This document retains the wording presented by the Judicial Council's Executive and Planning Committee approved by the Judicial Council on August 31, 2012.

#	Directive *	Timeline	Status	Status Updates
37	E&P recommends that the Judicial Council direct the Administrative Director of the Courts to require that the Finance Division track appropriations and expenditures by fund, and keep a historical record of both so that easy year-to-year comparisons can be made. This can be done by unit, division, or by program, whichever provides the most informed and accurate picture of the budget.	ADOC interim report to the council at the February 2013 meeting and final report at the October 2013 meeting.	Completed	<p>This directive is considered complete as AOC FSO staff currently tracks appropriations and expenditures by fund. As required by Department of Finance and to comply with State of California Legal Basis Accounting, the Oracle financial system maintains all of this information dating back to 1996-97. Additionally, the Judicial Branch display in the annual Governor's Budget and supporting schedules provide appropriations and expenditures by fund.</p> <p>Also, the AOC FSO conducts regular reviews of budget and expenditure information to ensure divisions/offices are functioning within available resources. This includes monthly budget forecasting for the remainder of the fiscal year as well as year-end planning activities. AOC staff also provides these budget support services to the Supreme Court, Courts of Appeal, and the Habeas Corpus Resource Center.</p> <p>Finally, after the end of this fiscal year, FSO will review existing reports and develop a standard year-end summary to facilitate comparative year-to-year funding changes. AOC staff will continue to review existing processes and procedures to determine what improvements can be implemented on an ongoing basis.</p>
<u>SEC Recommendation</u>				
<p>The Finance Division (Fiscal Services Office) should track appropriations and expenditures by fund, and keep a historical record of both so that easy year-to-year comparisons can be made. This can be done by unit, division or by program — whichever provides the audience with the most informed and accurate picture of the budget.</p>				

\* This document retains the wording presented by the Judicial Council's Executive and Planning Committee approved by the Judicial Council on August 31, 2012.



#	Directive *	Timeline	Status	Status Updates
38	E&P recommends that the Judicial Council direct the Administrative Director of the Courts to require that expenditures be split into those for state operations and local assistance (funds that go to the trial courts) so it is clear which entity benefits from the resources. State operations figures must be further broken down as support for the Supreme Court and Appellate Courts. The AOC should adopt the methodology of distributing the administrative costs among programs.	Administrative Director interim report to the council at the February 2013 meeting and the final report at the April 2015 meeting.	In Progress	<p>The JCC Finance Office does track expenditures split into those for state operations and local assistance. Local assistance expenditures are tracked by trial court (if an individual trial court directly benefited) and state-wide (for expenditures that benefits more than one trial court). State operations expenditure tracking is further broken down by the program and entity specified in each year's Budget Act.</p> <p>With respect to the distribution of administrative costs, JCC Finance Office staff will be evaluating methodologies employed by other state-funded entities to determine which method should be applied at the JCC.</p> <p>A budget process survey was distributed to 23 executive branch departments as a tool to gather information regarding their internal budget and fiscal processes. A total of 16 departments/agencies responded to the survey including 7 which utilize CALSTARS. JCC Finance Office staff will review, evaluate and summarize the survey results and also develop recommendations for improvements that can be made to JCC processes. We expect this phase of the process will take until the June 2014 reporting period to be completed.</p> <p>Staff progress has been delayed due to workload associated with the audit of the Judicial Council authorized by the Joint Legislative Audit Committee and conducted by the California State Auditor. Additionally, process and schedule changes related to Department of Finance's implementation of the Financial Information System for California (also known as FI\$CAL) have contributed to the delay.</p> <p>Given that the California State Auditor's JCC (AOC) Audit Report includes findings and recommendations related to internal budget processes, additional time is necessary for staff to compare and consolidate the</p>

\* This document retains the wording presented by the Judicial Council's Executive and Planning Committee approved by the Judicial Council on August 31, 2012.

#	Directive *	Timeline	Status	Status Updates
	<p><a href="#">SEC Recommendation</a></p> <p>Expenditures should be split into those for state operations and local assistance (funds that go to the trial courts) so it is clear which entity benefits from the resources. State operations figures should be further broken down as support for the Supreme Court and Appellate Courts. In most state departments, administrative costs are distributed among programs. The AOC should adopt this methodology.</p>			SEC and CSA recommendations, which along with the budget survey responses, will provide the basis for defining the budget process and development of the budget calendar.
39	<p>E&amp;P recommends that the Judicial Council direct the Administrative Director of the Courts to require that the AOC schedule its budget development and budget administration around the time frames used by all state entities.</p> <p><a href="#">SEC Recommendation</a></p> <p>The AOC should schedule its budget development and budget administration around the time frames used by all state entities. Assuming the budget for any fiscal year is enacted by July 1, the AOC should immediately allocate its budgeted resources by fund among programs, divisions, units.</p>	Administrative Director of the Courts to provide update to Judicial Council at the October 2013 council meeting.	Completed	Status on implementation progress for this directive is included in the Activity Reporting and Proposal Form submitted to the Judicial Council for the June 28, 2013, Judicial Council Meeting.

\* This document retains the wording presented by the Judicial Council's Executive and Planning Committee approved by the Judicial Council on August 31, 2012.

#	Directive *	Timeline	Status	Status Updates
40	E&P recommends that the Judicial Council direct the Administrative Director of the Courts to require that requests for additional resources be presented to the Judicial Council at its August meeting, identify the increased resources requested, and be accompanied by clear statements of the need and use of the resources and the impact on the AOC, as well as the impact on the judicial branch, if any. A cost-benefit analysis should be part of any request and there should be a system to prioritize requests.	Immediate implementation	Completed	<p>Directives 7-13, 21, 40, 91, and 145 have been combined as part of a broader review and policy discussion relating to the development of a cost-benefit analysis proposal for the AOC. After a review of existing internal processes, AOC staff have developed general guidelines that seek to ensure that all elements within each of these 10 directives were adequately addressed. A process for approval of branchwide projects and other significant initiatives was developed to ensure an appropriate evaluation is completed, which can include a full and comprehensive cost-benefit analysis, as necessary. That evaluation will include the input and collaboration of all stakeholders, a complete analysis of scope, accurate cost estimates and funding streams and associated controls, documentation of the decision-making processes, and the full transparent consideration of fiscal, operational, and other impacts to the courts and stakeholders.</p> <p>The AOC fully recognizes the value of implementing guidelines to effectively coordinate and manage important branchwide projects. The new "Guidelines for the Administration of Branchwide Projects and Initiatives" have been reviewed and approved by the Administrative Director of the Courts and will be implemented as the official AOC process in the coming weeks. These guidelines will be presented to the Judicial Council at its December 2013 meeting. At this time, having addressed the matters in each, the AOC will close Directives 7-13, 21, 40, 91, and 145.</p>

#### SEC Recommendation

Requests for additional resources are presented to the Judicial Council at its August meeting. These requests identify increased resources requested and should be accompanied by clear statements of need and use of the resources and the impact on the AOC, as well as the impact on the judicial branch, if any. A cost-benefit

\* This document retains the wording presented by the Judicial Council's Executive and Planning Committee approved by the Judicial Council on August 31, 2012.

#	Directive *	Timeline	Status	Status Updates
	<p>analysis should be part of any request, and there should be a system to prioritize requests.</p> <hr/>			
41	<p>E&amp;P recommends that the Judicial Council direct the Administrative Director of the Courts to require that, after the Governor's Budget is released in January, the AOC should present a midyear update of the judicial branch budget at the next scheduled Judicial Council meeting. All figures provided by the AOC should tie back to the Governor's Budget or be explained in footnotes.</p> <p><u>SEC Recommendation</u></p> <p>After the Governor's Budget is released in January, the AOC should present a midyear update of the judicial branch budget at the next scheduled Judicial Council meeting. This presentation should tie to the figures in the Governor's Budget so that everyone has the same understanding of the budget.</p> <hr/>	<p>Immediate implementation. ADOC report to the council at the February 2013 council meeting.</p>	<p>Completed</p>	<p>Status on implementation progress for this directive is included in the Activity Reporting and Proposal Form submitted to the Judicial Council for the April 26, 2013, Judicial Council Meeting.</p>
42	<p>E&amp;P recommends that the Judicial Council direct the Administrative Director of the Courts to require that, except for budget changes that must be made to comply with time requirements in the state budget process, the AOC not change the numbers in the budget statements it presents. All figures provided by the AOC must tie back to the Governor's budget or be explained in footnotes.</p> <p><u>SEC Recommendation</u></p> <p>Except for changes that must be made to comply with time requirements in the state budget process, the AOC should not change the numbers it presents – continual changes in the numbers, or new displays, add to confusion about the budget.</p> <hr/>	<p>Immediate implementation (Ongoing)</p>	<p>Completed</p>	<p>Activity Reporting and Proposal Form submitted to the Judicial Council for the December 14, 2012, Judicial Council Meeting.</p>

\* This document retains the wording presented by the Judicial Council's Executive and Planning Committee approved by the Judicial Council on August 31, 2012.

#	Directive *	Timeline	Status	Status Updates
43	E&P recommends that the Judicial Council direct the Administrative Director of the Courts to perform internal audits upon completion of the restructuring of the AOC.	Judicial Council Administrative Director to report to council at the February 2015 council meeting.	In Progress	<p data-bbox="1440 168 2022 483">Audit Services (AS) balances its audit activities between the branch and the Judicial Council based on staffing availability. Historically, AS had an authorized staff high of 17 positions and actual of 15 positions in Fiscal Year (FY) 2006-2007 and has a current authorized and actual staff of 14 in FY 2014-2015. These staffing levels do not reflect the external audit contract that was in place from FY 2001-2002 through FY 2012-2013 that provided up to six supplemental auditors.</p> <p data-bbox="1440 521 2022 992">With this staffing, AS conducts superior court audits and internal audits of the Judicial Council. The primary focus of the AS work at the Judicial Council has been in facilities where AS has audited the work of the external facilities maintenance vendors and capital construction. AS continues to perform work in this area and in FY 2014-2015 it plans on auditing facilities areas including the: 1) documentation and operational process concerning the delegated facilities maintenance program; 2) Computer Aided Facilities Management (CAFM) system for logical and physical security access controls and data integrity testing; and 3) Court Facilities Architecture Revolving Fund established under Government Code Section 70379.</p> <p data-bbox="1440 1029 2022 1344">Other AS internal audit work at the Judicial Council planned for fiscal year 2014-2015 includes: 1) Review of certain general and application controls over Oracle Financials including: (a) data integrity testing of information in the database used for decision making purposes and financial reporting; (b) logical and physical access controls to the system; and 2) Review of the overall logical access to the Judicial Council's network as a follow-up to the CSA audit of December 2013.</p> <p data-bbox="1440 1382 2022 1437">Significantly impacting the audit plan for fiscal year 2014-2015 are external audits of the Judicial Council</p>

\* This document retains the wording presented by the Judicial Council's Executive and Planning Committee approved by the Judicial Council on August 31, 2012.

#	Directive *	Timeline	Status	Status Updates
				<p>and the A&amp;E Advisory Committee activities that have recently been performed or are in process. AS has been involved in the work and will evaluate it as part of its on-going risk assessment and work plans.</p> <p>AS work is subject to change based upon changes occurring in the Judicial Branch and within the Judicial Council. The Executive Office of the Judicial Council can also review and request work based upon these changes that will affect the plan for fiscal year 2014-2015 with trade-offs if new work is prioritized.</p> <p>Beyond 2014-2015, AS will work with the Executive Office to continue to identify and include internal audit activities for those offices believed to have higher risk profile (i.e., accounting functions, Phoenix financials, etc.) as part of its future audit plans while balancing this workload with audit services provided to the superior courts.</p> <p>It is requested that the timeline be modified to read "Judicial Council Administrative Director to report to the council at the June 2015 council meeting."</p>
	<p><a href="#">SEC Recommendation</a></p> <p>The AOC must perform internal audits. This will allow the leadership team and the Judicial Council to know how a particular unit or program is performing. An audit can be both fiscal and programmatic so that resources are tied to performance in meeting program goals and objectives.</p>			

\* This document retains the wording presented by the Judicial Council's Executive and Planning Committee approved by the Judicial Council on August 31, 2012.

#	Directive *	Timeline	Status	Status Updates
44	E&P recommends that the Judicial Council direct the Administrative Director of the Courts to require that the leadership team must develop and employ budget review techniques so that the budget of an individual unit is aligned with its program responsibilities.	The Administrative Director of the Courts to report to the council at the December 2014 meeting.	Completed	<p>In 2013, the JCC staff Executive Office retained an individual with extensive departmental budget experience with both the judicial and executive branch to undertake a review of the JCC office's budget and forecast processes. Budget and forecasting recommendations from this effort were received and are planned for implementation in July 2014. These process improvements along with periodic reviews of individual JCC offices' budgets will provide the framework upon which budget allocations are based beginning in FY 2014-15 as well as a structure for ensuring that unit budgets are aligned with program responsibilities.</p> <p>Following the JCC's determination of staff services and workload priorities the Finance Office will work with the Executive Office to align individual units with their program responsibilities.</p> <p>Although process improvements will be implemented in July 2014 with the first financial forecast under the new process occurring in November 2014, the FSO will continue to make modifications to its budget review techniques as part of an ongoing process of continuous improvement.</p>
<u>SEC Recommendation</u>				
As part of the reorganization and downsizing of the AOC, the leadership team should employ budget review techniques (such as zero-based budgeting) so that the budget of an individual unit is aligned with its program responsibilities. In the future, there should be periodic reviews of units and or programs to make sure funding is consistent with mandated requirements.				

\* This document retains the wording presented by the Judicial Council's Executive and Planning Committee approved by the Judicial Council on August 31, 2012.

#	Directive *	Timeline	Status	Status Updates
45	<p>E&amp;P recommends that the Judicial Council direct the Administrative Director of the Courts that the total staff size of the AOC must be reduced significantly and must not exceed the total number of authorized positions. The consolidation of divisions, elimination of unnecessary and overlapping positions, and other organizational changes should reduce the number of positions.</p> <p>E&amp;P recommends that the Judicial Council direct the Administrative Director of the Courts to require that staffing levels of the AOC be made more transparent and understandable. Information on staffing levels must be made readily available, including posting the information online. All categories of staffing — including, but not limited to, authorized positions, “909” staff, employment agency temporary employees and contract staff — must be accounted for in a manner understandable to the public.</p> <p><a href="#">SEC Recommendation</a></p> <p>9-1. The total staff size of the AOC should be reduced significantly.</p> <p>9-2. The total staff size of the AOC must be reduced significantly and should not exceed the total number of authorized positions. The current number of authorized positions is 880. The consolidation of divisions, elimination of unnecessary and overlapping positions and other organizational changes recommended in this report should reduce the number of positions by an additional 100 to 200, bringing the staff level to approximately 680 to 780.</p> <p>9-5. The staffing levels of the AOC must be made more transparent and understandable. Information on staffing levels must be made readily available, including posting the information online. All categories of staffing—including, but not limited to, authorized positions, “909” staff, employment agency temporary employees and contract staff—must be accounted for in</p>	Immediate implementation (Ongoing)	Completed	Activity Reporting and Proposal Form submitted to the Judicial Council for the October 26, 2012, Judicial Council Meeting.

\* This document retains the wording presented by the Judicial Council’s Executive and Planning Committee approved by the Judicial Council on August 31, 2012.



#	Directive *	Timeline	Status	Status Updates
	a manner understandable to the public.			
46	E&P recommends that the Judicial Council direct the Administrative Director of the Courts to report to the Judicial Council vacant authorized positions if they have remained unfilled for six months.	(Ongoing) ADOC to provide updates to the council for each council meeting.	Completed	Activity Reporting and Proposal Form submitted to the Judicial Council for the October 26, 2012, Judicial Council Meeting.
	<u>SEC Recommendation</u> Vacant authorized positions should be eliminated if they have remained unfilled for six months.			
47	E&P recommends that the Judicial Council direct the Administrative Director of the Courts to ensure that the employment of temporary or other staff to circumvent a hiring freeze is not permitted. The Administrative Director must review all temporary staff assignments and eliminate those that are being used to replace positions subject to the hiring freeze. Temporary employees should be limited to periods not exceeding six months and should be used only in limited circumstances of demonstrated need, such as in the case of an emergency or to provide a critical skill set not available through the use of authorized employees.	Completion by June 2013	Completed	Status on implementation progress for this directive is included in the Activity Reporting and Proposal Form submitted to the Judicial Council for the June 28, 2013, Judicial Council Meeting.
	<u>SEC Recommendation</u> Employment of temporary or other staff to circumvent a hiring freeze should not be permitted. The Executive Leadership Team should immediately review all temporary staff assignments and eliminate those that are being used to replace positions subject to the hiring freeze. Temporary employees should be limited to periods not exceeding six months and should be used only in limited circumstances of demonstrated need, such as in the case of an emergency or to provide a critical skill set not available through the use of authorized employees.			

\* This document retains the wording presented by the Judicial Council's Executive and Planning Committee approved by the Judicial Council on August 31, 2012.

#	Directive *	Timeline	Status	Status Updates
48	E&P recommends that the Judicial Council direct the Administrative Director of the Courts, as part of the council's long-term strategic planning, to evaluate the location of the AOC main offices based on a cost-benefit analysis and other considerations.	For long term consideration	In Progress	A series of real estate transactions resulted in an expense reduction of nearly \$8.6 million in rent and a space contraction of 82,761 SF (25%) through FY 2014-15. These were subsequently approved in fulfillment of Directive 22, which represents the initial phase implementation of Directive 48. The California State Auditor's JCC (AOC) Audit Report of January 7, 2015 includes a recommendation regarding this same issue. As such, the directive's full implementation will occur as part of the Council's long-term strategic planning and in response to the audit recommendation language, evaluating the location of the Judicial Council main offices based on a cost-benefit analysis and other considerations.
	<p><a href="#">SEC Recommendation</a></p> <p>As part of its long-term planning, the AOC should consider relocation of its main offices, based on a cost-benefit analysis of doing so.</p>			
49	E&P recommends that the Judicial Council support SEC Recommendation 7-2 with no further action. The AOC has terminated special consultants hired on a continuous basis.	Completed	Completed	Activity Reporting and Proposal Form submitted to the Judicial Council for the October 26, 2012, Judicial Council Meeting.
	<p><a href="#">SEC Recommendation</a></p> <p>The practice of employing a special consultant on a continuous basis should be reevaluated and considered for termination taking into account the relative costs, benefits, and other available resources.</p>			

\* This document retains the wording presented by the Judicial Council's Executive and Planning Committee approved by the Judicial Council on August 31, 2012.

#	Directive *	Timeline	Status	Status Updates
50	E&P recommends that the Judicial Council direct the Administrative Director of the Courts to consider SEC Recommendation 7-3 and implement the necessary organizational changes, contingent upon the council's approval of an organizational structure for the AOC and taking into account the results of the classification and compensation studies to be completed.	The Classification & Compensation Study is scheduled to be adopted by the Judicial Council at its meeting in April 2015; based upon the direction provided by the Judicial Council, the Executive Office will implement the plan accordingly and will provide an update to council at the October 2015 council meeting.	In Progress	<p>Implementation of directives 50, 64, 72, 78, 89, 100, 106, 123, 130, 135, and 142 are tied to the outcome of the AOC Classification and Compensation Study.</p> <p>On September 9, 2013, the Executive and Planning Committee (E&amp;P) reviewed the methodology, criteria, and process used to score the Request for Proposal (RFP) bids, reviewed the final bid scoring and findings, and approved the awarding of the contract to the highest scored bidder.</p> <p>In October 2013, E&amp;P provided an update to the Judicial Council notifying them that the highest scored bidder was selected to conduct the classification and compensation study.</p> <p>In November 2013, Fox Lawson &amp; Associates was awarded the contract to conduct the Judicial Council's classification and compensation study. Four meetings were held with Fox Lawson &amp; Associates, members of the Human Resources (HR) staff, and the Executive Office to establish the specifics of the study, including methodology, timeline, and a review of the current classification and compensation system at the Judicial Council.</p> <p>In December 2013, communications were sent to all Judicial Council staff informing them of the beginning of the study and outlining the requirements, including completing employee Position Description Questionnaires (PDQ), which were due in February 2014.</p> <p>In January 2014, Judicial Council staff conducted information sessions at each Judicial Council office to answer employees' questions regarding the study.</p> <p>In April and May 2014, Fox Lawson completed meeting with approximately 20 occupational panels across Judicial Council offices and locations, and will</p>

\* This document retains the wording presented by the Judicial Council's Executive and Planning Committee approved by the Judicial Council on August 31, 2012.

#	Directive *	Timeline	Status	Status Updates
				<p>be scheduling regular updates to brief the Executive Office.</p> <p>In June 2014, the Judicial Council Human Resources office and Fox Lawson discussed the current progress of the study with the council. Fox Lawson also began a series of one-on-one phone interviews with a small number of employees. The purpose was to clarify specific information provided in the PDQs regarding essential duties.</p> <p>In July 2014, the Executive Office held all-staff meetings to update Judicial Council staff about the progress of the study and discussed the selected comparator markets.</p> <p>In August 2014, Fox Lawson met with the Internal Chairs and the Executive Office to discuss recommendations for the proposed classification structure. The Internal Chairs and the Executive Office briefed the Judicial Council in closed session.</p> <p>In September 2014, Fox Lawson took steps to draft classification specifications and finalized job description summaries for market survey.</p> <p>In October 2014, Fox Lawson continued to draft and finalize the classification specifications and initiated the market survey to begin the compensation phase of the study.</p> <p>All-staff meetings were held in November 2014 to communicate the current status of the Classification and Compensation Study. During the meeting, employees were provided with an overview of the new classification system and were given information on the appeals process.</p> <p>In February 2015, employees are expected to be informed of their new classifications within the new</p>

\* This document retains the wording presented by the Judicial Council's Executive and Planning Committee approved by the Judicial Council on August 31, 2012.

#	Directive *	Timeline	Status	Status Updates
---	-------------	----------	--------	----------------

structure and will have an opportunity to submit an appeal if they feel that their position has been incorrectly classified.

SEC Recommendation

The Center for Families, Children and the Courts should be an office reporting to the Chief Operating Officer in the AOC's Judicial and Court Operations Services Division, rather than a stand-alone division. The CFCC manager position should be compensated at its current level.

---

\* This document retains the wording presented by the Judicial Council's Executive and Planning Committee approved by the Judicial Council on August 31, 2012.

#	Directive *	Timeline	Status	Status Updates
51	E&P recommends that the Judicial Council direct the Administrative Director of the Courts to consider SEC Recommendation 7-4(a) and implement the necessary organizational and staffing changes, taking into account the results of the classification and compensation studies to be completed.	The Classification & Compensation Study is scheduled to be adopted by the Judicial Council at its meeting in April 2015; based upon the direction provided by the Judicial Council, the Executive Office will implement the plan accordingly and will provide an update to council at the October 2015 council meeting.	In Progress	<p>Implementation of this directive is directly tied to the outcome of the AOC Classification and Compensation Study.</p> <p>On September 9, 2013, the Executive and Planning Committee (E&amp;P) reviewed the methodology, criteria, and process used to score the Request for Proposal (RFP) bids, reviewed the final bid scoring and findings, and approved the awarding of the contract to the highest scored bidder.</p> <p>In October 2013, E&amp;P provided an update to the Judicial Council notifying them that the highest scored bidder was selected to conduct the classification and compensation study.</p> <p>In November 2013, Fox Lawson &amp; Associates was awarded the contract to conduct the Judicial Council's classification and compensation study. Four meetings were held with Fox Lawson &amp; Associates, members of the Human Resources (HR) staff, and the Executive Office to establish the specifics of the study, including methodology, timeline, and a review of the current classification and compensation system at the Judicial Council.</p> <p>In December 2013, communications were sent to all Judicial Council staff informing them of the beginning of the study and outlining the requirements, including completing employee Position Description Questionnaires (PDQ), which were due in February 2014.</p> <p>In January 2014, Judicial Council staff conducted information sessions at each Judicial Council office to answer employees' questions regarding the study.</p> <p>In April and May 2014, Fox Lawson completed meeting with approximately 20 occupational panels across Judicial Council offices and locations, and will</p>

\* This document retains the wording presented by the Judicial Council's Executive and Planning Committee approved by the Judicial Council on August 31, 2012.

#	Directive *	Timeline	Status	Status Updates
				<p>be scheduling regular updates to brief the Executive Office.</p> <p>In June 2014, the Judicial Council Human Resources office and Fox Lawson discussed the current progress of the study with the council. Fox Lawson also began a series of one-on-one phone interviews with a small number of employees. The purpose was to clarify specific information provided in the PDQs regarding essential duties.</p> <p>In July 2014, the Executive Office held all-staff meetings to update Judicial Council staff about the progress of the study and discussed the selected comparator markets.</p> <p>In August 2014, Fox Lawson met with the Internal Chairs and the Executive Office to discuss recommendations for the proposed classification structure. The Internal Chairs and the Executive Office briefed the Judicial Council in closed session.</p> <p>In September 2014, Fox Lawson took steps to draft classification specifications and finalized job description summaries for market survey.</p> <p>In October 2014, Fox Lawson continued to draft and finalize the classification specifications and initiated the market survey to begin the compensation phase of the study.</p> <p>All-staff meetings were held in November 2014 to communicate the current status of the Classification and Compensation Study. During the meeting, employees were provided with an overview of the new classification system and were given information on the appeals process.</p> <p>In February 2015, employees are expected to be informed of their new classifications within the new</p>

\* This document retains the wording presented by the Judicial Council's Executive and Planning Committee approved by the Judicial Council on August 31, 2012.

#	Directive *	Timeline	Status	Status Updates
---	-------------	----------	--------	----------------

structure and will have an opportunity to submit an appeal if they feel that their position has been incorrectly classified.

SEC Recommendation

CFCC's current number of authorized positions should be reduced. To achieve the reduction, these areas should be reviewed and considered, and appropriate actions taken:

(a) CFCC has a one-over-one management structure with a Division Director and an Assistant Division Director position. The Assistant Division Director position should be eliminated.

---

\* This document retains the wording presented by the Judicial Council's Executive and Planning Committee approved by the Judicial Council on August 31, 2012.



#	Directive *	Timeline	Status	Status Updates
52	E&P recommends that the Judicial Council direct the Administrative Director of the Courts to consider SEC Recommendation 7-4(b) and (c) and implement the necessary organizational and staffing changes, taking into account the results of the classification and compensation studies to be completed.	The Classification & Compensation Study is scheduled to be adopted by the Judicial Council at its meeting in April 2015; based upon the direction provided by the Judicial Council, the Executive Office will implement the plan accordingly and will provide an update to council at the October 2015 council meeting.	In Progress	<p>On September 9, 2013, the Executive and Planning Committee (E&amp;P) reviewed the methodology, criteria, and process used to score the Request for Proposal (RFP) bids, reviewed the final bid scoring and findings, and approved the awarding of the contract to the highest scored bidder.</p> <p>In October 2013, E&amp;P provided an update to the Judicial Council notifying them that the highest scored bidder was selected to conduct the classification and compensation study.</p> <p>In November 2013, Fox Lawson &amp; Associates was awarded the contract to conduct the Judicial Council's classification and compensation study. Four meetings were held with Fox Lawson &amp; Associates, members of the Human Resources (HR) staff, and the Executive Office to establish the specifics of the study, including methodology, timeline, and a review of the current classification and compensation system at the Judicial Council.</p> <p>In December 2013, communications were sent to all Judicial Council staff informing them of the beginning of the study and outlining the requirements, including completing employee Position Description Questionnaires (PDQ), which were due in February 2014.</p> <p>In January 2014, Judicial Council staff conducted information sessions at each Judicial Council office to answer employees' questions regarding the study.</p> <p>In April and May 2014, Fox Lawson completed meeting with approximately 20 occupational</p>

\* This document retains the wording presented by the Judicial Council's Executive and Planning Committee approved by the Judicial Council on August 31, 2012.

#	Directive *	Timeline	Status	Status Updates
				<p>panels across Judicial Council offices and locations, and will be scheduling regular updates to brief the Executive Office.</p> <p>In June 2014, the Judicial Council Human Resources office and Fox Lawson discussed the current progress of the study with the council. Fox Lawson also began a series of one-on-one phone interviews with a small number of employees. The purpose was to clarify specific information provided in the PDQs regarding essential duties.</p> <p>In July 2014, the Executive Office held all-staff meetings to update Judicial Council staff about the progress of the study and discussed the selected comparator markets.</p> <p>In August 2014, Fox Lawson met with the Internal Chairs and the Executive Office to discuss recommendations for the proposed classification structure. The Internal Chairs and the Executive Office briefed the Judicial Council in closed session.</p> <p>In September 2014, Fox Lawson took steps to draft classification specifications and finalized job description summaries for market survey.</p> <p>In October 2014, Fox Lawson continued to draft and finalize the classification specifications and initiated the market survey to begin the compensation phase of the study.</p> <p>All-staff meetings were held in November 2014 to communicate the current status of the Classification and Compensation Study. During the meeting, employees were provided with an overview of the new classification system and were given information on the appeals process.</p>

\* This document retains the wording presented by the Judicial Council's Executive and Planning Committee approved by the Judicial Council on August 31, 2012.

#	Directive *	Timeline	Status	Status Updates
---	-------------	----------	--------	----------------

In February 2015, employees are expected to be informed of their new classifications within the new structure and will have an opportunity to submit an appeal if they feel that their position has been incorrectly classified.

SEC Recommendation

CFCC's current number of authorized positions should be reduced. To achieve the reduction, these areas should be reviewed and considered, and appropriate actions taken:

(b) There are nearly 30 attorney positions in CFCC, including 7 attorneys who act as Judicial Court Assistance Team Liaisons. All attorney position allocations should be reviewed with a goal of reducing their numbers and/or reallocating them to nonattorney classifications.

---

\* This document retains the wording presented by the Judicial Council's Executive and Planning Committee approved by the Judicial Council on August 31, 2012.

#	Directive *	Timeline	Status	Status Updates
52.1	E&P recommends that the Judicial Council direct the Administrative Director of the Courts to consider SEC Recommendation 7-4(b) and (c) and implement the necessary organizational and staffing changes, taking into account the results of the classification and compensation studies to be completed.	Administrative Director of the Courts to provide an Interim Report to the council at the June 2013 Judicial Council meeting.	Completed	<p>CFCC reports that this directive is completed. The total number of authorized CFCC positions has been reduced by 32%. The percentage of reductions was nearly equivalent in positions funded by CFCC's general fund allocation (33%) and other funding sources (27%).</p> <p>Additionally, CFCC reports the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>* CFCC's Rules and Forms Unit has been eliminated.</li> <li>* CFCC follows the new guidance from the Judicial Council Rules and Projects Committee (RUPRO) regarding the production of new and revised rules and forms proposals. This new guidance has not resulted in staffing reductions in CFCC.</li> <li>* This directive has been tied to directive 145 which includes a proposed process and policy for pursuing competitive grants for the council at the August 2013 council meeting. CFCC external funding sources come from long-standing state and federal allocations which are not subject to competitive grant process. As such, the proposed grant process and policy referenced in directive 145 is not applicable to current CFCC external funding and will not result in a reduction in CFCC staffing.</li> </ul> <p>For these reasons, no further staffing reductions are anticipated as a result of implementation of Judicial Council Directives regarding grants and rule-making.</p>

#### SEC Recommendation

CFCC's current number of authorized positions should be reduced. To achieve the reduction, these areas should be reviewed and considered, and appropriate actions taken:

(c) The CFCC has numerous grant-funded positions, including five in its Rules and Forms Unit. Implementation of our recommendations for the AOC's Grants and Rule-making Processes could result in some reductions in these positions.

---

\* This document retains the wording presented by the Judicial Council's Executive and Planning Committee approved by the Judicial Council on August 31, 2012.

#	Directive *	Timeline	Status	Status Updates
53	E&P recommends that the Judicial Council direct the Administrative Director of the Courts to consider SEC Recommendation 7-4(d) and implement the necessary organizational and staffing changes, contingent upon the council's approval of an organizational structure for the AOC.	Administrative Director of the Courts to present a report of available options regarding the study's implementation to the Judicial Council for their consideration at the July 2013 Judicial Council meeting.	Completed	Since the end of FY 10-11, the number of AOC employees in research classifications has declined by approximately 45%. To improve the efficiency and effectiveness of research in support of the Judicial Council and the courts, and consistent with Judicial Council Directives 53 and 72.1, all research analysts currently at the AOC have been consolidated into offices within the Judicial and Court Operations Division. Managers overseeing research in those offices began discussions in October 2012 and have implemented a protocol to manage workforce reduction and address staffing current and future projects.
	<p><a href="#">SEC Recommendation</a></p> <p>CFCC's current number of authorized positions should be reduced. To achieve the reduction, these areas should be reviewed and considered, and appropriate actions taken:</p> <p>(d) The CFCC has a number of positions devoted to research programs, as do other offices to be placed within the Judicial and Court Operations Services Division, presenting opportunities for efficiencies by consolidating divisional research efforts.</p>			

\* This document retains the wording presented by the Judicial Council's Executive and Planning Committee approved by the Judicial Council on August 31, 2012.

#	Directive *	Timeline	Status	Status Updates
54	E&P recommends that the Judicial Council direct the Administrative Director of the Courts to implement the necessary organizational and staffing changes, contingent upon the council's approval of an organizational structure for the AOC and taking into account the results of the classification and compensation studies to be completed.	The Classification & Compensation Study is scheduled to be adopted by the Judicial Council at its meeting in April 2015; based upon the direction provided by the Judicial Council, the Executive Office will implement the plan accordingly and will provide an update to council at the October 2015 council meeting.	In Progress	<p>After the completion of the AOC Classification and Compensation Study, the Executive Team will have more information necessary for determining staffing needs and resources for committee support. As such, this directive will be addressed after the completion of the Classification and Compensation Study.</p> <p>On September 9, 2013, the Executive and Planning Committee (E&amp;P) reviewed the methodology, criteria, and process used to score the Request for Proposal (RFP) bids, reviewed the final bid scoring and findings, and approved the awarding of the contract to the highest scored bidder.</p> <p>In October 2013, E&amp;P provided an update to the Judicial Council notifying them that the highest scored bidder was selected to conduct the classification and compensation study.</p> <p>In November 2013, Fox Lawson &amp; Associates was awarded the contract to conduct the Judicial Council's classification and compensation study. Four meetings were held with Fox Lawson &amp; Associates, members of the Human Resources (HR) staff, and the Executive Office to establish the specifics of the study, including methodology, timeline, and a review of the current classification and compensation system at the Judicial Council.</p> <p>In December 2013, communications were sent to all Judicial Council staff informing them of the beginning of the study and outlining the requirements, including completing employee Position Description Questionnaires (PDQ), which were due in February 2014.</p> <p>In January 2014, Judicial Council staff conducted information sessions at each Judicial Council office to answer employees' questions regarding the study.</p>

\* This document retains the wording presented by the Judicial Council's Executive and Planning Committee approved by the Judicial Council on August 31, 2012.

#	Directive *	Timeline	Status	Status Updates
				<p>In April and May 2014, Fox Lawson completed meeting with approximately 20 occupational panels across Judicial Council offices and locations, and will be scheduling regular updates to brief the Executive Office.</p> <p>In June 2014, the Judicial Council Human Resources office and Fox Lawson discussed the current progress of the study with the council. Fox Lawson also began a series of one-on-one phone interviews with a small number of employees. The purpose was to clarify specific information provided in the PDQs regarding essential duties.</p> <p>In July 2014, the Executive Office held all-staff meetings to update Judicial Council staff about the progress of the study and discussed the selected comparator markets.</p> <p>In August 2014, Fox Lawson met with the Internal Chairs and the Executive Office to discuss recommendations for the proposed classification structure. The Internal Chairs and the Executive Office briefed the Judicial Council in closed session.</p> <p>In September 2014, Fox Lawson took steps to draft classification specifications and finalized job description summaries for market survey.</p> <p>In October 2014, Fox Lawson continued to draft and finalize the classification specifications and initiated the market survey to begin the compensation phase of the study.</p> <p>All-staff meetings were held in November 2014 to communicate the current status of the Classification and Compensation Study. During the meeting, employees were provided with an overview of the new classification system and were given information on the appeals process.</p>

\* This document retains the wording presented by the Judicial Council's Executive and Planning Committee approved by the Judicial Council on August 31, 2012.

#	Directive *	Timeline	Status	Status Updates
	<p><a href="#">SEC Recommendation</a></p> <p>CFCC's current number of authorized positions should be reduced. To achieve the reduction, these areas should be reviewed and considered, and appropriate actions taken:</p> <p>(e) CFCC staff members provide support to a number of Judicial Council committees and task forces. The recommended consolidation of this support function under the direction of the Chief of Staff will present opportunities for efficiencies and resource reduction.</p>			In February 2015, employees are expected to be informed of their new classifications within the new structure and will have an opportunity to submit an appeal if they feel that their position has been incorrectly classified.
55	<p>E&amp;P recommends that the Judicial Council support SEC Recommendation 7-4(f) with no further action, as these administrative and grant support functions have been consolidated through the AOC's initiatives to reduce costs and downsize its workforce and operations.</p> <p><a href="#">SEC Recommendation</a></p> <p>CFCC's current number of authorized positions should be reduced. To achieve the reduction, these areas should be reviewed and considered, and appropriate actions taken:</p> <p>(f) The CFCC maintains a Core Operations Unit, which is essentially an administrative and grant support unit. The consolidation of administrative functions and resources within the Judicial and Court Administrative Services Division should lead to the downsizing of this unit.</p>	Completed	Completed	Activity Reporting and Proposal Form submitted to the Judicial Council for the October 26, 2012, Judicial Council Meeting.

\* This document retains the wording presented by the Judicial Council's Executive and Planning Committee approved by the Judicial Council on August 31, 2012.



#	Directive *	Timeline	Status	Status Updates
56	<p>E&amp;P recommends that the Judicial Council direct the Administrative Director of the Courts to consider reducing or eliminating various publications produced by the Center for Families, Children, &amp; the Courts.</p> <p><u>SEC Recommendation</u> CFCC's current number of authorized positions should be reduced. To achieve the reduction, these areas should be reviewed and considered, and appropriate actions taken:</p> <p>(g) CFCC staff members produce various publications. They should be considered for reduction or elimination</p>	<p>ADOC to report to the council at the February 2013 council meeting.</p>	<p>Completed</p>	<p>Activity Reporting and Proposal Form submitted to the Judicial Council for the February 26, 2013, Judicial Council Meeting.</p>
57	<p>E&amp;P recommends that the Judicial Council support SEC Recommendation 7-4(h) with no further action. The Judge-in Residence is now volunteering time to fulfill this responsibility.</p> <p><u>SEC Recommendation</u> CFCC's current number of authorized positions should be reduced. To achieve the reduction, these areas should be reviewed and considered, and appropriate actions taken:</p> <p>(h) The Judge-in-Residence position in this division should be eliminated.</p>	<p>Completed</p>	<p>Completed</p>	<p>Activity Reporting and Proposal Form submitted to the Judicial Council for the October 26, 2012, Judicial Council Meeting.</p>
58	<p>E&amp;P recommends that the Judicial Council support SEC Recommendation 7-4(i) with no further action, as the positions related to CCMS have been eliminated through the AOC's initiatives to reduce costs and downsize its workforce and operations.</p> <p><u>SEC Recommendation</u> CFCC's current number of authorized positions should be reduced. To achieve the reduction, these areas should be reviewed and considered, and appropriate actions taken:</p> <p>(i) Positions related to CCMS should be eliminated.</p>	<p>Completed</p>	<p>Completed</p>	<p>Activity Reporting and Proposal Form submitted to the Judicial Council for the October 26, 2012, Judicial Council Meeting.</p>

\* This document retains the wording presented by the Judicial Council's Executive and Planning Committee approved by the Judicial Council on August 31, 2012.

#	Directive *	Timeline	Status	Status Updates
59	<p>E&amp;P recommends that the Judicial Council direct the Administrative Director of the Courts to propose an organizational plan for the Center for Families, Children, &amp; the Courts that allows for reasonable servicing of the diverse programs mandated by statute and assigned to this division.</p> <p><u>SEC Recommendation</u></p> <p>CFCC's current number of authorized positions should be reduced. To achieve the reduction, these areas should be reviewed and considered, and appropriate actions taken:</p> <p>(j) Although staffing reductions in this division are feasible, any reorganization or downsizing of this division must continue to allow for reasonable servicing of the diverse programs mandated by statute and assigned to this division, including such programs as the Tribal Project program.</p>	<p>ADOC to report to the council at the February 2013 council meeting.</p>	Completed	<p>Activity Reporting and Proposal Form submitted to the Judicial Council for the February 26, 2013, Judicial Council Meeting.</p>
60	<p>E&amp;P recommends that the Judicial Council direct the Administrative Director of the Courts to consider maximizing and combining self-help resources with resources from similar subject programs, including resources provided through the Justice Corps and the Sargent Shriver Civil Counsel program, and return to the council with an assessment and proposal.</p> <p><u>SEC Recommendation</u></p> <p>Self-represented litigants in small claims, collection matters, foreclosures, and landlord-tenant matters are frequent users of court self-help centers. A majority of self-help clients seek assistance in family law matters. Consideration should be given to maximizing and combining self-help resources with resources from similar subject programs, including resources provided through the Justice Corps and the Sargent Shriver Civil Counsel program.</p>	<p>ADOC to propose a plan for implementation to the council at the February 2013 meeting.</p>	Completed	<p>Activity Reporting and Proposal Form submitted to the Judicial Council for the February 26, 2013, Judicial Council Meeting.</p>

\* This document retains the wording presented by the Judicial Council's Executive and Planning Committee approved by the Judicial Council on August 31, 2012.

#	Directive *	Timeline	Status	Status Updates
61	<p>E&amp;P recommends to the Judicial Council that any legislative proposals generated by the AOC must follow the process established by the Policy Coordination and Liaison Committee.</p> <p><a href="#">SEC Recommendation</a></p> <p>Consistent with recommendations in this report calling for a review of AOC's rule-making process, legislative proposals generated through this division should be limited to those required by court decisions and statutory mandates and approved by the Judicial Council Advisory Committees.</p>	Immediate implementation (Ongoing)	Completed	Activity Reporting and Proposal Form submitted to the Judicial Council for the October 26, 2012, Judicial Council Meeting.
62	<p>E&amp;P recommends that the Judicial Council direct the Administrative Director of the Courts that a systems review of the manner in which AOC staff review trial court records should be conducted to streamline Judicial Review and Technical Assistance audits, if possible, and to lessen the impact on court resources.</p> <p><a href="#">SEC Recommendation</a></p> <p>A systems review of the manner in which trial court records are reviewed should be conducted to streamline audits, if possible, and to lessen the impact on court resources.</p>	ADOC to report to the council on the audit process at the June 2013 council meeting.	Completed	Status on implementation progress for this directive is included in the Activity Reporting and Proposal Form submitted to the Judicial Council for the June 28, 2013, Judicial Council Meeting.
63	<p>With the exception of assigned judges, AOC staff must not investigate complaints from litigants about judicial officers.</p> <p><a href="#">SEC Recommendation</a></p> <p>The CFCC should discontinue investigating and responding to complaints from litigants about judicial officers who handle family law matters, as such matters are handled by other entities.</p>	Ongoing	Completed	Activity Reporting and Proposal Form submitted to the Judicial Council for the October 26, 2012, Judicial Council Meeting.

\* This document retains the wording presented by the Judicial Council's Executive and Planning Committee approved by the Judicial Council on August 31, 2012.

#	Directive *	Timeline	Status	Status Updates
64	E&P recommends that the Judicial Council direct the Administrative Director of the Courts to consider SEC Recommendation 7-10 and implement the necessary organizational and staffing changes, contingent upon the council's approval of an organizational structure for the AOC and taking into account the results of the classification and compensation studies to be completed.	The Classification & Compensation Study is scheduled to be adopted by the Judicial Council at its meeting in April 2015; based upon the direction provided by the Judicial Council, the Executive Office will implement the plan accordingly and will provide an update to council at the October 2015 council meeting.	In Progress	<p>Implementation of directives 50, 64, 72, 78, 89, 100, 106, 123, 130, 135, and 142 are tied to the outcome of the AOC Classification and Compensation Study.</p> <p>On September 9, 2013, the Executive and Planning Committee (E&amp;P) reviewed the methodology, criteria, and process used to score the Request for Proposal (RFP) bids, reviewed the final bid scoring and findings, and approved the awarding of the contract to the highest scored bidder.</p> <p>In October 2013, E&amp;P provided an update to the Judicial Council notifying them that the highest scored bidder was selected to conduct the classification and compensation study.</p> <p>In November 2013, Fox Lawson &amp; Associates was awarded the contract to conduct the Judicial Council's classification and compensation study. Four meetings were held with Fox Lawson &amp; Associates, members of the Human Resources (HR) staff, and the Executive Office to establish the specifics of the study, including methodology, timeline, and a review of the current classification and compensation system at the Judicial Council.</p> <p>In December 2013, communications were sent to all Judicial Council staff informing them of the beginning of the study and outlining the requirements, including completing employee Position Description Questionnaires (PDQ), which were due in February 2014.</p> <p>In January 2014, Judicial Council staff conducted information sessions at each Judicial Council office to answer employees' questions regarding the study.</p> <p>In April and May 2014, Fox Lawson completed meeting with approximately 20 occupational panels across Judicial Council offices and locations, and will</p>

\* This document retains the wording presented by the Judicial Council's Executive and Planning Committee approved by the Judicial Council on August 31, 2012.

#	Directive *	Timeline	Status	Status Updates
				<p>be scheduling regular updates to brief the Executive Office.</p> <p>In June 2014, the Judicial Council Human Resources office and Fox Lawson discussed the current progress of the study with the council. Fox Lawson also began a series of one-on-one phone interviews with a small number of employees. The purpose was to clarify specific information provided in the PDQs regarding essential duties.</p> <p>In July 2014, the Executive Office held all-staff meetings to update Judicial Council staff about the progress of the study and discussed the selected comparator markets.</p> <p>In August 2014, Fox Lawson met with the Internal Chairs and the Executive Office to discuss recommendations for the proposed classification structure. The Internal Chairs and the Executive Office briefed the Judicial Council in closed session.</p> <p>In September 2014, Fox Lawson took steps to draft classification specifications and finalized job description summaries for market survey.</p> <p>In October 2014, Fox Lawson continued to draft and finalize the classification specifications and initiated the market survey to begin the compensation phase of the study.</p> <p>All-staff meetings were held in November 2014 to communicate the current status of the Classification and Compensation Study. During the meeting, employees were provided with an overview of the new classification system and were given information on the appeals process.</p> <p>In February 2015, employees are expected to be informed of their new classifications within the new</p>

\* This document retains the wording presented by the Judicial Council's Executive and Planning Committee approved by the Judicial Council on August 31, 2012.

#	Directive *	Timeline	Status	Status Updates
	<p><a href="#">SEC Recommendation</a></p> <p>The Court Operations Special Services Office (COSSO), formerly CPAS, should be an office reporting to the Chief Operating Officer within the AOC's Judicial and Court Operations Services Division, rather than a stand-alone division. The COSSO manager position should be at the Senior Manager level.</p>			structure and will have an opportunity to submit an appeal if they feel that their position has been incorrectly classified.
65	<p>E&amp;P recommends that the Judicial Council direct the Administrative Director of the Courts to consider SEC Recommendation 7-12 and implement the necessary organizational changes, contingent upon the council's approval of an organizational structure for the AOC.</p>	Interim and incoming ADOC organizational proposal to be presented for council consideration at the 8/31/12, council meeting.	Completed	Activity Reporting and Proposal Form submitted to the Judicial Council for the October 26, 2012, Judicial Council Meeting.
	<p><a href="#">SEC Recommendation</a></p> <p>The Promising and Effective Programs Unit functions are largely discretionary and should be considered for reduction or elimination, resulting in position savings.</p>			
65.1	<p>E&amp;P recommends that the Judicial Council support SEC Recommendation 7-12(a) with no further action, due to the temporary suspension of the Kleps Program initiated to reduce branch costs.</p>	Completed	Completed	Activity Reporting and Proposal Form submitted to the Judicial Council for the October 26, 2012, Judicial Council Meeting.
	<p><a href="#">SEC Recommendation</a></p> <p>The Promising and Effective Programs Unit functions are largely discretionary and should be considered for reduction or elimination, resulting in position savings. Consideration should be given to the following:</p> <p>(a) To save resources, the Kleps Award Program should be suspended temporarily.</p>			

\* This document retains the wording presented by the Judicial Council's Executive and Planning Committee approved by the Judicial Council on August 31, 2012.

#	Directive *	Timeline	Status	Status Updates
66	<p>E&amp;P recommends that the Judicial Council defer a decision on SEC Recommendation 7-12(b), pending a recommendation from the Trial Court Budget Working Group.</p> <p><u>SEC Recommendation</u></p> <p>The Promising and Effective Programs Unit functions are largely discretionary and should be considered for reduction or elimination, resulting in position savings. Consideration should be given to the following:</p> <p>(b) The Justice Corps Program should be maintained, with AOC's involvement limited to procuring and distributing funding to the courts.</p>		Completed	<p>Activity Reporting and Proposal Form submitted to the Judicial Council for the February 26, 2013, Judicial Council Meeting.</p>
67	<p>E&amp;P recommends that the Judicial Council support SEC Recommendation 7-12(c) with no further action as the Procedural Fairness/Public Trust and Confidence program has been eliminated through the AOC's initiatives to reduce costs and downsize its workforce and operations.</p> <p><u>SEC Recommendation</u></p> <p>The Promising and Effective Programs Unit functions are largely discretionary and should be considered for reduction or elimination, resulting in position savings. Consideration should be given to the following:</p> <p>(c) Since funding for the Procedural Fairness/Public Trust and Confidence program has ceased, it should be eliminated.</p>	Completed	Completed	<p>Activity Reporting and Proposal Form submitted to the Judicial Council for the October 26, 2012, Judicial Council Meeting.</p>

\* This document retains the wording presented by the Judicial Council's Executive and Planning Committee approved by the Judicial Council on August 31, 2012.

#	Directive *	Timeline	Status	Status Updates
68	<p>E&amp;P recommends that the Judicial Council consider whether to continue support for the Civics Education Program after the conclusion of the 2013 summit. The California On My Honor Program has been suspended for 2 years due to the lack of funding.</p> <p><u>SEC Recommendation</u></p> <p>The Promising and Effective Programs Unit functions are largely discretionary and should be considered for reduction or elimination, resulting in position savings. Consideration should be given to the following:</p> <p>(d) Once the 2013 summit has concluded, the Administrative Director and Judicial Council should evaluate continuing support for the Civics Education Program/California On My Honor program.</p>	<p>ADOC to report to the council at the April 2013 council meeting.</p>	<p>Completed</p>	<p>Status on implementation progress for this directive is included in the Activity Reporting and Proposal Form submitted to the Judicial Council for the April 26, 2013, Judicial Council Meeting.</p>
69	<p>E&amp;P recommends that the Judicial Council direct the ADOC to evaluate the extent to which financial and personnel support for the Jury Improvement Project should be maintained, recognizing the high value of the project to the judicial branch, especially because jury service represents the single largest point of contact between citizens and the courts.</p> <p><u>SEC Recommendation</u></p> <p>The Promising and Effective Programs Unit functions are largely discretionary and should be considered for reduction or elimination, resulting in position savings. Consideration should be given to the following:</p> <p>(e) The Jury Improvement Project is of high value to the judicial branch, especially as jury service represents the single largest point of contact between citizens and the courts. The Judicial Council should evaluate the extent to which financial and personnel support for the project should be maintained.</p>	<p>ADOC to report to the council at the 10/26/12, council meeting.</p>	<p>Completed</p>	<p>Activity Reporting and Proposal Form submitted to the Judicial Council for the February 26, 2013, Judicial Council Meeting.</p>

\* This document retains the wording presented by the Judicial Council's Executive and Planning Committee approved by the Judicial Council on August 31, 2012.



#	Directive *	Timeline	Status	Status Updates
70	<p>E&amp;P recommends that the Judicial Council direct the Administrative Director of the Courts to study the budget and operational components of the Court Interpreters Program to determine whether greater efficiencies can be implemented to deliver interpreter services to the courts. The Finance Division should not act as an impediment in the delivery of interpreter services to the courts.</p> <p><u>SEC Recommendation</u></p> <p>The Promising and Effective Programs Unit functions are largely discretionary and should be considered for reduction or elimination, resulting in position savings. Consideration should be given to the following:</p> <p>(g) The Administrative Director and Judicial Council should study the budget and operational components of Court Interpreters Program to determine whether greater efficiencies can be implemented to deliver interpreter services to the courts. Internally, the Finance Division should not act as an impediment in the delivery of interpreter services to the courts.</p>	ADOC to report to the council at the April 2013 council meeting.	Completed	Status on implementation progress for this directive is included in the Activity Reporting and Proposal Form submitted to the Judicial Council for the April 26, 2013, Judicial Council Meeting.
71	<p>E&amp;P recommends that the Judicial Council support SEC Recommendation 7-16 with no further action as the Judicial Administration Library has been eliminated through the AOC's initiatives to reduce costs and downsize its workforce and operations.</p> <p><u>SEC Recommendation</u></p> <p>The Judicial Administration Library should be consolidated with the Supreme Court Library.</p>	Completed	Completed	Activity Reporting and Proposal Form submitted to the Judicial Council for the October 26, 2012, Judicial Council Meeting.

\* This document retains the wording presented by the Judicial Council's Executive and Planning Committee approved by the Judicial Council on August 31, 2012.

#	Directive *	Timeline	Status	Status Updates
72	E&P recommends that the Judicial Council direct the Administrative Director of the Courts to consider SEC Recommendations 7-11(a) and (b) and 7-14 and implement the necessary organizational and staffing changes, contingent upon the council's approval of an organizational structure for the AOC and taking into account the results of the classification and compensation studies to be completed.	The Classification & Compensation Study is scheduled to be adopted by the Judicial Council at its meeting in April 2015; based upon the direction provided by the Judicial Council, the Executive Office will implement the plan accordingly and will provide an update to council at the October 2015 council meeting.	In Progress	<p>Implementation of directives 50, 64, 72, 78, 89, 100, 106, 123, 130, 135, and 142 are tied to the outcome of the AOC Classification and Compensation Study.</p> <p>On September 9, 2013, the Executive and Planning Committee (E&amp;P) reviewed the methodology, criteria, and process used to score the Request for Proposal (RFP) bids, reviewed the final bid scoring and findings, and approved the awarding of the contract to the highest scored bidder.</p> <p>In October 2013, E&amp;P provided an update to the Judicial Council notifying them that the highest scored bidder was selected to conduct the classification and compensation study.</p> <p>In November 2013, Fox Lawson &amp; Associates was awarded the contract to conduct the Judicial Council's classification and compensation study. Four meetings were held with Fox Lawson &amp; Associates, members of the Human Resources (HR) staff, and the Executive Office to establish the specifics of the study, including methodology, timeline, and a review of the current classification and compensation system at the Judicial Council.</p> <p>In December 2013, communications were sent to all Judicial Council staff informing them of the beginning of the study and outlining the requirements, including completing employee Position Description Questionnaires (PDQ), which were due in February 2014.</p> <p>In January 2014, Judicial Council staff conducted information sessions at each Judicial Council office to answer employees' questions regarding the study.</p> <p>In April and May 2014, Fox Lawson completed meeting with approximately 20 occupational panels across Judicial Council offices and locations, and will</p>

\* This document retains the wording presented by the Judicial Council's Executive and Planning Committee approved by the Judicial Council on August 31, 2012.

#	Directive *	Timeline	Status	Status Updates
				<p>be scheduling regular updates to brief the Executive Office.</p> <p>In June 2014, the Judicial Council Human Resources office and Fox Lawson discussed the current progress of the study with the council. Fox Lawson also began a series of one-on-one phone interviews with a small number of employees. The purpose was to clarify specific information provided in the PDQs regarding essential duties.</p> <p>In July 2014, the Executive Office held all-staff meetings to update Judicial Council staff about the progress of the study and discussed the selected comparator markets.</p> <p>In August 2014, Fox Lawson met with the Internal Chairs and the Executive Office to discuss recommendations for the proposed classification structure. The Internal Chairs and the Executive Office briefed the Judicial Council in closed session.</p> <p>In September 2014, Fox Lawson took steps to draft classification specifications and finalized job description summaries for market survey.</p> <p>In October 2014, Fox Lawson continued to draft and finalize the classification specifications and initiated the market survey to begin the compensation phase of the study.</p> <p>All-staff meetings were held in November 2014 to communicate the current status of the Classification and Compensation Study. During the meeting, employees were provided with an overview of the new classification system and were given information on the appeals process.</p> <p>In February 2015, employees are expected to be informed of their new classifications within the new</p>

\* This document retains the wording presented by the Judicial Council's Executive and Planning Committee approved by the Judicial Council on August 31, 2012.

#	Directive *	Timeline	Status	Status Updates
	<a href="#">SEC Recommendation</a> 7-11. COSSO's current level of approximately 74 positions (including those reassigned from the former regional offices as recommended in this report) should be reduced. To achieve the reduction the areas listed below should be reviewed and considered, and appropriate actions taken.  (a) COSSO should have a management structure that includes a Unit Manager, but the Assistant Division Director position should be eliminated			structure and will have an opportunity to submit an appeal if they feel that their position has been incorrectly classified.

\* This document retains the wording presented by the Judicial Council's Executive and Planning Committee approved by the Judicial Council on August 31, 2012.

#	Directive *	Timeline	Status	Status Updates
72.1	<p>E&amp;P recommends that the Judicial Council direct the Administrative Director of the Courts to consider SEC Recommendations 7-11(a) and (b) and 7-14 and implement the necessary organizational and staffing changes, contingent upon the council's approval of an organizational structure for the AOC and taking into account the results of the classification and compensation studies to be completed.</p> <p><u>SEC Recommendation</u></p> <p>7-11. COSSO's current level of approximately 74 positions (including those reassigned from the former regional offices as recommended in this report) should be reduced. To achieve the reduction the areas listed below should be reviewed and considered, and appropriate actions taken.</p> <p>(b) The research functions and units of COSSO should be reviewed for possible consolidation with other research programs in the Judicial and Court Operations Services Division, presenting opportunities for efficiencies and position reductions.</p>	<p>Administrative Director of the Courts to present a report of available options regarding the study's implementation to the Judicial Council for their consideration at the July 2013 Judicial Council meeting.</p>	Completed	<p>Since the end of FY 10-11, the number of AOC employees in research classifications has declined by approximately 45%. To improve the efficiency and effectiveness of research in support of the Judicial Council and the courts, and consistent with Judicial Council Directives 53 and 72.1, all research analysts currently at the AOC have been consolidated into offices within the Judicial and Court Operations Division. Managers overseeing research in those offices began discussions in October 2012 and have implemented a protocol to manage workforce reduction and address staffing current and future projects.</p>

\* This document retains the wording presented by the Judicial Council's Executive and Planning Committee approved by the Judicial Council on August 31, 2012.

#	Directive *	Timeline	Status	Status Updates
72.2	<p>E&amp;P recommends that the Judicial Council direct the Administrative Director of the Courts to consider SEC Recommendations 7-11(a) and (b) and 7-14 and implement the necessary organizational and staffing changes, contingent upon the council's approval of an organizational structure for the AOC and taking into account the results of the classification and compensation studies to be completed.</p> <p><u>SEC Recommendation</u></p> <p>7-14. A significant number of COSSO staff members, such as those in the Administration and Planning unit, are assigned to various functions in support of the Judicial Council. The recommended consolidation of Judicial Council support activities under the direction of the Chief of Staff will present opportunities for efficiencies and resource reductions.</p>	<p>Incoming ADOC's organizational proposal to be presented for council consideration at the 8/31/12, council meeting.**</p>	Completed	<p>Activity Reporting and Proposal Form submitted to the Judicial Council for the February 26, 2013, Judicial Council Meeting.</p>
73	<p>E&amp;P recommends that the Judicial Council direct the Administrative Director of the Courts to consider SEC Recommendation 7-13 and implement the necessary organizational and staffing changes, contingent upon the council's approval of an organizational structure for the AOC.</p> <p><u>SEC Recommendation</u></p> <p>The Editing and Graphics Group, with half of its eight positions currently vacant, should be considered for elimination.</p>	<p>Interim and incoming ADOC organizational proposal to be presented for council consideration at the 8/31/12, council meeting.</p>	Completed	<p>Activity Reporting and Proposal Form submitted to the Judicial Council for the October 26, 2012, Judicial Council Meeting.</p>

\* This document retains the wording presented by the Judicial Council's Executive and Planning Committee approved by the Judicial Council on August 31, 2012.

#	Directive *	Timeline	Status	Status Updates
74	<p>E&amp;P recommends that the Judicial Council direct the Administrative Director of the Courts that activities related to the education and training of Appellate Court Justices in the COSSO should be consolidated with the Education Division/CJER.</p> <p><u>SEC Recommendation</u> Some COSSO staff are engaged in activities relating to the education and training of Appellate Court Justices. These functions should be consolidated with the Education Division/CJER.</p>	Completion by June 2013.	Closed	<p>Status on implementation progress for this directive is included in the Activity Reporting and Proposal Form submitted to the Judicial Council for the April 26, 2013 Judicial Council Meeting. At the April 26, 2013 Judicial Council Meeting, the Administra</p>
75	<p>E&amp;P recommends that the Judicial Council support SEC Recommendation 7-17(a) with no further action as the Assigned Judges Program and Assigned Judges Program Regional Assignment Units have merged through the AOC's initiatives to reduce costs and downsize its workforce and operations.</p> <p><u>SEC Recommendation</u> Modifications to the Assigned Judges Program should be considered, including the following:</p> <p>(a) The Assigned Judges Program and Assigned Judges Program Regional Assignments units should be merged, resulting in the elimination of a unit supervisor position.</p>	Completed	Completed	<p>Activity Reporting and Proposal Form submitted to the Judicial Council for the October 26, 2012, Judicial Council Meeting.</p>

\* This document retains the wording presented by the Judicial Council's Executive and Planning Committee approved by the Judicial Council on August 31, 2012.

#	Directive *	Timeline	Status	Status Updates
76	<p>E&amp;P recommends that SEC Recommendations 7-17(b), (c), and (d) be referred to the Chief Justice for consideration. The AOC's Assigned Judges Program provides support to the Chief Justice in the assignment of judges under California Constitution Article VI, Section 6(e).</p> <p><u>SEC Recommendation</u></p> <p>Modifications to the Assigned Judges Program should be considered, including the following:</p> <p>(b) The program's travel and expense policies should be reviewed to mitigate adverse impacts on the availability of assigned judges to smaller and rural courts.</p> <p>(c) Consideration should be given to a pilot program to allow half-day assignments of judges, taking into account the probable inability of small, rural courts to attract judges on this basis.</p> <p>(d) Consideration should be given to development of an Assigned Commissioner Program to assist courts with such matters as AB1058 child support cases.</p>		Completed	Activity Reporting and Proposal Form submitted to the Judicial Council for the October 26, 2012, Judicial Council Meeting.
77	<p>E&amp;P recommends that the Judicial Council direct the Administrative Director of the Courts to consider SEC Recommendation 7-18 and implement the necessary organizational changes, contingent upon the council's approval of an organizational structure for the AOC.</p> <p><u>SEC Recommendation</u></p> <p>The functions of the Trial Court Leadership Service unit should be moved under the auspices of the new Executive Office, as matters of policy emanating from the Trial Court Presiding Judges Advisory Committee and Court Executives Advisory Committee often relate to branch-wide policies.</p>	Interim and incoming ADOC organizational proposal to be presented for council consideration at the 8/31/12, meeting.	Completed	Activity Reporting and Proposal Form submitted to the Judicial Council for the October 26, 2012, Judicial Council Meeting.

\* This document retains the wording presented by the Judicial Council's Executive and Planning Committee approved by the Judicial Council on August 31, 2012.



#	Directive *	Timeline	Status	Status Updates
78	E&P recommends that the Judicial Council direct the Administrative Director of the Courts to consider SEC Recommendation 7-19 and implement the necessary organizational changes, contingent upon the council's approval of an organizational structure for the AOC.	The Classification & Compensation Study is scheduled to be adopted by the Judicial Council at its meeting in April 2015; based upon the direction provided by the Judicial Council, the Executive Office will implement the plan accordingly and will provide an update to council at the October 2015 council meeting.	In Progress	<p>Implementation of directives 50, 64, 72, 78, 89, 100, 106, 123, 130, 135, and 142 are tied to the outcome of the AOC Classification and Compensation Study.</p> <p>On September 9, 2013, the Executive and Planning Committee (E&amp;P) reviewed the methodology, criteria, and process used to score the Request for Proposal (RFP) bids, reviewed the final bid scoring and findings, and approved the awarding of the contract to the highest scored bidder.</p> <p>In October 2013, E&amp;P provided an update to the Judicial Council notifying them that the highest scored bidder was selected to conduct the classification and compensation study.</p> <p>In November 2013, Fox Lawson &amp; Associates was awarded the contract to conduct the Judicial Council's classification and compensation study. Four meetings were held with Fox Lawson &amp; Associates, members of the Human Resources (HR) staff, and the Executive Office to establish the specifics of the study, including methodology, timeline, and a review of the current classification and compensation system at the Judicial Council.</p> <p>In December 2013, communications were sent to all Judicial Council staff informing them of the beginning of the study and outlining the requirements, including completing employee Position Description Questionnaires (PDQ), which were due in February 2014.</p> <p>In January 2014, Judicial Council staff conducted information sessions at each Judicial Council office to answer employees' questions regarding the study.</p> <p>In April and May 2014, Fox Lawson completed meeting with approximately 20 occupational panels across Judicial Council offices and locations, and will</p>

\* This document retains the wording presented by the Judicial Council's Executive and Planning Committee approved by the Judicial Council on August 31, 2012.

#	Directive *	Timeline	Status	Status Updates
				<p>be scheduling regular updates to brief the Executive Office.</p> <p>In June 2014, the Judicial Council Human Resources office and Fox Lawson discussed the current progress of the study with the council. Fox Lawson also began a series of one-on-one phone interviews with a small number of employees. The purpose was to clarify specific information provided in the PDQs regarding essential duties.</p> <p>In July 2014, the Executive Office held all-staff meetings to update Judicial Council staff about the progress of the study and discussed the selected comparator markets.</p> <p>In August 2014, Fox Lawson met with the Internal Chairs and the Executive Office to discuss recommendations for the proposed classification structure. The Internal Chairs and the Executive Office briefed the Judicial Council in closed session.</p> <p>In September 2014, Fox Lawson took steps to draft classification specifications and finalized job description summaries for market survey.</p> <p>In October 2014, Fox Lawson continued to draft and finalize the classification specifications and initiated the market survey to begin the compensation phase of the study.</p> <p>All-staff meetings were held in November 2014 to communicate the current status of the Classification and Compensation Study. During the meeting, employees were provided with an overview of the new classification system and were given information on the appeals process.</p> <p>In February 2015, employees are expected to be informed of their new classifications within the new</p>

\* This document retains the wording presented by the Judicial Council's Executive and Planning Committee approved by the Judicial Council on August 31, 2012.

#	Directive *	Timeline	Status	Status Updates
	<p><a href="#">SEC Recommendation</a></p> <p>The Education Division should be an office within the Judicial and Court Operations Services Division, under the direction of the Chief Operating Officer, rather than a stand-alone division. The Education Division/CJER manager position should be compensated at its current level.</p>			structure and will have an opportunity to submit an appeal if they feel that their position has been incorrectly classified.
79	E&P recommends that the Judicial Council direct the Rules and Projects Committee to evaluate relaxation of mandatory education requirements to allow the Administrative Director of the Courts and Court Executive Officers greater discretion and flexibility in utilizing their workforces during times of budget constraints.	Final reporting on this directive will be submitted at the June 2014 council meeting.	Completed	RUPRO recommended that the council adopt a proposal to amend rule 10.474 on education for trial court employees at its April 25, 2014 meeting. The amendments provide that each court executive officer has discretion to determine the number of hours, if any, of traditional (live, face-to-face) education required to meet the continuing education requirement, and may, for good cause, grant a one-year extension of time to complete the education requirements. The council adopted the rule proposal at its April 25th council meeting and the amendments will be effective January 1, 2015.
	<p><a href="#">SEC Recommendation</a></p> <p>As to training currently required of AOC staff and court personnel, the Judicial Council should examine and consider a relaxation of current mandatory requirements to allow the Administrative Director of the AOC and/or court executive officers greater discretion and flexibility in utilizing their workforces during times of budget constraints.</p>			

\* This document retains the wording presented by the Judicial Council's Executive and Planning Committee approved by the Judicial Council on August 31, 2012.

#	Directive *	Timeline	Status	Status Updates
80	E&P recommends that the Judicial Council direct the Administrative Director of the Courts to evaluate the efficiencies identified by the working group reviewing all education for new judges to ensure that education is provided in the most effective and efficient way possible.	Administrative Director of the Courts to provide report that evaluates education for new judges at the June 2013 council meeting.	Completed	Judicial Council report presented to the Judicial Council for consideration at the June 28, 2013 Judicial Council Meeting.
	<u>SEC Recommendation</u>			
	The Education Division's current staffing level is one of the highest in the AOC and should be reduced. To achieve the reduction, the following areas should be reviewed and considered, and appropriate actions taken:			
	(a) A workgroup has been formed to review all education for new judges to ensure that it is being provided in the most effective and efficient way possible. The efficiencies identified by this working group may present opportunities for reductions.			

\* This document retains the wording presented by the Judicial Council's Executive and Planning Committee approved by the Judicial Council on August 31, 2012.

#	Directive *	Timeline	Status	Status Updates
81	E&P recommends that the Judicial Council direct the Administrative Director of the Courts to consider SEC Recommendation 7-20(b), taking into account the results of the classification and compensation studies to be completed.	The Classification & Compensation Study is scheduled to be adopted by the Judicial Council at its meeting in April 2015; based upon the direction provided by the Judicial Council, the Executive Office will implement the plan accordingly and will provide an update to council at the October 2015 council meeting.	In Progress	<p>On September 9, 2013, the Executive and Planning Committee (E&amp;P) reviewed the methodology, criteria, and process used to score the Request for Proposal (RFP) bids, reviewed the final bid scoring and findings, and approved the awarding of the contract to the highest scored bidder.</p> <p>In October 2013, E&amp;P provided an update to the Judicial Council notifying them that the highest scored bidder was selected to conduct the classification and compensation study.</p> <p>In November 2013, Fox Lawson &amp; Associates was awarded the contract to conduct the Judicial Council's classification and compensation study. Four meetings were held with Fox Lawson &amp; Associates, members of the Human Resources (HR) staff, and the Executive Office to establish the specifics of the study, including methodology, timeline, and a review of the current classification and compensation system at the Judicial Council.</p> <p>In December 2013, communications were sent to all Judicial Council staff informing them of the beginning of the study and outlining the requirements, including completing employee Position Description Questionnaires (PDQ), which were due in February 2014.</p> <p>In January 2014, Judicial Council staff conducted information sessions at each Judicial Council office to answer employees' questions regarding the study.</p> <p>In April and May 2014, Fox Lawson completed meeting with approximately 20 occupational</p>

\* This document retains the wording presented by the Judicial Council's Executive and Planning Committee approved by the Judicial Council on August 31, 2012.

#	Directive *	Timeline	Status	Status Updates
				<p>panels across Judicial Council offices and locations, and will be scheduling regular updates to brief the Executive Office.</p> <p>In June 2014, the Judicial Council Human Resources office and Fox Lawson discussed the current progress of the study with the council. Fox Lawson also began a series of one-on-one phone interviews with a small number of employees. The purpose was to clarify specific information provided in the PDQs regarding essential duties.</p> <p>In July 2014, the Executive Office held all-staff meetings to update Judicial Council staff about the progress of the study and discussed the selected comparator markets.</p> <p>In August 2014, Fox Lawson met with the Internal Chairs and the Executive Office to discuss recommendations for the proposed classification structure. The Internal Chairs and the Executive Office briefed the Judicial Council in closed session.</p> <p>In September 2014, Fox Lawson took steps to draft classification specifications and finalized job description summaries for market survey.</p> <p>In October 2014, Fox Lawson continued to draft and finalize the classification specifications and initiated the market survey to begin the compensation phase of the study.</p> <p>All-staff meetings were held in November 2014 to communicate the current status of the Classification and Compensation Study. During the meeting, employees were provided with an overview of the new classification system and were given information on the appeals process.</p>

\* This document retains the wording presented by the Judicial Council's Executive and Planning Committee approved by the Judicial Council on August 31, 2012.

#	Directive *	Timeline	Status	Status Updates
---	-------------	----------	--------	----------------

In February 2015, employees are expected to be informed of their new classifications within the new structure and will have an opportunity to submit an appeal if they feel that their position has been incorrectly classified.

SEC Recommendation

The Education Division's current staffing level is one of the highest in the AOC and should be reduced. To achieve the reduction, the following areas should be reviewed and considered, and appropriate actions taken:

(b) There are in excess of a dozen attorney positions in the Education Division in units such as Design and Consulting, and Publications and Resources, in addition to the Judicial Education unit. All attorney position allocations should be reviewed with a goal of reducing their numbers and/or reallocating them to nonattorney classifications. In particular, education specialist positions are staffed by attorneys, a staffing practice that appears unnecessary.

---

\* This document retains the wording presented by the Judicial Council's Executive and Planning Committee approved by the Judicial Council on August 31, 2012.

#	Directive *	Timeline	Status	Status Updates
82	<p>E&amp;P recommends that the Judicial Council support SEC Recommendation 7-20(c) with no further action, as the positions and activities related to the Court Case Management System in the Education Division have been eliminated, through the AOC's initiatives to reduce costs and downsize its workforce and operations.</p> <p><u>SEC Recommendation</u></p> <p>The Education Division's current staffing level is one of the highest in the AOC and should be reduced. To achieve the reduction, the following areas should be reviewed and considered, and appropriate actions taken:</p> <p>(c) The Court Case Management System training unit and any other positions engaged in CCMS-related activities should be eliminated in light of the Judicial Council's decision to cancel the full deployment of the CCMS system.</p>	Completed	Completed	Activity Reporting and Proposal Form submitted to the Judicial Council for the October 26, 2012, Judicial Council Meeting.
83	<p>E&amp;P recommends that the Judicial Council direct the Administrative Director of the Courts to evaluate the impacts of a reduction in the size of the Production, Delivery, and Educational Technologies Unit and the reduction in services that would result, and provide the findings and recommendations to the Judicial Council.</p> <p><u>SEC Recommendation</u></p> <p>The Education Division's current staffing level is one of the highest in the AOC and should be reduced. To achieve the reduction, the following areas should be reviewed and considered, and appropriate actions taken:</p> <p>(d) The Production, Delivery and Educational Technologies unit has grown to more than 25 positions plus several temporary staff. The number of staff in this unit should be reduced in light of the difficult fiscal environment.</p>	ADOC to report to council with recommendations at the June 2013 council meeting.	Completed	Status on implementation progress for this directive is included in the Activity Reporting and Proposal Form submitted to the Judicial Council for the April 26, 2013, Judicial Council Meeting.

\* This document retains the wording presented by the Judicial Council's Executive and Planning Committee approved by the Judicial Council on August 31, 2012.



#	Directive *	Timeline	Status	Status Updates
84	E&P recommends that the Judicial Council direct the Administrative Director of the Courts to evaluate and consider reducing the positions assigned to develop training for AOC Staff in the Curriculum and Course Development Unit, especially if training requirements are relaxed	ADOC to report to council with recommendations following recommendations from RUPRO on training requirements.	Completed	<p>This directive is completed after action on Judicial Council directive #79 was taken. Directive #79 was referred to RUPRO for action, and states: E&amp;P recommends that the Judicial Council direct the Rules and Projects Committee to evaluate relaxation of mandatory education requirements to allow the Administrative Director of the Courts and Court Executive Officers greater discretion and flexibility in utilizing their workforces during times of budget constraints.</p> <p>At its meeting in March, RUPRO reviewed and discussed a letter from Judge Jahr (attached) in which he provided recommendations for relaxation of the education rules to provide him with greater discretion and flexibility in utilizing AOC staff during this time of budget constraint. RUPRO appointed a subcommittee to evaluate the relaxation of education rules for AOC and court staff.</p> <p>The RUPRO subcommittee recommended and RUPRO adopted a modification of the rule that governs education for AOC staff (CRC 10.491) which will extend the time frame for completing education requirements by one year and allow the ADOC discretion in determining how much of that education needs to be live face to face or distance. The Judicial Council adopted this rule amendment at its June 28, 2013, meeting. On August 6, 2013, a memorandum was issued to all AOC staff advising them that the Administrative Director was authorizing a one-year extension for all AOC staff to meet their education requirements. The Administrative Director of the Courts has considered reducing the positions assigned to develop training for AOC staff in the Curriculum and Course Development Unit (now the Judicial Branch Education Development Unit) in light of the recent revision to CRC 10.491 and has determined that a reduction in positions is not warranted. The</p>

\* This document retains the wording presented by the Judicial Council's Executive and Planning Committee approved by the Judicial Council on August 31, 2012.

#	Directive *	Timeline	Status	Status Updates
				<p>relaxation of the education requirements for AOC staff is not on-going. During this relaxation period, any staff resources which may be partially relieved will be assigned to work on other existing education programs.</p> <p>CJER conducted a comprehensive review of AOC education it provides and made extensive revisions in an effort to streamline this education by reducing classes that were not well attended, and increasing the education which is court focused. This was done to implement Judicial Council directive #88 and was completed. Directive #88 states that: E&amp;P recommends that the Judicial Council direct the Administrative Director of the Courts to report to the council on a review of the content of training courses offered to AOC managers, supervisors, and employees, the number and location of courses offered, and the means by which courses and training are delivered. Training opportunities should include greater orientation and development of understanding of court functions.</p> <p>SERVICE LEVEL IMPACT</p> <p>The recent revisions to AOC education will result in providing AOC staff with more court focused education which will enhance the level of service AOC staff provide to the courts.</p>
	<p><a href="#">SEC Recommendation</a></p> <p>The Education Division's current staffing level is one of the highest in the AOC and should be reduced. To achieve the reduction, the following areas should be reviewed and considered, and appropriate actions taken:</p> <p>(e) The Curriculum and Course Development unit includes several positions assigned to develop training for AOC staff. This activity should be evaluated and reduced, especially if training requirements are relaxed.</p>			

\* This document retains the wording presented by the Judicial Council's Executive and Planning Committee approved by the Judicial Council on August 31, 2012.

#	Directive *	Timeline	Status	Status Updates
85	<p>E&amp;P recommends that the Judicial Council direct the Administrative Director of the Courts to evaluate the impacts of a reduction in the size of the Administrative Services Unit and the reduction in services that would result, and provide the findings and recommendations to the Judicial Council.</p> <p><a href="#">SEC Recommendation</a></p> <p>The Education Division's current staffing level is one of the highest in the AOC and should be reduced. To achieve the reduction, the following areas should be reviewed and considered, and appropriate actions taken:</p> <p>(f) The Administrative Services unit contains more than 20 staff engaged in support activities such as records management, printing and copying, scheduling and planning training delivery, and coordinating logistics for all AOC events. The number of staff in this unit should be evaluated and reduced commensurate with the reduction in the number of live programs and events, and reflecting a reduction in the number of employees AOC-wide.</p>	<p>ADOC to report to council with recommendations at the June 2013 council meeting.</p>	<p>Completed</p>	<p>Status on implementation progress for this directive is included in the Activity Reporting and Proposal Form submitted to the Judicial Council for the April 26, 2013, Judicial Council Meeting.</p>
86	<p>E&amp;P recommends that the Judicial Council direct the Administrative Director of the Courts that the Education Division should conduct true cost benefit analyses in determining the types of training and education it provides for new judicial officers and others, and to report to the council on the results. Analyses should include types, lengths, locations of programs, delivery methods, and the costs to courts.</p> <p><a href="#">SEC Recommendation</a></p> <p>The Education Division should conduct true cost-benefit analyses — and not rely only on its own preferences — in determining the types of training and education it provides, including types, lengths, and locations of programs, delivery methods, and the costs to courts. This type of analysis should apply to training and education programs for new judicial officers.</p>	<p>ADOC to provide recommendations on the process at 12/14/12, council meeting with a final report at the April 2013 meeting.</p>	<p>Completed</p>	<p>Status on implementation progress for this directive is included in the Activity Reporting and Proposal Form submitted to the Judicial Council for the April 26, 2013, Judicial Council Meeting.</p>

\* This document retains the wording presented by the Judicial Council's Executive and Planning Committee approved by the Judicial Council on August 31, 2012.

#	Directive *	Timeline	Status	Status Updates
87	<p>E&amp;P recommends that the Judicial Council direct the Administrative Director of the Courts that the AOC should support and provide requested assistance to those courts that collaborate with other regional courts in providing judicial education and staff training or that request support in providing their own programs.</p> <p><a href="#">SEC Recommendation</a></p> <p>The Education Division should support and provide requested assistance to those courts that collaborate with other regional courts in providing judicial education and staff training or that request support in providing their own programs.</p>	Ongoing	Completed	Activity Reporting and Proposal Form submitted to the Judicial Council for the October 26, 2012, Judicial Council Meeting.
88	<p>E&amp;P recommends that the Judicial Council direct the Administrative Director of the Courts to report to the council on a review of the content of training courses offered to AOC managers, supervisors, and employees, the number and location of courses offered, and the means by which courses and training are delivered. Training opportunities should include greater orientation and development of understanding of court functions.</p> <p><a href="#">SEC Recommendation</a></p> <p>As to training currently required of AOC managers, supervisors, and employees, the Administrative Director should order a review of the content of training courses offered, the number and location of courses offered, and the means by which courses and training are delivered. Training opportunities should include greater orientation and development of understanding of court functions.</p>	ADOC report to the council at the 12/14/12, council meeting.	Completed	Activity Reporting and Proposal Form submitted to the Judicial Council for the December 14, 2012, Judicial Council Meeting.

\* This document retains the wording presented by the Judicial Council's Executive and Planning Committee approved by the Judicial Council on August 31, 2012.

#	Directive *	Timeline	Status	Status Updates
89	E&P recommends that the Judicial Council direct the Administrative Director of the Courts to consider SEC Recommendation 7-25 and implement the necessary organizational and staffing changes, contingent upon the council's approval of an organizational structure for the AOC.	The Classification & Compensation Study is scheduled to be adopted by the Judicial Council at its meeting in April 2015; based upon the direction provided by the Judicial Council, the Executive Office will implement the plan accordingly and will provide an update to council at the October 2015 council meeting.	In Progress	<p>Implementation of directives 50, 64, 72, 78, 89, 100, 106, 123, 130, 135, and 142 are tied to the outcome of the AOC Classification and Compensation Study.</p> <p>On September 9, 2013, the Executive and Planning Committee (E&amp;P) reviewed the methodology, criteria, and process used to score the Request for Proposal (RFP) bids, reviewed the final bid scoring and findings, and approved the awarding of the contract to the highest scored bidder.</p> <p>In October 2013, E&amp;P provided an update to the Judicial Council notifying them that the highest scored bidder was selected to conduct the classification and compensation study.</p> <p>In November 2013, Fox Lawson &amp; Associates was awarded the contract to conduct the Judicial Council's classification and compensation study. Four meetings were held with Fox Lawson &amp; Associates, members of the Human Resources (HR) staff, and the Executive Office to establish the specifics of the study, including methodology, timeline, and a review of the current classification and compensation system at the Judicial Council.</p> <p>In December 2013, communications were sent to all Judicial Council staff informing them of the beginning of the study and outlining the requirements, including completing employee Position Description Questionnaires (PDQ), which were due in February 2014.</p> <p>In January 2014, Judicial Council staff conducted information sessions at each Judicial Council office to answer employees' questions regarding the study.</p> <p>In April and May 2014, Fox Lawson completed meeting with approximately 20 occupational panels across Judicial Council offices and locations, and will</p>

\* This document retains the wording presented by the Judicial Council's Executive and Planning Committee approved by the Judicial Council on August 31, 2012.

#	Directive *	Timeline	Status	Status Updates
				<p>be scheduling regular updates to brief the Executive Office.</p> <p>In June 2014, the Judicial Council Human Resources office and Fox Lawson discussed the current progress of the study with the council. Fox Lawson also began a series of one-on-one phone interviews with a small number of employees. The purpose was to clarify specific information provided in the PDQs regarding essential duties.</p> <p>In July 2014, the Executive Office held all-staff meetings to update Judicial Council staff about the progress of the study and discussed the selected comparator markets.</p> <p>In August 2014, Fox Lawson met with the Internal Chairs and the Executive Office to discuss recommendations for the proposed classification structure. The Internal Chairs and the Executive Office briefed the Judicial Council in closed session.</p> <p>In September 2014, Fox Lawson took steps to draft classification specifications and finalized job description summaries for market survey.</p> <p>In October 2014, Fox Lawson continued to draft and finalize the classification specifications and initiated the market survey to begin the compensation phase of the study.</p> <p>All-staff meetings were held in November 2014 to communicate the current status of the Classification and Compensation Study. During the meeting, employees were provided with an overview of the new classification system and were given information on the appeals process.</p> <p>In February 2015, employees are expected to be informed of their new classifications within the new</p>

\* This document retains the wording presented by the Judicial Council's Executive and Planning Committee approved by the Judicial Council on August 31, 2012.

#	Directive *	Timeline	Status	Status Updates
---	-------------	----------	--------	----------------

structure and will have an opportunity to submit an appeal if they feel that their position has been incorrectly classified.

SEC Recommendation

The functions performed by the Finance Division should be placed in the Judicial and Court Administrative Services Division. The Finance Division should be renamed the Fiscal Services Office, reporting to the Chief Administrative Officer. The Fiscal Services Office Manager position should be at the Senior Manager level.

---

\* This document retains the wording presented by the Judicial Council's Executive and Planning Committee approved by the Judicial Council on August 31, 2012.

#	Directive *	Timeline	Status	Status Updates
90	E&P recommends that the Judicial Council direct the Administrative Director of the Courts to consider SEC Recommendation 7-26 and implement the necessary organizational and staffing changes, taking into account the results of the classification and compensation studies to be completed.	The Classification & Compensation Study is scheduled to be adopted by the Judicial Council at its meeting in April 2015; based upon the direction provided by the Judicial Council, the Executive Office will implement the plan accordingly and will provide an update to council at the October 2015 council meeting.	In Progress	<p>On September 9, 2013, the Executive and Planning Committee (E&amp;P) reviewed the methodology, criteria, and process used to score the Request for Proposal (RFP) bids, reviewed the final bid scoring and findings, and approved the awarding of the contract to the highest scored bidder.</p> <p>In October 2013, E&amp;P provided an update to the Judicial Council notifying them that the highest scored bidder was selected to conduct the classification and compensation study.</p> <p>In November 2013, Fox Lawson &amp; Associates was awarded the contract to conduct the Judicial Council's classification and compensation study. Four meetings were held with Fox Lawson &amp; Associates, members of the Human Resources (HR) staff, and the Executive Office to establish the specifics of the study, including methodology, timeline, and a review of the current classification and compensation system at the Judicial Council.</p> <p>In December 2013, communications were sent to all Judicial Council staff informing them of the beginning of the study and outlining the requirements, including completing employee Position Description Questionnaires (PDQ), which were due in February 2014.</p> <p>In January 2014, Judicial Council staff conducted information sessions at each Judicial Council office to answer employees' questions regarding the study.</p> <p>In April and May 2014, Fox Lawson completed meeting with approximately 20 occupational</p>

\* This document retains the wording presented by the Judicial Council's Executive and Planning Committee approved by the Judicial Council on August 31, 2012.



#	Directive *	Timeline	Status	Status Updates
				<p>panels across Judicial Council offices and locations, and will be scheduling regular updates to brief the Executive Office.</p> <p>In June 2014, the Judicial Council Human Resources office and Fox Lawson discussed the current progress of the study with the council. Fox Lawson also began a series of one-on-one phone interviews with a small number of employees. The purpose was to clarify specific information provided in the PDQs regarding essential duties.</p> <p>In July 2014, the Executive Office held all-staff meetings to update Judicial Council staff about the progress of the study and discussed the selected comparator markets.</p> <p>In August 2014, Fox Lawson met with the Internal Chairs and the Executive Office to discuss recommendations for the proposed classification structure. The Internal Chairs and the Executive Office briefed the Judicial Council in closed session.</p> <p>In September 2014, Fox Lawson took steps to draft classification specifications and finalized job description summaries for market survey.</p> <p>In October 2014, Fox Lawson continued to draft and finalize the classification specifications and initiated the market survey to begin the compensation phase of the study.</p> <p>All-staff meetings were held in November 2014 to communicate the current status of the Classification and Compensation Study. During the meeting, employees were provided with an overview of the new classification system and were given information on the appeals process.</p>

\* This document retains the wording presented by the Judicial Council's Executive and Planning Committee approved by the Judicial Council on August 31, 2012.

#	Directive *	Timeline	Status	Status Updates
---	-------------	----------	--------	----------------

In February 2015, employees are expected to be informed of their new classifications within the new structure and will have an opportunity to submit an appeal if they feel that their position has been incorrectly classified.

[SEC Recommendation](#)

The number of managers and supervisors should be reduced.

---

\* This document retains the wording presented by the Judicial Council's Executive and Planning Committee approved by the Judicial Council on August 31, 2012.

#	Directive *	Timeline	Status	Status Updates
91	E&P recommends that the Judicial Council direct the Administrative Director of the Courts to ensure through the budget and fiscal management measures implemented by the AOC that the AOC's Finance Division is involved in all phases of fiscal planning and budgeting, especially with regard to large-scale or branch-wide projects or initiatives.	ADOC interim report to the council at the February 2013 council meeting and final report at the meeting in October 2013.	Completed	<p>Directives 7-13, 21, 40, 91, and 145 have been combined as part of a broader review and policy discussion relating to the development of a cost-benefit analysis proposal for the AOC. After a review of existing internal processes, AOC staff have developed general guidelines that seek to ensure that all elements within each of these 10 directives were adequately addressed. A process for approval of branchwide projects and other significant initiatives was developed to ensure an appropriate evaluation is completed, which can include a full and comprehensive cost-benefit analysis, as necessary. That evaluation will include the input and collaboration of all stakeholders, a complete analysis of scope, accurate cost estimates and funding streams and associated controls, documentation of the decision-making processes, and the full transparent consideration of fiscal, operational, and other impacts to the courts and stakeholders.</p> <p>The AOC fully recognizes the value of implementing guidelines to effectively coordinate and manage important branchwide projects. The new "Guidelines for the Administration of Branchwide Projects and Initiatives" have been reviewed and approved by the Administrative Director of the Courts and will be implemented as the official AOC process in the coming weeks. These guidelines will be presented to the Judicial Council at its December 2013 meeting. At this time, having addressed the matters in each, the AOC will close Directives 7-13, 21, 40, 91, and 145.</p>
	<a href="#">SEC Recommendation</a> The AOC must improve its fiscal decision making processes. The AOC must make a commitment to involve the Fiscal Services Office in all phases of fiscal planning and budgeting, especially with regard to large-scale or branch-wide projects or initiatives.			

\* This document retains the wording presented by the Judicial Council's Executive and Planning Committee approved by the Judicial Council on August 31, 2012.

#	Directive *	Timeline	Status	Status Updates
92	E&P recommends that the Judicial Council direct the Administrative Director of the Courts to report back on the budget and fiscal management measures implemented by the AOC to ensure that the AOC's fiscal and budget processes are more transparent.	ADOC interim report to the council at the February 2013 meeting and final report at the October 2013 meeting.	Completed	<p>This directive is considered complete as the Fiscal Services Office continues to work on ensuring that budget information is readily available to the public via the courts website which includes the link to the DOF ebudget website (<a href="http://www.ebudget.ca.gov/">http://www.ebudget.ca.gov/</a>). The branch's fiscal information is displayed here as part of the Governor's budget package, including three year expenditures and position detail, fund condition statements, and fund transfer information. The AOC mid-year forecast as well as fiscal and budget processes calendar are planned future additions to the court website. Other detailed fiscal reports, such as reports to the legislative on branch expenditures, can be accessed on the public website as well (see attached example on special fund expenditures for 2011-12).</p> <p>The AOC will build upon the DOF annual budget development calendar to document the AOC fiscal and budget processes. Additionally, the Fiscal Services Office will confer with other state departments to obtain feedback regarding their internal fiscal and budget processes.</p>

SEC Recommendation

The budgeting process must become more transparent. Budget information must be readily available to the public, including online. Budget documents must provide understandable explanations and detail concerning revenue sources, fund transfers, and expenditures.

---

\* This document retains the wording presented by the Judicial Council's Executive and Planning Committee approved by the Judicial Council on August 31, 2012.

#	Directive *	Timeline	Status	Status Updates
93	E&P recommends that the Judicial Council direct the Administrative Director of the Courts to ensure that the budget and fiscal management measures implemented by the AOC enable the Finance Division to improve the timeliness of processing contracts to better serve courts, contractors, vendors, and others.	Interim report to the council on the changes in progress by the February 2013 council meeting.  Final report on measures taken to implement a new approach to the budget process, by June 2013 council meeting.	Completed	Status on implementation progress for this directive is included in the Activity Reporting and Proposal Form submitted to the Judicial Council for the June 28, 2013, Judicial Council Meeting.
<u>SEC Recommendation</u>				
This division must make a commitment to processing contracts in more timely fashion, with an eye toward better serving courts, contractors, vendors, and others.				
-----				
94	E&P recommends that the Judicial Council direct the Administrative Director of the Courts that the Finance Division must assess its workload needs, especially in light of legislation on court security and auditing functions being assumed by the State Controller's Office, so that any necessary adjustments in staffing positions can be made.	ADOC to report to the council at the June 2013 council meeting.	Completed	Status on implementation progress for this directive is included in the Activity Reporting and Proposal Form submitted to the Judicial Council for the June 28, 2013, Judicial Council Meeting.
<u>SEC Recommendation</u>				
The Finance Division must assess its workload needs, especially in light of legislation on court security and auditing functions being assumed by the State Controller's Office, so that any necessary adjustments in staffing positions can be made.				
-----				

\* This document retains the wording presented by the Judicial Council's Executive and Planning Committee approved by the Judicial Council on August 31, 2012.

#	Directive *	Timeline	Status	Status Updates
95	<p>E&amp;P recommends that the Judicial Council support SEC Recommendation 7-31 with no further action as the unit has been eliminated through the AOC's initiatives to reduce costs and downsize its workforce and operations.</p> <p><a href="#">SEC Recommendation</a> The need for a Strategic Policy, Communication, and Administration Unit should be reevaluated by the Chief Administrative Officer and, most likely, be eliminated.</p>	Completed	Completed	Activity Reporting and Proposal Form submitted to the Judicial Council for the October 26, 2012, Judicial Council Meeting.
96	<p>E&amp;P recommends that the Judicial Council direct the Administrative Director of the Courts to consider SEC Recommendation 7-32 and implement the necessary organizational and staffing changes, contingent upon the council's approval of an organizational structure for the AOC.</p> <p><a href="#">SEC Recommendation</a> Consistent with recent consolidation of this division, the HR function should no longer be assigned stand-alone division status in the AOC organizational structure and should be combined with other administrative functions, reporting to the Chief Administrative Officer in the AOC's Administrative Services Division.</p>	Interim and incoming ADOC to present organizational proposal the council at the 8/31/12, meeting.	Completed	Activity Reporting and Proposal Form submitted to the Judicial Council for the October 26, 2012, Judicial Council Meeting.

\* This document retains the wording presented by the Judicial Council's Executive and Planning Committee approved by the Judicial Council on August 31, 2012.

#	Directive *	Timeline	Status	Status Updates
97	<p>E&amp;P recommends that the Judicial Council direct the Administrative Director of the Courts to consider SEC Recommendation 7-34 and implement the necessary organizational and staffing changes, contingent upon the council's approval of an organizational structure for the AOC and taking into account the results of the classification and compensation studies to be completed.</p> <p><u>SEC Recommendation</u> The current number of higher-level positions in the HR Division should be reduced, as follows:</p> <p>(a) The Division Director position should be permanently eliminated as the HR function should no longer be a stand-alone division.</p>	Completed	Completed	Activity Reporting and Proposal Form submitted to the Judicial Council for the October 26, 2012, Judicial Council Meeting.
97.1	<p>E&amp;P recommends that the Judicial Council direct the Administrative Director of the Courts to consider SEC Recommendation 7-34 and implement the necessary organizational and staffing changes, contingent upon the council's approval of an organizational structure for the AOC and taking into account the results of the classification and compensation studies to be completed.</p> <p><u>SEC Recommendation</u> The current number of higher-level positions in the HR Division should be reduced, as follows:</p> <p>(b) The number of manager positions should be reduced from five to three, with some of the resulting resources allocated to line HR functions.</p>	ADOC to make a proposal based on the classification and compensation study.	Completed	Activity Reporting and Proposal Form submitted to the Judicial Council for the October 26, 2012, Judicial Council Meeting.

\* This document retains the wording presented by the Judicial Council's Executive and Planning Committee approved by the Judicial Council on August 31, 2012.

#	Directive *	Timeline	Status	Status Updates
97.2	<p>E&amp;P recommends that the Judicial Council direct the Administrative Director of the Courts to consider SEC Recommendation 7-34 and implement the necessary organizational and staffing changes, contingent upon the council's approval of an organizational structure for the AOC and taking into account the results of the classification and compensation studies to be completed.</p> <p><u>SEC Recommendation</u></p> <p>The current number of higher-level positions in the HR Division should be reduced, as follows:</p> <p>(c) One of the three Senior Manager positions is vacant, a vacancy that should be made permanent by reallocating managerial responsibilities to the two filled Senior Manager positions.</p>	Completed. This Division has 2 senior manager positions.	Completed	Activity Reporting and Proposal Form submitted to the Judicial Council for the October 26, 2012, Judicial Council Meeting.
98	<p>E&amp;P recommends that the Judicial Council direct the Administrative Director of the Courts to report back on the progress and results of staffing changes being implemented in the Human Resources unit as part of the AOC's internal restructuring process.</p> <p><u>SEC Recommendation</u></p> <p>The current number of higher-level positions in the HR Division should be reduced, as follows:</p> <p>(d) With the elimination of the positions discussed above, consideration should be given to redirecting the resources from those positions to support vacant HR analyst positions that can be assigned work needed to help reestablish effective HR policies and practices in the AOC.</p>	ADOC to report to the council on the results and status of AOC restructuring at the February 2013 council meeting.	Completed	Activity Reporting and Proposal Form submitted to the Judicial Council for the October 26, 2012, Judicial Council Meeting.

\* This document retains the wording presented by the Judicial Council's Executive and Planning Committee approved by the Judicial Council on August 31, 2012.



#	Directive *	Timeline	Status	Status Updates
99	E&P recommends that the Judicial Council support SEC Recommendation 7-42 with no further action, as the issues have been resolved.  <a href="#">SEC Recommendation</a> The Administrative Director should resolve any remaining issues that have existed between the HR Division and Office of General Counsel, including by redefining respective roles relating to employee discipline or other HR functions.	Completed	Completed	Activity Reporting and Proposal Form submitted to the Judicial Council for the October 26, 2012, Judicial Council Meeting.

---

\* This document retains the wording presented by the Judicial Council's Executive and Planning Committee approved by the Judicial Council on August 31, 2012.

#	Directive *	Timeline	Status	Status Updates
100	E&P recommends that the Judicial Council direct the Administrative Director of the Courts to consider SEC Recommendation 7-43 and implement the necessary organizational and staffing changes, contingent upon the council's approval of an organizational structure for the AOC.	The Classification & Compensation Study is scheduled to be adopted by the Judicial Council at its meeting in April 2015; based upon the direction provided by the Judicial Council, the Executive Office will implement the plan accordingly and will provide an update to council at the October 2015 council meeting.	In Progress	<p>Implementation of directives 50, 64, 72, 78, 89, 100, 106, 123, 130, 135, and 142 are tied to the outcome of the AOC Classification and Compensation Study.</p> <p>On September 9, 2013, the Executive and Planning Committee (E&amp;P) reviewed the methodology, criteria, and process used to score the Request for Proposal (RFP) bids, reviewed the final bid scoring and findings, and approved the awarding of the contract to the highest scored bidder.</p> <p>In October 2013, E&amp;P provided an update to the Judicial Council notifying them that the highest scored bidder was selected to conduct the classification and compensation study.</p> <p>In November 2013, Fox Lawson &amp; Associates was awarded the contract to conduct the Judicial Council's classification and compensation study. Four meetings were held with Fox Lawson &amp; Associates, members of the Human Resources (HR) staff, and the Executive Office to establish the specifics of the study, including methodology, timeline, and a review of the current classification and compensation system at the Judicial Council.</p> <p>In December 2013, communications were sent to all Judicial Council staff informing them of the beginning of the study and outlining the requirements, including completing employee Position Description Questionnaires (PDQ), which were due in February 2014.</p> <p>In January 2014, Judicial Council staff conducted information sessions at each Judicial Council office to answer employees' questions regarding the study.</p> <p>In April and May 2014, Fox Lawson completed meeting with approximately 20 occupational panels across Judicial Council offices and locations, and will</p>

\* This document retains the wording presented by the Judicial Council's Executive and Planning Committee approved by the Judicial Council on August 31, 2012.

#	Directive *	Timeline	Status	Status Updates
				<p>be scheduling regular updates to brief the Executive Office.</p> <p>In June 2014, the Judicial Council Human Resources office and Fox Lawson discussed the current progress of the study with the council. Fox Lawson also began a series of one-on-one phone interviews with a small number of employees. The purpose was to clarify specific information provided in the PDQs regarding essential duties.</p> <p>In July 2014, the Executive Office held all-staff meetings to update Judicial Council staff about the progress of the study and discussed the selected comparator markets.</p> <p>In August 2014, Fox Lawson met with the Internal Chairs and the Executive Office to discuss recommendations for the proposed classification structure. The Internal Chairs and the Executive Office briefed the Judicial Council in closed session.</p> <p>In September 2014, Fox Lawson took steps to draft classification specifications and finalized job description summaries for market survey.</p> <p>In October 2014, Fox Lawson continued to draft and finalize the classification specifications and initiated the market survey to begin the compensation phase of the study.</p> <p>All-staff meetings were held in November 2014 to communicate the current status of the Classification and Compensation Study. During the meeting, employees were provided with an overview of the new classification system and were given information on the appeals process.</p> <p>In February 2015, employees are expected to be informed of their new classifications within the new</p>

\* This document retains the wording presented by the Judicial Council's Executive and Planning Committee approved by the Judicial Council on August 31, 2012.

#	Directive *	Timeline	Status	Status Updates
	<a href="#">SEC Recommendation</a> The committee recommends that the functions of this division be placed under a unit titled Information and Technology Services Office, combined with any remaining functions of CCMS. The office should report to the Chief Administrative Officer of the Judicial and Court Administrative Services Division. The IS Manager position should be compensated at its current level.			structure and will have an opportunity to submit an appeal if they feel that their position has been incorrectly classified.
101	E&P recommends that the Judicial Council support SEC Recommendation 7-44 and direct the council's Technology Committee to reexamine technology policies in the judicial branch to formulate any new branch-wide technology policies or standards, based on the input, needs, and experiences of the courts and court users, and including cost-benefit analysis.	Report to the council at the October 2014 council meeting.	Completed	The Technology Committee has developed a unified, long-term plan to achieve funding stability for court technology that was approved by the Judicial Council. The Technology Planning Task Force was charged with developing this plan. Three tracks were launched: governance, strategic plan, and funding. The new Court Technology Governance and Strategic Plan was developed and reviewed by the Judicial Council. A period of public comment period was held. The plan was approved by the council in August 2014, and was updated and approved at the October 2014 council meeting, with revised language around language access. Work has started to implement the recommendations from the Court Technology Governance and Strategic Plan.
	<a href="#">SEC Recommendation</a> A reexamination of technology policies in the judicial branch must occur now that CCMS does not represent the technology vision for all courts. Formulation of any new branch-wide technology policies or standards must be based on the input, needs, and experiences of the courts, and including cost-benefit analysis.			

\* This document retains the wording presented by the Judicial Council's Executive and Planning Committee approved by the Judicial Council on August 31, 2012.

#	Directive *	Timeline	Status	Status Updates
102	<p>E&amp;P recommends that the Judicial Council support SEC Recommendation 7-45(a) with no further action, as the recommended staff reductions have occurred through the AOC's initiatives to reduce costs and downsize its workforce and operations.</p> <p><a href="#">SEC Recommendation</a> Especially with CCMS not being fully deployed, staff reductions in this division are in order, including:</p> <p>(a) Unnecessary CCMS positions should be eliminated.</p>	Completed	Completed	Activity Reporting and Proposal Form submitted to the Judicial Council for the October 26, 2012, Judicial Council Meeting.
103	<p>E&amp;P recommends that the Judicial Council direct the Administrative Director of the Courts to consider SEC Recommendation 7-45(b) and implement the necessary organizational and staffing changes, contingent upon the council's approval of an organizational structure for the AOC and taking into account the results of the classification and compensation studies to be completed.</p> <p><a href="#">SEC Recommendation</a> Especially with CCMS not being fully deployed, staff reductions in this division are in order, including:</p> <p>(b) The total number of senior managers should be reduced.</p>	ADOC to make a proposal based on the classification and compensation study.	Completed	Activity Reporting and Proposal Form submitted to the Judicial Council for the October 26, 2012, Judicial Council Meeting.

\* This document retains the wording presented by the Judicial Council's Executive and Planning Committee approved by the Judicial Council on August 31, 2012.

#	Directive *	Timeline	Status	Status Updates
104	E&P recommends that the Judicial Council direct that the Administrative Director of the Courts should review and reduce accordingly the use of temporary employees, consultants, and contractors.	ADOC will report to the council at the April 2014 meeting.	Completed	<p data-bbox="1440 168 2028 545">In 2012, the AOC Executive Office approved a program that converts full-time employees into a limited number of contractor positions in critical long-term maintenance and support roles to provide cost savings and longer term stability and support. A three phase project was developed by ITSO and recruitments began in April 2013 with the hiring of eight (8) positions followed by a second recruitment in November 2013 that resulted in the hiring of two additional positions. (It should be noted that one of these hires resigned a short time after being employed in a regular position).</p> <p data-bbox="1440 581 2028 958">The program has been a success to date with cost savings of 35% for each position hired. However, ITSO has been met with challenges in hiring permanent staff due to a competitive IT market, the exclusion of short term programs or assignments from the program, a pay structure that is generally perceived to be non-competitive for skilled and experienced IT resources, and the policy that new hires may not participate in the pilot telecommunication program. For these reasons, the program appears to have plateaued with 50% of external candidates declining offers for positions.</p> <p data-bbox="1440 993 2028 1279">The organization will continue its efforts on a periodic basis to review opportunities for converting contractor positions to full time employees with the understanding that not all contractor positions can be converted, that there will always be a need for contractors on short term programs with specialized skill sets, and that with the termination of some interim programs, the overall number of programs will be reduced (i.e., V2).</p> <p data-bbox="1440 1315 2028 1438">The infrastructure for this process has been developed and the organization will periodically review the program with the goal of hiring full time staff for full time programs to provide the best</p>

\* This document retains the wording presented by the Judicial Council's Executive and Planning Committee approved by the Judicial Council on August 31, 2012.

#	Directive *	Timeline	Status	Status Updates
	<a href="#">SEC Recommendation</a> Especially with CCMS not being fully deployed, staff reductions in this division are in order, including:  (c) The use of temporary employees, consultants, and contractors should be reviewed and reductions made accordingly.			services to the user community and experience cost savings for the organization.
105	E&P recommends that the Judicial Council support SEC Recommendation 7-46 and direct the Administrative Director of the Courts, as part of AOC long-term planning, to conduct a review and audit of all technology currently used at the AOC and to return to the Judicial Council with a progress report on the findings, including efficiencies and potential cost savings.	ADOC will report to the council at the February 2014 meeting.	Completed	This directive has been closed. The Information Technology Services Office continues to review technology currently used in AOC data centers and utilizes Enterprise Technology Standards established by the AOC Enterprise Architecture Working Group. These standards define technologies that should be leveraged and those that should be phased out in order to maximize efficiencies and cost savings, and they are updated twice each year with the next update scheduled for December 2013. The standards are discussed with the application and infrastructure teams during monthly meetings to monitor compliance and identify strategies for ensuring compliance. Additional detail regarding the technology audit, standards and processes was added to the drafted closure documentation for targeted completion in February 2014.
	<a href="#">SEC Recommendation</a> Different divisions in AOC operate from different technology platforms, including SAP used for the Phoenix system, Oracle, and CCMS. As part of a long range plan for the use of technology in AOC operations, the AOC should conduct a review and audit of all technology currently used in the AOC.			
	Efficiencies and cost savings could result from the use of a single platform.			

\* This document retains the wording presented by the Judicial Council's Executive and Planning Committee approved by the Judicial Council on August 31, 2012.

#	Directive *	Timeline	Status	Status Updates
106	E&P recommends that the Judicial Council direct the Administrative Director of the Courts to consider SEC Recommendation 7-71 and implement the necessary organizational and staffing changes, contingent upon the council's approval of an organizational structure for the AOC.	The Classification & Compensation Study is scheduled to be adopted by the Judicial Council at its meeting in April 2015; based upon the direction provided by the Judicial Council, the Executive Office will implement the plan accordingly and will provide an update to council at the October 2015 council meeting.	In Progress	<p>Implementation of directives 50, 64, 72, 78, 89, 100, 106, 123, 130, 135, and 142 are tied to the outcome of the AOC Classification and Compensation Study.</p> <p>On September 9, 2013, the Executive and Planning Committee (E&amp;P) reviewed the methodology, criteria, and process used to score the Request for Proposal (RFP) bids, reviewed the final bid scoring and findings, and approved the awarding of the contract to the highest scored bidder.</p> <p>In October 2013, E&amp;P provided an update to the Judicial Council notifying them that the highest scored bidder was selected to conduct the classification and compensation study.</p> <p>In November 2013, Fox Lawson &amp; Associates was awarded the contract to conduct the Judicial Council's classification and compensation study. Four meetings were held with Fox Lawson &amp; Associates, members of the Human Resources (HR) staff, and the Executive Office to establish the specifics of the study, including methodology, timeline, and a review of the current classification and compensation system at the Judicial Council.</p> <p>In December 2013, communications were sent to all Judicial Council staff informing them of the beginning of the study and outlining the requirements, including completing employee Position Description Questionnaires (PDQ), which were due in February 2014.</p> <p>In January 2014, Judicial Council staff conducted information sessions at each Judicial Council office to answer employees' questions regarding the study.</p> <p>In April and May 2014, Fox Lawson completed meeting with approximately 20 occupational panels across Judicial Council offices and locations, and will</p>

\* This document retains the wording presented by the Judicial Council's Executive and Planning Committee approved by the Judicial Council on August 31, 2012.



#	Directive *	Timeline	Status	Status Updates
				<p>be scheduling regular updates to brief the Executive Office.</p> <p>In June 2014, the Judicial Council Human Resources office and Fox Lawson discussed the current progress of the study with the council. Fox Lawson also began a series of one-on-one phone interviews with a small number of employees. The purpose was to clarify specific information provided in the PDQs regarding essential duties.</p> <p>In July 2014, the Executive Office held all-staff meetings to update Judicial Council staff about the progress of the study and discussed the selected comparator markets.</p> <p>In August 2014, Fox Lawson met with the Internal Chairs and the Executive Office to discuss recommendations for the proposed classification structure. The Internal Chairs and the Executive Office briefed the Judicial Council in closed session.</p> <p>In September 2014, Fox Lawson took steps to draft classification specifications and finalized job description summaries for market survey.</p> <p>In October 2014, Fox Lawson continued to draft and finalize the classification specifications and initiated the market survey to begin the compensation phase of the study.</p> <p>All-staff meetings were held in November 2014 to communicate the current status of the Classification and Compensation Study. During the meeting, employees were provided with an overview of the new classification system and were given information on the appeals process.</p> <p>In February 2015, employees are expected to be informed of their new classifications within the new</p>

\* This document retains the wording presented by the Judicial Council's Executive and Planning Committee approved by the Judicial Council on August 31, 2012.

#	Directive *	Timeline	Status	Status Updates
---	-------------	----------	--------	----------------

structure and will have an opportunity to submit an appeal if they feel that their position has been incorrectly classified.

SEC Recommendation

The Office of General Counsel should be renamed Legal Services Office, consistent with its past designation, and should be a stand-alone office reporting to the Administrative Director of the Courts. The Legal Services Office manager position should be compensated at its current level. The Legal Services Office should not be at the same divisional level as the Judicial and Court Operations Services Division or the Judicial and Court Administrative Services Division. The Chief Counsel, manager of the Legal Services Office, should not be a member of the Executive Leadership Team.

---

\* This document retains the wording presented by the Judicial Council's Executive and Planning Committee approved by the Judicial Council on August 31, 2012.

#	Directive *	Timeline	Status	Status Updates
107	<p>E&amp;P recommends that the Judicial Council direct the Administrative Director of the Courts to consider SEC Recommendation 7-72(a) and implement the necessary organizational and staffing changes, contingent upon the council's approval of an organizational structure for the AOC and taking into account the results of the classification and compensation studies to be completed.</p> <p><a href="#">SEC Recommendation</a></p> <p>The Legal Services Office's current level of approximately 75 positions, including more than 50 attorney positions, should be reduced. To achieve the reduction, the following areas should be reviewed and considered, and appropriate actions taken:</p> <p>(a) In addition to the General Counsel, there are nine management level attorney positions in the Legal Services Office, including the Assistant General Counsel, three Managing Attorneys, and five Supervising Attorneys. This is an excessive number of management positions, which should be reduced. The position of Assistant General Counsel position could be eliminated. One managing attorney could be assigned to manage each of the two major functional components of the division, house counsel, and Judicial Council services, with each managing attorney reporting directly to the Chief Counsel.</p>	<p>ADOC to make recommendations to the council at the April 2014 council meeting.</p>	<p>Completed</p>	<p>Judicial Council report presented to the Judicial Council for consideration at the April 25, 2014, Judicial Council Meeting.</p>

\* This document retains the wording presented by the Judicial Council's Executive and Planning Committee approved by the Judicial Council on August 31, 2012.

#	Directive *	Timeline	Status	Status Updates
108	<p>E&amp;P recommends that the Judicial Council support SEC Recommendation 7-72(b) and direct the Administrative Director of the Courts to direct implementation of fundamental management practices to address underperformance of staff members and provide better supervision and allocation of work.</p> <p><a href="#">SEC Recommendation</a></p> <p>The Legal Services Office's current level of approximately 75 positions, including more than 50 attorney positions, should be reduced. To achieve the reduction, the following areas should be reviewed and considered, and appropriate actions taken:</p> <p>(b) Despite the large number of management positions, management systems and processes are particularly lacking in the Legal Services Office. Implementing fundamental management practices to address the underperformance of staff members and provide better supervision and allocation of work should produce efficiencies that can result in reductions.</p>	<p>ADOC interim report to the council on the changes in progress by the February 2013 council meeting.</p>	<p>Completed</p>	<p>Status on implementation progress for this directive is included in the Activity Reporting and Proposal Form submitted to the Judicial Council for the April 26, 2013, Judicial Council Meeting.</p>

\* This document retains the wording presented by the Judicial Council's Executive and Planning Committee approved by the Judicial Council on August 31, 2012.

#	Directive *	Timeline	Status	Status Updates
109	<p>E&amp;P recommends that the Judicial Council direct the Administrative Director of the Courts to consider SEC Recommendation 7-72(c) and implement the necessary organizational and staffing changes, contingent upon the council's approval of an organizational structure for the AOC and taking into account the results of the classification and compensation studies to be completed.</p> <p><a href="#">SEC Recommendation</a></p> <p>The Legal Services Office's current level of approximately 75 positions, including more than 50 attorney positions, should be reduced. To achieve the reduction, the following areas should be reviewed and considered, and appropriate actions taken:</p> <p>(c) A large number of Legal Services Office positions are dedicated to supporting the Judicial Council and its various committees and task forces. Assigning responsibility for coordinating the AOC's Judicial Council support activities to the Executive Office under the direction of the Chief of Staff will lead to efficiencies that should result in reductions of Legal Services Office positions dedicated to these activities.</p>	<p>Interim and incoming ADOC organizational proposal to be presented to the council at the 8/31/12, meeting.</p>	<p>Completed</p>	<p>Activity Reporting and Proposal Form submitted to the Judicial Council for the February 26, 2013, Judicial Council Meeting.</p>

\* This document retains the wording presented by the Judicial Council's Executive and Planning Committee approved by the Judicial Council on August 31, 2012.

#	Directive *	Timeline	Status	Status Updates
110	<p>E&amp;P recommends that the Judicial Council support SEC Recommendation 7-72(d) and direct the Administrative Director of the Courts to report to the council on measures to streamline and improve the AOC's contracting processes and reduce contract-related work performed by this office.</p> <p><a href="#">SEC Recommendation</a></p> <p>The Legal Services Office's current level of approximately 75 positions, including more than 50 attorney positions, should be reduced. To achieve the reduction, the following areas should be reviewed and considered, and appropriate actions taken:</p> <p>(d) Implementation of the recommendations designed to streamline and improve the AOC's contracting processes should reduce contract-related work performed by the Legal Services Office.</p>	<p>Final report to the council at June 2013 meeting.</p>	<p>Completed</p>	<p>Status on implementation progress for this directive is included in the Activity Reporting and Proposal Form submitted to the Judicial Council for the June 28, 2013, Judicial Council Meeting.</p>

\* This document retains the wording presented by the Judicial Council's Executive and Planning Committee approved by the Judicial Council on August 31, 2012.

#	Directive *	Timeline	Status	Status Updates
111	E&P recommends that the Judicial Council direct the Administrative Director of the Courts to consider SEC Recommendation 7-72 (e) and implement the necessary organizational and staffing changes, contingent upon the council's approval of an organizational structure for the AOC and taking into account the results of the classification and compensation studies to be completed	The Classification & Compensation Study is scheduled to be adopted by the Judicial Council at its meeting in April 2015; based upon the direction provided by the Judicial Council, the Executive Office will implement the plan accordingly and will provide an update to council at the October 2015 council meeting.	In Progress	<p>On September 9, 2013, the Executive and Planning Committee (E&amp;P) reviewed the methodology, criteria, and process used to score the Request for Proposal (RFP) bids, reviewed the final bid scoring and findings, and approved the awarding of the contract to the highest scored bidder.</p> <p>In October 2013, E&amp;P provided an update to the Judicial Council notifying them that the highest scored bidder was selected to conduct the classification and compensation study.</p> <p>In November 2013, Fox Lawson &amp; Associates was awarded the contract to conduct the Judicial Council's classification and compensation study. Four meetings were held with Fox Lawson &amp; Associates, members of the Human Resources (HR) staff, and the Executive Office to establish the specifics of the study, including methodology, timeline, and a review of the current classification and compensation system at the Judicial Council.</p> <p>In December 2013, communications were sent to all Judicial Council staff informing them of the beginning of the study and outlining the requirements, including completing employee Position Description Questionnaires (PDQ), which were due in February 2014.</p> <p>In January 2014, Judicial Council staff conducted information sessions at each Judicial Council office to answer employees' questions regarding the study.</p> <p>In April and May 2014, Fox Lawson completed meeting with approximately 20 occupational</p>

\* This document retains the wording presented by the Judicial Council's Executive and Planning Committee approved by the Judicial Council on August 31, 2012.

#	Directive *	Timeline	Status	Status Updates
				<p>panels across Judicial Council offices and locations, and will be scheduling regular updates to brief the Executive Office.</p> <p>In June 2014, the Judicial Council Human Resources office and Fox Lawson discussed the current progress of the study with the council. Fox Lawson also began a series of one-on-one phone interviews with a small number of employees. The purpose was to clarify specific information provided in the PDQs regarding essential duties.</p> <p>In July 2014, the Executive Office held all-staff meetings to update Judicial Council staff about the progress of the study and discussed the selected comparator markets.</p> <p>In August 2014, Fox Lawson met with the Internal Chairs and the Executive Office to discuss recommendations for the proposed classification structure. The Internal Chairs and the Executive Office briefed the Judicial Council in closed session.</p> <p>In September 2014, Fox Lawson took steps to draft classification specifications and finalized job description summaries for market survey.</p> <p>In October 2014, Fox Lawson continued to draft and finalize the classification specifications and initiated the market survey to begin the compensation phase of the study.</p> <p>All-staff meetings were held in November 2014 to communicate the current status of the Classification and Compensation Study. During the meeting, employees were provided with an overview of the new classification system and were given information on the appeals process.</p>

\* This document retains the wording presented by the Judicial Council's Executive and Planning Committee approved by the Judicial Council on August 31, 2012.



#	Directive *	Timeline	Status	Status Updates
---	-------------	----------	--------	----------------

In February 2015, employees are expected to be informed of their new classifications within the new structure and will have an opportunity to submit an appeal if they feel that their position has been incorrectly classified.

SEC Recommendation

The Legal Services Office's current level of approximately 75 positions, including more than 50 attorney positions, should be reduced. To achieve the reduction, the following areas should be reviewed and considered, and appropriate actions taken:

(e) The Legal Services Office has promoted and contributed to the "lawyerizing" of numerous activities and functions in the AOC. There are opportunities for work currently performed by attorneys in the Rules and Projects, Transactions and Business Operations, Real Estate, and Labor and Employment units to be performed by nonattorneys, resulting in efficiencies and possible staff reductions.

---

\* This document retains the wording presented by the Judicial Council's Executive and Planning Committee approved by the Judicial Council on August 31, 2012.

#	Directive *	Timeline	Status	Status Updates
112	<p>E&amp;P recommends that the Judicial Council direct the Administrative Director of the Courts to consider SEC Recommendation 7-72(f) and implement the necessary organizational and staffing changes, contingent upon the council's approval of an organizational structure for the AOC and taking into account the results of the classification and compensation studies to be completed.</p> <p><u>SEC Recommendation</u></p> <p>The Legal Services Office's current level of approximately 75 positions, including more than 50 attorney positions, should be reduced. To achieve the reduction, the following areas should be reviewed and considered, and appropriate actions taken:</p> <p>(f) Development and use of paralegal classifications, as found elsewhere in legal services throughout both the public and private sectors, could lead to the reduction of attorney positions in the Legal Services Office.</p>	<p>ADOC to make recommendations to the council at the April 2014 council meeting.</p>	Completed	<p>Judicial Council report presented to the Judicial Council for consideration at the April 25, 2014, Judicial Council Meeting.</p>
113	<p>E&amp;P recommends that the Judicial Council support SEC Recommendation 7-73 with no further action. The telecommuting status of one position has ended and, as of September 7, 2012, the telecommuting status of the second position will end.</p> <p><u>SEC Recommendation</u></p> <p>There currently are at least two positions in the Legal Services Office that violate the AOC's telecommuting policy. These should be terminated immediately, resulting in reductions. Nor should telecommuting be permitted for supervising attorneys in this division.</p>	<p>ADOC to report to the council with proposal for a revised policy at the 12/14/12, council meeting.</p>	Completed	<p>Activity Reporting and Proposal Form submitted to the Judicial Council for the October 26, 2012, Judicial Council Meeting.</p>

\* This document retains the wording presented by the Judicial Council's Executive and Planning Committee approved by the Judicial Council on August 31, 2012.

#	Directive *	Timeline	Status	Status Updates
114	E&P recommends that the Judicial Council direct the Administrative Director of the Courts to evaluate the costs and benefits of allocating staff attorneys and resources to various advisory committees, task forces, and working groups.	The Classification & Compensation Study is scheduled to be adopted by the Judicial Council at its meeting in April 2015; based upon the direction provided by the Judicial Council, the Executive Office will implement the plan accordingly and will provide an update to council at the October 2015 council meeting.	In Progress	<p>After the completion of the AOC Classification and Compensation Study, the Executive Team will have more information necessary for determining staffing needs and resources for committee support. As such, this directive will be addressed after the completion of the Classification and Compensation Study.</p> <p>On September 9, 2013, the Executive and Planning Committee (E&amp;P) reviewed the methodology, criteria, and process used to score the Request for Proposal (RFP) bids, reviewed the final bid scoring and findings, and approved the awarding of the contract to the highest scored bidder.</p> <p>In October 2013, E&amp;P provided an update to the Judicial Council notifying them that the highest scored bidder was selected to conduct the classification and compensation study.</p> <p>In November 2013, Fox Lawson &amp; Associates was awarded the contract to conduct the Judicial Council's classification and compensation study. Four meetings were held with Fox Lawson &amp; Associates, members of the Human Resources (HR) staff, and the Executive Office to establish the specifics of the study, including methodology, timeline, and a review of the current classification and compensation system at the Judicial Council.</p> <p>In December 2013, communications were sent to all Judicial Council staff informing them of the beginning of the study and outlining the requirements, including completing employee Position Description Questionnaires (PDQ), which were due in February 2014.</p> <p>In January 2014, Judicial Council staff conducted information sessions at each Judicial Council office to answer employees' questions regarding the study.</p>

\* This document retains the wording presented by the Judicial Council's Executive and Planning Committee approved by the Judicial Council on August 31, 2012.

#	Directive *	Timeline	Status	Status Updates
				<p>In April and May 2014, Fox Lawson completed meeting with approximately 20 occupational panels across Judicial Council offices and locations, and will be scheduling regular updates to brief the Executive Office.</p> <p>In June 2014, the Judicial Council Human Resources office and Fox Lawson discussed the current progress of the study with the council. Fox Lawson also began a series of one-on-one phone interviews with a small number of employees. The purpose was to clarify specific information provided in the PDQs regarding essential duties.</p> <p>In July 2014, the Executive Office held all-staff meetings to update Judicial Council staff about the progress of the study and discussed the selected comparator markets.</p> <p>In August 2014, Fox Lawson met with the Internal Chairs and the Executive Office to discuss recommendations for the proposed classification structure. The Internal Chairs and the Executive Office briefed the Judicial Council in closed session.</p> <p>In September 2014, Fox Lawson took steps to draft classification specifications and finalized job description summaries for market survey.</p> <p>In October 2014, Fox Lawson continued to draft and finalize the classification specifications and initiated the market survey to begin the compensation phase of the study.</p> <p>All-staff meetings were held in November 2014 to communicate the current status of the Classification and Compensation Study. During the meeting, employees were provided with an overview of the new classification system and were given information on the appeals process.</p>

\* This document retains the wording presented by the Judicial Council's Executive and Planning Committee approved by the Judicial Council on August 31, 2012.

#	Directive *	Timeline	Status	Status Updates
	<p><a href="#">SEC Recommendation</a></p> <p>As recommended elsewhere, the Judicial Council should assess the costs and benefits of allocating staff attorneys and resources to various advisory committees, task forces, and working groups.</p>			In February 2015, employees are expected to be informed of their new classifications within the new structure and will have an opportunity to submit an appeal if they feel that their position has been incorrectly classified.
115	<p>E&amp;P recommends that the Judicial Council direct the Administrative Director of the Courts, as part of the review of the AOC organizational structure, to review current responsibilities and clearly define the role of the Chief Counsel.</p> <p><a href="#">SEC Recommendation</a></p> <p>The role of the Chief Counsel should be redefined to reflect the primary role of providing legal advice and services, as opposed to developing policy for the judicial branch.</p>	ADOC to make recommendations to the council at the April 2014 council meeting.	Completed	Judicial Council report presented to the Judicial Council for consideration at the April 25, 2014, Judicial Council Meeting.

\* This document retains the wording presented by the Judicial Council's Executive and Planning Committee approved by the Judicial Council on August 31, 2012.

#	Directive *	Timeline	Status	Status Updates
116	<p>E&amp;P recommends that the Judicial Council support SEC Recommendation 7-77(a) and (d), and direct the Administrative Director of the Courts that the Office of the General Counsel should employ and emphasize a customer service model of operation, recognizing a primary goal of providing timely service and advice to its clients, including to internal clients in the AOC and to those courts that request legal advice or services from this office.</p> <p><a href="#">SEC Recommendation</a></p> <p>This office must place greater emphasis on being a service provider and in improving how it provides services, including as follows:</p> <p>(a) Most fundamentally, this division should employ and emphasize a customer service model of operation — recognizing a primary goal of providing timely service and advice to its clients, including to internal clients in the AOC and to those courts that request legal advice or services from this office.</p> <hr/>	<p>ADOC to report back to the council at the February 2013 council meeting</p>	<p>Completed</p>	<p>Activity Reporting and Proposal Form submitted to the Judicial Council for the February 26, 2013, Judicial Council Meeting.</p>

\* This document retains the wording presented by the Judicial Council's Executive and Planning Committee approved by the Judicial Council on August 31, 2012.

#	Directive *	Timeline	Status	Status Updates
117	E&P recommends that the Judicial Council direct the Administrative Director of the Courts to adopt an operations model whereby attorneys generally are housed at one location with flexibility to adjust as necessary to meet court needs regionally, including regional demand for additional attorney support and smaller courts that have fewer staff for research and other legal services. The location where attorneys report to work should ensure proper supervision.	Administrative Director of the Courts to provide an interim report at the July 2013 council meeting with a final report at a later date.	Completed	At the June 28, 2013, Judicial Council meeting, the council approved recommendations contained in a report from the council Liaisons to the Legal Services Office (LSO) including a recommendation regarding LSO attorney resources housed in AOC field offices. The council liaisons identified that having attorneys housed in field offices is consistent with other government agencies and private law firms and allows for more direction communication between LSO attorneys and the courts in their region. As such, the council approved the liaisons' recommendation that the current practice of employing LSO attorney staff in AOC field offices is appropriate.
	<p><a href="#">SEC Recommendation</a></p> <p>This office must place greater emphasis on being a service provider and in improving how it provides services, including as follows:</p> <p>(b) This office should adopt an operations model whereby its attorneys generally are housed at one location. This would eliminate nonsupervision of some attorneys, promote better and more regular supervision of staff attorneys, and promote better utilization of available skills.</p>			

\* This document retains the wording presented by the Judicial Council's Executive and Planning Committee approved by the Judicial Council on August 31, 2012.

#	Directive *	Timeline	Status	Status Updates
118	<p>E&amp;P recommends that the Judicial Council direct the Administrative Director of the Courts that the Office of the General Counsel service model should emphasize that time is of the essence when it comes to delivering advice and opinions to the courts; that recommendations and advice to courts should include a full range of options available to the courts; and that there must be a greater recognition that the AOC's interests may conflict with the specific interests of the courts. Clearer procedures should be put in place to safeguard the interests of individual courts in those instances when legitimate conflicts arise.</p> <p><u>SEC Recommendation</u></p> <p>This office must place greater emphasis on being a service provider and in improving how it provides services, including as follows:</p> <p>(c) The service model should emphasize that time is of the essence when it comes to delivering advice and opinions to the courts; that recommendations and advice to courts should include a full range of options available to the courts; and that there must be a greater recognition that the AOC's interests may conflict with the specific interests of the courts. Clearer procedures should be put in place to safeguard the interests of individual courts in those instances when legitimate conflicts arise.</p>	<p>ADOC to report back to the council at the February 2013 council meeting.</p>	<p>Completed</p>	<p>Activity Reporting and Proposal Form submitted to the Judicial Council for the February 26, 2013, Judicial Council Meeting.</p>

\* This document retains the wording presented by the Judicial Council's Executive and Planning Committee approved by the Judicial Council on August 31, 2012.



#	Directive *	Timeline	Status	Status Updates
119	<p>E&amp;P recommends that the Judicial Council direct the Administrative Director of the Courts to place emphasis on reducing bottlenecks for advice, contracts, and other projects. More effective tickler and tracking systems for opinions, contracts, and other documents should be put in place.</p> <p><a href="#">SEC Recommendation</a></p> <p>This office must place greater emphasis on being a service provider and in improving how it provides services, including as follows:</p> <p>(d) Emphasis must be placed on reducing bottlenecks for advice, contracts, and other projects. More effective tickler and tracking systems for opinions, contracts, and other documents should be put in place.</p>	<p>ADOC to report back to the council at the June 2013 council meeting.</p>	<p>Completed</p>	<p>Status on implementation progress for this directive is included in the Activity Reporting and Proposal Form submitted to the Judicial Council for the April 26, 2013, Judicial Council Meeting.</p>
120	<p>E&amp;P recommends that the Judicial Council direct the Administrative Director of the Courts that court users of legal services should be surveyed periodically to determine if such services are performed in a timely and satisfactory manner.</p> <p><a href="#">SEC Recommendation</a></p> <p>This office must place greater emphasis on being a service provider and in improving how it provides services, including as follows:</p> <p>(e) Court users of legal services should be surveyed periodically to determine if such services are performed in a timely and satisfactory manner.</p>	<p>ADOC to make recommendations to the council at the April 2014 council meeting.</p>	<p>Completed</p>	<p>Judicial Council report presented to the Judicial Council for consideration at the April 25, 2014, Judicial Council Meeting.</p>

\* This document retains the wording presented by the Judicial Council's Executive and Planning Committee approved by the Judicial Council on August 31, 2012.

#	Directive *	Timeline	Status	Status Updates
121	E&P recommends that the Judicial Council support SEC Recommendation 7-78 with no further action, as the issues have been resolved.	Completed	Completed	Activity Reporting and Proposal Form submitted to the Judicial Council for the October 26, 2012, Judicial Council Meeting.
	<p><a href="#">SEC Recommendation</a></p> <p>The Administrative Director should resolve issues that have existed between the HR Division and OGC, including by redefining respective roles relating to employee discipline or other HR functions.</p>			
122	E&P recommends that the Judicial Council direct the Administrative Director of the Courts to order an independent review of the Office of General Counsel's use, selection, and management of outside legal counsel to determine whether outside counsel is being utilized in a cost effective manner. Before initiating the independent review, the Administrative Director of the Courts must provide a proposal with options for conducting the review, including the associated costs.	ADOC to present a proposal with options to the council by the February 2013 council meeting, with a final report at the December 2013 meeting.	Completed	At the June 28, 2013, Judicial Council meeting, the council approved recommendations contained in a report from the council Liaisons to the Legal Services Office (LSO) relating to the use of outside counsel by LSO. The council liaisons concluded that the use of outside counsel is appropriate and in some cases mandated providing valuable legal resources for the varying needs of LSO. The council approved various recommendations proposed by the council liaisons designed to assist LSO in reinforcing its existing protocols for utilizing outside counsel to ensure that outside counsel is monitored, supervised, and managed. These recommendations included an annual report from the Administrative Director to the Advisory Committee on Financial Accountability and Efficiency (A&E) for review and reporting to the council. The council directed the Administrative Director to implement the recommendations and report back to the council on the implementation by March 31, 2014.
	<p><a href="#">SEC Recommendation</a></p> <p>The Judicial Council and/or Administrative Director should order an independent review of this office's use, selection, and management of outside legal counsel to determine whether outside counsel is being utilized in a cost-effective manner.</p>			

\* This document retains the wording presented by the Judicial Council's Executive and Planning Committee approved by the Judicial Council on August 31, 2012.

#	Directive *	Timeline	Status	Status Updates
123	E&P recommends that the Judicial Council direct the Administrative Director of the Courts to consider SEC Recommendation 7-52 and implement the necessary organizational changes, contingent upon the council's approval of an organizational structure for the AOC.	The Classification & Compensation Study is scheduled to be adopted by the Judicial Council at its meeting in April 2015; based upon the direction provided by the Judicial Council, the Executive Office will implement the plan accordingly and will provide an update to council at the October 2015 council meeting.	In Progress	<p>Implementation of directives 50, 64, 72, 78, 89, 100, 106, 123, 130, 135, and 142 are tied to the outcome of the AOC Classification and Compensation Study.</p> <p>On September 9, 2013, the Executive and Planning Committee (E&amp;P) reviewed the methodology, criteria, and process used to score the Request for Proposal (RFP) bids, reviewed the final bid scoring and findings, and approved the awarding of the contract to the highest scored bidder.</p> <p>In October 2013, E&amp;P provided an update to the Judicial Council notifying them that the highest scored bidder was selected to conduct the classification and compensation study.</p> <p>In November 2013, Fox Lawson &amp; Associates was awarded the contract to conduct the Judicial Council's classification and compensation study. Four meetings were held with Fox Lawson &amp; Associates, members of the Human Resources (HR) staff, and the Executive Office to establish the specifics of the study, including methodology, timeline, and a review of the current classification and compensation system at the Judicial Council.</p> <p>In December 2013, communications were sent to all Judicial Council staff informing them of the beginning of the study and outlining the requirements, including completing employee Position Description Questionnaires (PDQ), which were due in February 2014.</p> <p>In January 2014, Judicial Council staff conducted information sessions at each Judicial Council office to answer employees' questions regarding the study.</p> <p>In April and May 2014, Fox Lawson completed meeting with approximately 20 occupational panels across Judicial Council offices and locations, and will</p>

\* This document retains the wording presented by the Judicial Council's Executive and Planning Committee approved by the Judicial Council on August 31, 2012.

#	Directive *	Timeline	Status	Status Updates
				<p>be scheduling regular updates to brief the Executive Office.</p> <p>In June 2014, the Judicial Council Human Resources office and Fox Lawson discussed the current progress of the study with the council. Fox Lawson also began a series of one-on-one phone interviews with a small number of employees. The purpose was to clarify specific information provided in the PDQs regarding essential duties.</p> <p>In July 2014, the Executive Office held all-staff meetings to update Judicial Council staff about the progress of the study and discussed the selected comparator markets.</p> <p>In August 2014, Fox Lawson met with the Internal Chairs and the Executive Office to discuss recommendations for the proposed classification structure. The Internal Chairs and the Executive Office briefed the Judicial Council in closed session.</p> <p>In September 2014, Fox Lawson took steps to draft classification specifications and finalized job description summaries for market survey.</p> <p>In October 2014, Fox Lawson continued to draft and finalize the classification specifications and initiated the market survey to begin the compensation phase of the study.</p> <p>All-staff meetings were held in November 2014 to communicate the current status of the Classification and Compensation Study. During the meeting, employees were provided with an overview of the new classification system and were given information on the appeals process.</p> <p>In February 2015, employees are expected to be informed of their new classifications within the new</p>

\* This document retains the wording presented by the Judicial Council's Executive and Planning Committee approved by the Judicial Council on August 31, 2012.

#	Directive *	Timeline	Status	Status Updates
	<p><a href="#">SEC Recommendation</a></p> <p>The Office of Communications should remain in the Executive Office and under the direction of a Chief of Staff. The Office of Communications manager position should be placed at the Senior Manager level.</p>			structure and will have an opportunity to submit an appeal if they feel that their position has been incorrectly classified.
124	<p>E&amp;P recommends that the Judicial Council direct the Administrative Director of the Courts, to the extent that resources are available, that Office of Communication resources, including the Public Information Officer, should be made more available to furnish increased media relations services to courts requesting such assistance</p> <p><a href="#">SEC Recommendation</a></p> <p>The resources of this office, including the Public Information Officer, should be made more available to furnish increased media relations services to courts requesting such assistance.</p>	ADOC to report to the council on the restructuring changes to this office at the February 2013 council meeting.	Completed	Activity Reporting and Proposal Form submitted to the Judicial Council for the February 26, 2013, Judicial Council Meeting.

\* This document retains the wording presented by the Judicial Council's Executive and Planning Committee approved by the Judicial Council on August 31, 2012.

#	Directive *	Timeline	Status	Status Updates
125	E&P recommends that the Judicial Council direct the Administrative Director of the Courts to return to the Judicial Council with an analysis, defining the necessary emergency response and security functions for the branch and a recommendation on the organizational plan for council approval.	Administrative Director of the Courts to provide an interim report to the council at the July 2014 council meeting with a final report at the February 2015 council meeting.	In Progress	<p>The Judicial Council approved the recommendation by the Administrative Director of the Courts (ADOC) to maintain the Office of Security, but deferred action on directing a proposed Court Security Advisory Committee to review the Office of Security and make recommendations on its functions, pending further review of advisory groups by the Executive and Planning Committee (E&amp;P) and Rules and Projects Committee (RUPRO). After completion of that review, the Judicial Council approved the related recommendation by E&amp;P and RUPRO, directing them to propose establishment of a Court Security Advisory Committee with a rule of court, charge, and appointments made through the annual nominations process. Proposed rule 10.61 to establish the committee was circulated for public comment and submitted to the council for consideration at its October 25, 2013, meeting. The council adopted rule 10.61 establishing the committee. E&amp;P issued a solicitation for nominations for membership in the committee on November 8, 2013. Nominations were due by December 4, 2013. The Chief Justice appointed the members to the committee and announced Judge Thomas Maddock as chair of the committee on February 10, 2014. The committee convened briefly for an introductory meeting on June 18, 2014.</p> <p>At its first in-person meeting on September 4, 2014, the committee approved a draft Annual Agenda for submission to E&amp;P. Members discussed recommendations on emergency response and security functions and the organization of the Office of Security. An Ad Hoc Short Term Subcommittee on Office of Security Functions and Duties was formed to further develop recommendations and return to the full committee with a draft report for its consideration. The committee will meet its obligation to provide a final report to the Judicial Council on the functions of the Office of Security at the April 2015</p>

\* This document retains the wording presented by the Judicial Council's Executive and Planning Committee approved by the Judicial Council on August 31, 2012.

#	Directive *	Timeline	Status	Status Updates
	<p><a href="#">SEC Recommendation</a></p> <p>7-54. There is no need for a stand-alone Office of Emergency Response and Security. Most necessary functions performed by the office can be reassigned and absorbed by existing units in the Judicial and Court Operations Services Division.</p> <p>7-55. The functions of this office should be refocused and limited to those reasonably required by statute or by the Rules of Court, primarily including review of security plans for new and existing facilities; review of court security equipment, if requested by the courts; and review of emergency plans.</p> <p>7-56. Reductions in this office are feasible. The office cannot effectively provide branch-wide judicial security and online protection for all judicial officers. Positions allocated for such functions should be eliminated. The Administrative Director should evaluate whether some activities undertaken by this office are cost effective, such as judicial security and online protection functions.</p>			<p>meeting. As such, it is requested that the timeline be modified to read “Administrative Director of the Courts to provide an interim report to the council at the July 2014 council meeting with a final report at the April 2015 council meeting.”</p>

\* This document retains the wording presented by the Judicial Council’s Executive and Planning Committee approved by the Judicial Council on August 31, 2012.

#	Directive *	Timeline	Status	Status Updates
126	<p>E&amp;P recommends that the Judicial Council support SEC Recommendation 7-84 with no further action, as the Bay Area, Northern Central, and Southern Regional Offices no longer have any direct regional office staff. The Northern Central Regional Office has been reorganized as the Trial Court Liaison Office reporting to the Executive Office.</p> <p><u>SEC Recommendation</u></p> <p>The regional offices should cease to exist as a separate division within AOC. The BANCRO and SRO offices should close. Advocacy and liaison services provided to the trial courts should be provided through the office of Trial Court Support and Liaison in the new Executive Office.</p>	Completed. ADOC to report to the council on specific actions taken.	Completed	Activity Reporting and Proposal Form submitted to the Judicial Council for the October 26, 2012, Judicial Council Meeting.
127	<p>E&amp;P recommends that the Judicial Council direct the Administrative Director of the Courts to renegotiate or terminate, if possible, the leases for space utilized by SRO and BANCRO. To the extent AOC staff from other divisions is assigned to work at leased space at the regional offices, the need for locating such staff in currently leased space should be reevaluated.</p> <p><u>SEC Recommendation</u></p> <p>Leases for space utilized by SRO and BANCRO should be renegotiated or terminated, if possible, as such lease costs cannot be justified. To the extent AOC staff from other divisions is assigned to work at leased space at the regional offices, the need for locating such staff in currently leased space should be reevaluated.</p>	Completed. ADOC to update the council on the status of the leases at the 10/26/12, council meeting.	Completed	Activity Reporting and Proposal Form submitted to the Judicial Council for the October 26, 2012, Judicial Council Meeting.

\* This document retains the wording presented by the Judicial Council's Executive and Planning Committee approved by the Judicial Council on August 31, 2012.



#	Directive *	Timeline	Status	Status Updates
128	<p>E&amp;P recommends that the Judicial Council support SEC Recommendation 7-86 and direct the Administrative Director of the Courts to provide the council with an update on organizational changes made with the elimination of the regional office staff.</p> <p><a href="#">SEC Recommendation</a></p> <p>While responsibility for essential services currently provided to courts through regional offices should be consolidated and placed under the direction of Trial Court Support and Liaison Services in the Executive Office, a physical office should be maintained in the Northern California Region area to provide some services to courts in the region.</p>	<p>Completed. ADOC to update the council on the status of the leases at the 10/26/12, council meeting.</p>	Completed	<p>Activity Reporting and Proposal Form submitted to the Judicial Council for the October 26, 2012, Judicial Council Meeting.</p>
129	<p>E&amp;P recommends that the Judicial Council direct the Administrative Director of the Courts to consider placing the significant special projects previously assigned to the regional offices under the direction of the Chief of Staff in the Executive Office, contingent upon council approval of the organizational structure for the AOC.</p> <p><a href="#">SEC Recommendation</a></p> <p>The significant special projects previously assigned to the regional offices should be placed under the direction of the Chief of Staff in the Executive Office.</p>	<p>Interim and incoming ADOC to present organizational proposal to the council at the 8/31/12, council meeting.</p>	Completed	<p>Activity Reporting and Proposal Form submitted to the Judicial Council for the October 26, 2012, Judicial Council Meeting.</p>

\* This document retains the wording presented by the Judicial Council's Executive and Planning Committee approved by the Judicial Council on August 31, 2012.

#	Directive *	Timeline	Status	Status Updates
130	E&P recommends that the Judicial Council direct the Administrative Director of the Courts to consider SEC Recommendation 7-47 and implement the necessary organizational and staffing changes, contingent upon the council's approval of an organizational structure for the AOC.	The Classification & Compensation Study is scheduled to be adopted by the Judicial Council at its meeting in April 2015; based upon the direction provided by the Judicial Council, the Executive Office will implement the plan accordingly and will provide an update to council at the October 2015 council meeting.	In Progress	<p>Implementation of directives 50, 64, 72, 78, 89, 100, 106, 123, 130, 135, and 142 are tied to the outcome of the AOC Classification and Compensation Study.</p> <p>On September 9, 2013, the Executive and Planning Committee (E&amp;P) reviewed the methodology, criteria, and process used to score the Request for Proposal (RFP) bids, reviewed the final bid scoring and findings, and approved the awarding of the contract to the highest scored bidder.</p> <p>In October 2013, E&amp;P provided an update to the Judicial Council notifying them that the highest scored bidder was selected to conduct the classification and compensation study.</p> <p>In November 2013, Fox Lawson &amp; Associates was awarded the contract to conduct the Judicial Council's classification and compensation study. Four meetings were held with Fox Lawson &amp; Associates, members of the Human Resources (HR) staff, and the Executive Office to establish the specifics of the study, including methodology, timeline, and a review of the current classification and compensation system at the Judicial Council.</p> <p>In December 2013, communications were sent to all Judicial Council staff informing them of the beginning of the study and outlining the requirements, including completing employee Position Description Questionnaires (PDQ), which were due in February 2014.</p> <p>In January 2014, Judicial Council staff conducted information sessions at each Judicial Council office to answer employees' questions regarding the study.</p> <p>In April and May 2014, Fox Lawson completed meeting with approximately 20 occupational panels across Judicial Council offices and locations, and will</p>

\* This document retains the wording presented by the Judicial Council's Executive and Planning Committee approved by the Judicial Council on August 31, 2012.

#	Directive *	Timeline	Status	Status Updates
				<p>be scheduling regular updates to brief the Executive Office.</p> <p>In June 2014, the Judicial Council Human Resources office and Fox Lawson discussed the current progress of the study with the council. Fox Lawson also began a series of one-on-one phone interviews with a small number of employees. The purpose was to clarify specific information provided in the PDQs regarding essential duties.</p> <p>In July 2014, the Executive Office held all-staff meetings to update Judicial Council staff about the progress of the study and discussed the selected comparator markets.</p> <p>In August 2014, Fox Lawson met with the Internal Chairs and the Executive Office to discuss recommendations for the proposed classification structure. The Internal Chairs and the Executive Office briefed the Judicial Council in closed session.</p> <p>In September 2014, Fox Lawson took steps to draft classification specifications and finalized job description summaries for market survey.</p> <p>In October 2014, Fox Lawson continued to draft and finalize the classification specifications and initiated the market survey to begin the compensation phase of the study.</p> <p>All-staff meetings were held in November 2014 to communicate the current status of the Classification and Compensation Study. During the meeting, employees were provided with an overview of the new classification system and were given information on the appeals process.</p> <p>In February 2015, employees are expected to be informed of their new classifications within the new</p>

\* This document retains the wording presented by the Judicial Council's Executive and Planning Committee approved by the Judicial Council on August 31, 2012.

#	Directive *	Timeline	Status	Status Updates
	<p><a href="#">SEC Recommendation</a></p> <p>TCAS should be made a unit under the Judicial and Court Administrative Services Division, reporting to the Chief Administrative Officer. The TCAS Manager position should be at the Senior Manager level.</p>			structure and will have an opportunity to submit an appeal if they feel that their position has been incorrectly classified.
131	<p>E&amp;P recommends that the Judicial Council direct the Administrative Director of the Courts that, subject to available resources, trial court use of the Phoenix HR/Payroll functionality should remain optional to individual trial courts.</p> <p><a href="#">SEC Recommendation</a></p> <p>The Phoenix Financial System is in place in all 58 superior courts; however, trial court use of the Phoenix HR/Payroll functionality should remain optional to individual trial courts.</p>	Ongoing	Completed	Activity Reporting and Proposal Form submitted to the Judicial Council for the October 26, 2012, Judicial Council Meeting.
132	<p>E&amp;P recommends that the Judicial Council determine whether to continue with the charge-back model whereby courts reimburse the AOC from their Trial Court Trust Fund allocations for the courts' use of the Phoenix financial system; and whether the Los Angeles court will be required to reimburse the AOC for use of the Phoenix financial system.</p> <p><a href="#">SEC Recommendation</a></p> <p>As policy matters, it is recommended that the Judicial Council determine whether to continue with the charge-back model whereby courts reimburse the AOC from their Trial Court Trust Fund allocations for the courts' use of the Phoenix financial system; and whether the Los Angeles court will be required to reimburse the AOC for use of the Phoenix financial system.</p>	Trial Court Budget Working Group to propose a timeline to return to the council to present its recommendations.	Completed	Activity Reporting and Proposal Form submitted to the Judicial Council for the February 26, 2013, Judicial Council Meeting.

\* This document retains the wording presented by the Judicial Council's Executive and Planning Committee approved by the Judicial Council on August 31, 2012.

#	Directive *	Timeline	Status	Status Updates
133	E&P recommends that the Judicial Council support SEC recommendations 7-46 and 7-50 and direct the Administrative Director of the Courts, as part of AOC long-term planning, to review the information technology systems currently implemented Branch wide to support enterprise resource planning: finance, human resources, and education functional areas; to identify costs, benefits, and potential long-term savings, and the challenges of migrating support to a single IT platform; and to return to the council with a progress report on the findings.	ADOC final report to the council at the December 2014 council meeting.	Completed	<p>Judicial Council staff reviewed the Phoenix Financial System and Oracle Financial System to determine whether the council should expend future time and resources to consolidate the systems into a single platform.</p> <p>Combining the two systems into a single platform will require legislative and, potentially, constitutional changes that would allow the judicial branch to have a single branchwide enterprise resource planning IT platform, including deposit of all judicial branch funds into a single judicial branch treasury. If successful in gaining the authority to have a single branch treasury, then Oracle System would then be moved to the Phoenix System. A preliminary staff estimate suggests there would be approximately \$5,000,000 in deployment costs with an ongoing annual savings of \$250,000. This will also require significant effort from council's Legal Services and Governmental Affairs, and will require a complete cost-benefit analysis once the requirements are solidified.</p> <p>Based on the review, it was determined that consolidating the two systems into a single platform is cost prohibitive at this time, and there is no monetary benefit to separating from the State Controller's Office. For this reason, we are recommending that this directive be closed. However, there is an argument for future consideration that the branch would be better able to manage its resources if accounting for the state entities and the trial courts were in one system.</p>

#### SEC Recommendation

As with the Information Services Division, the AOC should determine whether to continue use of multiple or overlapping technologies for similar functions, as using a single technology could result in efficiencies and savings, both operationally and in personnel cost.

---

\* This document retains the wording presented by the Judicial Council's Executive and Planning Committee approved by the Judicial Council on August 31, 2012.

#	Directive *	Timeline	Status	Status Updates
134	E&P recommends that the Judicial Council direct the Administrative Director of the Courts that the Trial Court Administrative Services division should continue to provide clear service-level agreements with respect to services provided to the courts.  <a href="#">SEC Recommendation</a> TCAS should continue to provide clear service-level agreements with respect to services provided to the courts.	Immediate implementation (Ongoing)	Completed	Activity Reporting and Proposal Form submitted to the Judicial Council for the October 26, 2012, Judicial Council Meeting.

\* This document retains the wording presented by the Judicial Council's Executive and Planning Committee approved by the Judicial Council on August 31, 2012.

#	Directive *	Timeline	Status	Status Updates
135	E&P recommends that the Judicial Council direct the Administrative Director of the Courts to consider SEC Recommendation 7-64 and implement the necessary organizational and staffing changes, contingent upon the council's approval of an organizational structure for the AOC.	The Classification & Compensation Study is scheduled to be adopted by the Judicial Council at its meeting in April 2015; based upon the direction provided by the Judicial Council, the Executive Office will implement the plan accordingly and will provide an update to council at the October 2015 council meeting.	In Progress	<p>Implementation of directives 50, 64, 72, 78, 89, 100, 106, 123, 130, 135, and 142 are tied to the outcome of the AOC Classification and Compensation Study.</p> <p>On September 9, 2013, the Executive and Planning Committee (E&amp;P) reviewed the methodology, criteria, and process used to score the Request for Proposal (RFP) bids, reviewed the final bid scoring and findings, and approved the awarding of the contract to the highest scored bidder.</p> <p>In October 2013, E&amp;P provided an update to the Judicial Council notifying them that the highest scored bidder was selected to conduct the classification and compensation study.</p> <p>In November 2013, Fox Lawson &amp; Associates was awarded the contract to conduct the Judicial Council's classification and compensation study. Four meetings were held with Fox Lawson &amp; Associates, members of the Human Resources (HR) staff, and the Executive Office to establish the specifics of the study, including methodology, timeline, and a review of the current classification and compensation system at the Judicial Council.</p> <p>In December 2013, communications were sent to all Judicial Council staff informing them of the beginning of the study and outlining the requirements, including completing employee Position Description Questionnaires (PDQ), which were due in February 2014.</p> <p>In January 2014, Judicial Council staff conducted information sessions at each Judicial Council office to answer employees' questions regarding the study.</p> <p>In April and May 2014, Fox Lawson completed meeting with approximately 20 occupational panels across Judicial Council offices and locations, and will</p>

\* This document retains the wording presented by the Judicial Council's Executive and Planning Committee approved by the Judicial Council on August 31, 2012.

#	Directive *	Timeline	Status	Status Updates
				<p>be scheduling regular updates to brief the Executive Office.</p> <p>In June 2014, the Judicial Council Human Resources office and Fox Lawson discussed the current progress of the study with the council. Fox Lawson also began a series of one-on-one phone interviews with a small number of employees. The purpose was to clarify specific information provided in the PDQs regarding essential duties.</p> <p>In July 2014, the Executive Office held all-staff meetings to update Judicial Council staff about the progress of the study and discussed the selected comparator markets.</p> <p>In August 2014, Fox Lawson met with the Internal Chairs and the Executive Office to discuss recommendations for the proposed classification structure. The Internal Chairs and the Executive Office briefed the Judicial Council in closed session.</p> <p>In September 2014, Fox Lawson took steps to draft classification specifications and finalized job description summaries for market survey.</p> <p>In October 2014, Fox Lawson continued to draft and finalize the classification specifications and initiated the market survey to begin the compensation phase of the study.</p> <p>All-staff meetings were held in November 2014 to communicate the current status of the Classification and Compensation Study. During the meeting, employees were provided with an overview of the new classification system and were given information on the appeals process.</p> <p>In February 2015, employees are expected to be informed of their new classifications within the new</p>

\* This document retains the wording presented by the Judicial Council's Executive and Planning Committee approved by the Judicial Council on August 31, 2012.



#	Directive *	Timeline	Status	Status Updates
---	-------------	----------	--------	----------------

structure and will have an opportunity to submit an appeal if they feel that their position has been incorrectly classified.

SEC Recommendation

The OCCM should be renamed Office of Court Construction and Facilities Management Services. The functions of this unit should be placed under the Judicial and Court Operations Services Division and reporting to the Chief Operating Officer. The manager of this unit should be compensated at the same level.

---

\* This document retains the wording presented by the Judicial Council's Executive and Planning Committee approved by the Judicial Council on August 31, 2012.

#	Directive *	Timeline	Status	Status Updates
136	E&P recommends that the Judicial Council direct the Administrative Director of the Courts to evaluate and propose an approach to evaluate cost effectiveness for the entire scope of Office of Court Construction and Management operations.	Administrative Director interim update to the council at the June 2013 council meeting and final report at the June 2015 meeting.	Completed	<p>Real Estate and Facilities Management (REFM) has now had over 9 years of experience using two general approaches to the delivery of facility management services :1) using a largely outsourced service-provider model, contracting for routine maintenance (Firm Fixed Price and Cost-Plus contracting), plant engineers, trades and crafts personnel (Job Order and Cost-Plus Contracting), supervised by in-house management staff in or near the court facilities, and 2), the court-delegated facility management program, piloted by four trial courts (Orange, Riverside, Imperial, San Luis Obispo) with limited discussion by the Trial Court Facility Modifications Working Group to expand the program if there is interest by other interested courts.</p> <p>The only untried general model is an in-house, limited contacting organization similar to the Department of General Services in the Executive Branch, where management, plant engineers, trades and other technicians are state employees. Implementation of this model would represent a significant departure from the models used thus far, and based on the limited information previously received, may be considerably more expensive on a per square foot basis and would require hiring approximately 125 more employees (initial OCCM staffing plan based on information from DGS indicated the need to staff facility management unit with 180 employees).</p> <p>The management of REFM has evaluated the scope of former OCCM operations concerning facilities management and is of the opinion that engaging a consultant would not yield the value gained from 10 years of “field-tested” experience of using several contract and delegation models. The projected cost of hiring an outside consultant to perform an analysis would also reduce funding available to support court facilities. This finding will be further evaluated by the</p>

\* This document retains the wording presented by the Judicial Council’s Executive and Planning Committee approved by the Judicial Council on August 31, 2012.

#	Directive *	Timeline	Status	Status Updates
	<p><a href="#">SEC Recommendation</a></p> <p>A cost-benefit analysis of the entire scope of OCCM operations is needed.</p>			Executive Office, and will engage in consultation with the Executive and Planning Committee for further direction.
137	E&P recommends that the Judicial Council direct the Administrative Director of the Courts to consider SEC Recommendation 7-66 and, once organizational changes are made as approved by the Judicial Council, evaluate and make recommendations to the council on facilities maintenance program efficiencies, including broadening courts' responsibilities for maintenance of court facilities and for smaller scale projects.	Administrative Director interim update to the council at the June 2013 council meeting and final report at the June 2015 meeting.	In Progress	<p>The Orange, San Luis Obispo, Imperial and Riverside County Superior Courts have been participating in a pilot program for the delegation of facility management services. The four courts presented preliminary findings on the program to the Trial Court Facility Modifications Advisory Committee (Advisory Committee) at its May, 2014 meeting. The courts reported generally positive results, but felt the requirements of the Intrabranch agreements (IBAs) limited their success; consequently, it was determined that expansion of the program to include other courts should be deferred for approximately one year.</p> <p>JCC staff revised the IBA to streamline the administrative requirements of the program, particularly in relation to invoicing procedures. The Delegation Working Group, the Advisory Committee and JCC staff agree that an extension of the pilot with the existing courts for an additional year would provide an opportunity to re-evaluate the program before reconsidering a recommendation to expand participation by other courts.</p>
	<p><a href="#">SEC Recommendation</a></p> <p>The current facilities maintenance program appears inefficient and unnecessarily costly. The consultant report is necessary and should be considered part of a necessary reevaluation of the program. Courts should be given the option to assume responsibility for maintenance of court facilities and for smaller-scale projects.</p>			

\* This document retains the wording presented by the Judicial Council's Executive and Planning Committee approved by the Judicial Council on August 31, 2012.

#	Directive *	Timeline	Status	Status Updates
138	E&P recommends that the Judicial Council direct the Administrative Director of the Courts to consider SEC Recommendation 7-67 and, once organizational changes are made as approved by the Judicial Council, evaluate and make recommendations to the Judicial Council regarding fiscal planning for facilities maintenance for new and existing facilities and revenue streams to fund increased costs for maintenance of court facilities.	Final report at the October 2014 council meeting.	Completed	<p>All efforts designed to implement this Directive have now been completed, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● The renegotiation of rent and generation of revenues, yielding gross expense reductions of over \$8 million during the prior 12-month period.</li> <li>● Approval of a Budget Change Proposal (BCP) to use Facility Program resources to fund a 10-year, \$150 million appropriation in support of the Trial Court Facility Modifications program.</li> </ul> <p>The Judicial Council subsequently approved the recommendation for additional resources to implement budgeted projects.</p>
	<p><a href="#">SEC Recommendation</a></p> <p>Fiscal planning for facilities maintenance for new and existing facilities needs to become an immediate priority, and revenue streams to fund increased costs for maintenance of court facilities must be identified and obtained.</p>			

\* This document retains the wording presented by the Judicial Council's Executive and Planning Committee approved by the Judicial Council on August 31, 2012.

#	Directive *	Timeline	Status	Status Updates
139	E&P recommends that the Judicial Council direct the Administrative Director of the Courts, once organizational changes are made as approved by the Judicial Council, to evaluate and make recommendations regarding staff reductions.	Administrative Director of the Courts to provide an interim report to the council at the December 2013 council meeting.	Completed	The office director, in collaboration with the Chief Operating Officer, has completed organizational changes and an assessment of the staffing and resource requirements to execute the \$5 billion construction program without increasing risk to the branch. As indicated in the October 2013 interim report to the Judicial Council, the office is proceeding with hiring three construction inspector positions critically needed now to effectively manage the current program, which will include 15 projects in construction totaling about \$2 billion by the end of 2013.
<u>SEC Recommendation</u>				
Staff reductions appear feasible in light of the slowdown in new court construction and should be made accordingly. The Chief Operating Officer should be charged with implementing necessary reductions.				
140	E&P recommends that the Judicial Council direct the Administrative Director of the Courts to ensure that the employment of temporary or other staff to circumvent a hiring freeze is not permitted. The Administrative Director must review all temporary staff assignments and eliminate those that are being used to replace positions subject to the hiring freeze. Temporary employees should be limited to periods not exceeding six months and should be used only in limited circumstances of demonstrated need, such as in the case of an emergency or to provide a critical skill set not available through the use of authorized employees.	Completion by June 2013	Completed	Status on implementation progress for this directive is included in the Activity Reporting and Proposal Form submitted to the Judicial Council for the June 28, 2013, Judicial Council Meeting.
<u>SEC Recommendation</u>				
The use of temporary or other staff to circumvent the hiring freeze should cease.				

\* This document retains the wording presented by the Judicial Council's Executive and Planning Committee approved by the Judicial Council on August 31, 2012.

#	Directive *	Timeline	Status	Status Updates
141	E&P recommends that the Judicial Council direct the Administrative Director of the Courts to review, as part of the AOC-wide review of its contracting processes, the contracting process utilized by the Office of Court Construction and Management.	Completion by December 2013.	Completed	<p>This directive was addressed as part of the AOC's ongoing contract process improvement efforts. In addition, the requirements of the Judicial Branch Contracting Manual has resulted in better standardization and better compliance with procurement practices for the non-capital projects divisions and offices. For the capital projects area, recommendations by a competitively solicited consultant (Pegasus) for procurement, contract administration and project management have been implemented and will go to the Judicial Council in January of 2014.</p> <p>Business Services staff have worked with Judicial Branch Capital Program Office and Office of Real Estate and Facilities Management to review and implement the Pegasus recommendations so that the current processes to the contracting process are improved.</p> <p>It should be recognized that the administration and maintenance of policies and procedures is an ongoing process of continuous improvement, and although milestones can be achieved, this maintenance effort will be an ongoing process.</p>
<p><u>SEC Recommendation</u></p> <p>The contracting process utilized by OCCM needs to be improved. This process should be reviewed as part of the AOC-wide review of its contracting processes.</p> <hr/>				

\* This document retains the wording presented by the Judicial Council's Executive and Planning Committee approved by the Judicial Council on August 31, 2012.

#	Directive *	Timeline	Status	Status Updates
142	E&P recommends that the Judicial Council direct the Administrative Director of the Courts to consider SEC Recommendation 7-80 and implement the necessary organizational and staffing changes, contingent upon the council's approval of an organizational structure for the AOC.	The Classification & Compensation Study is scheduled to be adopted by the Judicial Council at its meeting in April 2015; based upon the direction provided by the Judicial Council, the Executive Office will implement the plan accordingly and will provide an update to council at the October 2015 council meeting.	In Progress	<p>Implementation of directives 50, 64, 72, 78, 89, 100, 106, 123, 130, 135, and 142 are tied to the outcome of the AOC Classification and Compensation Study.</p> <p>On September 9, 2013, the Executive and Planning Committee (E&amp;P) reviewed the methodology, criteria, and process used to score the Request for Proposal (RFP) bids, reviewed the final bid scoring and findings, and approved the awarding of the contract to the highest scored bidder.</p> <p>In October 2013, E&amp;P provided an update to the Judicial Council notifying them that the highest scored bidder was selected to conduct the classification and compensation study.</p> <p>In November 2013, Fox Lawson &amp; Associates was awarded the contract to conduct the Judicial Council's classification and compensation study. Four meetings were held with Fox Lawson &amp; Associates, members of the Human Resources (HR) staff, and the Executive Office to establish the specifics of the study, including methodology, timeline, and a review of the current classification and compensation system at the Judicial Council.</p> <p>In December 2013, communications were sent to all Judicial Council staff informing them of the beginning of the study and outlining the requirements, including completing employee Position Description Questionnaires (PDQ), which were due in February 2014.</p> <p>In January 2014, Judicial Council staff conducted information sessions at each Judicial Council office to answer employees' questions regarding the study.</p> <p>In April and May 2014, Fox Lawson completed meeting with approximately 20 occupational panels across Judicial Council offices and locations, and will</p>

\* This document retains the wording presented by the Judicial Council's Executive and Planning Committee approved by the Judicial Council on August 31, 2012.

#	Directive *	Timeline	Status	Status Updates
				<p>be scheduling regular updates to brief the Executive Office.</p> <p>In June 2014, the Judicial Council Human Resources office and Fox Lawson discussed the current progress of the study with the council. Fox Lawson also began a series of one-on-one phone interviews with a small number of employees. The purpose was to clarify specific information provided in the PDQs regarding essential duties.</p> <p>In July 2014, the Executive Office held all-staff meetings to update Judicial Council staff about the progress of the study and discussed the selected comparator markets.</p> <p>In August 2014, Fox Lawson met with the Internal Chairs and the Executive Office to discuss recommendations for the proposed classification structure. The Internal Chairs and the Executive Office briefed the Judicial Council in closed session.</p> <p>In September 2014, Fox Lawson took steps to draft classification specifications and finalized job description summaries for market survey.</p> <p>In October 2014, Fox Lawson continued to draft and finalize the classification specifications and initiated the market survey to begin the compensation phase of the study.</p> <p>All-staff meetings were held in November 2014 to communicate the current status of the Classification and Compensation Study. During the meeting, employees were provided with an overview of the new classification system and were given information on the appeals process.</p> <p>In February 2015, employees are expected to be informed of their new classifications within the new</p>

\* This document retains the wording presented by the Judicial Council's Executive and Planning Committee approved by the Judicial Council on August 31, 2012.



#	Directive *	Timeline	Status	Status Updates
	<a href="#">SEC Recommendation</a> The Office of Governmental Affairs should be placed in the Executive Office, under the direction of the Chief of Staff. The OGA Manager position should be at the Senior Manager level.			structure and will have an opportunity to submit an appeal if they feel that their position has been incorrectly classified.
143	<a href="#">SEC Recommendation</a> E&P recommends that the Judicial Council direct the Administrative Director of the Courts that the Office of Governmental Affairs (OGA) should represent the interests of the judicial branch on the clear direction of the Judicial Council and its Policy Coordination and Liaison Committee (PCLC), and take steps to ensure that the PCLC is apprised fully of varying viewpoints of the courts, court executive officers, and judges before determining legislation positions or proposals.	Ongoing	Completed	Activity Reporting and Proposal Form submitted to the Judicial Council for the October 26, 2012, Judicial Council Meeting.
	<a href="#">SEC Recommendation</a> The OGA should represent the interests of the judicial branch on the clear direction of the Judicial Council and its Policy Coordination and Liaison Committee. The Chief of Staff should take steps to ensure that the PCLC is apprised fully of varying viewpoints of the courts, court executive officers, and judges before determining legislation positions or proposals.			

\* This document retains the wording presented by the Judicial Council's Executive and Planning Committee approved by the Judicial Council on August 31, 2012.

#	Directive *	Timeline	Status	Status Updates
144	<p>E&amp;P recommends that the Judicial Council direct the Administrative Director of the Courts that attorney resources in the AOC be utilized to best leverage and draw on subject matter expertise, which may assist OGA as legislative demands may require.</p> <p><a href="#">SEC Recommendation</a></p> <p>The Administrative Director should direct that attorney resources in the AOC be utilized to best leverage and draw on subject matter expertise, which may assist OGA as legislative demands may require.</p>	<p>Completed. ADOC will continue to monitor the deployment of expertise.</p>	<p>Completed</p>	<p>Activity Reporting and Proposal Form submitted to the Judicial Council for the October 26, 2012, Judicial Council Meeting.</p>

\* This document retains the wording presented by the Judicial Council's Executive and Planning Committee approved by the Judicial Council on August 31, 2012.

#	Directive *	Timeline	Status	Status Updates
145	<p>E&amp;P recommends that the Judicial Council direct the Administrative Director of the Courts to propose to the council a process and policies for pursuing grants. The process should mandate a detailed impact analysis for every grant proposal, including consideration of all anticipated impacts on the workload and resources of the courts and the impacts to the AOC as a whole. Until a process of review and oversight is finalized, the Administrative Director of the Courts must approve the AOC's engagement in all grant proposals and agreements.</p> <p><a href="#">SEC Recommendation</a></p> <p>6-9. The Executive Leadership Team must develop and make public a description of the AOC's process for determining which grants to pursue. The process should mandate a detailed impact analysis for every grant proposal, including consideration of all anticipated impacts on the workload and resources of the courts and the impacts to the AOC as a whole. Only after such analysis should the Executive Leadership Team make a determination whether the AOC should pursue grant funding.</p> <p>7-5. The Judicial Council should exercise oversight to assure that grant-funded programs are undertaken only when consistent with predetermined, branch-wide policy and plans. The fiscal and operational impacts of grant-funded programs on the courts should be considered as part of the fiscal planning process.</p> <p>7-12. The Promising and Effective Programs Unit functions are largely discretionary and should be considered for reduction or elimination, resulting in position savings. Consideration should be given to the following.</p> <p>Excerpt:</p> <p>(f) The Fund Development Group concerns itself with training to obtain grants, seeking grants, and grant reporting. As is the case with other divisions in the AOC,</p>	<p>ADOC to recommend to the council a process and policies for evaluating appropriate grants by August 2013 and a cost benefit analysis proposal by October 2013.</p>	Completed	<p>The Administrative Director of the Courts has approved a staff recommendation for a new policy and process for pursuing competitive grants that are in line with the branch's strategic goals, and--assuming the council approved--has directed staff to take steps to publicize and implement the new policy and process, which are appended to the staff report to the Administrative Director, dated July 30, 2013, and entitled "Judicial Council Directive 145 re Grant Seeking."</p>

\* This document retains the wording presented by the Judicial Council's Executive and Planning Committee approved by the Judicial Council on August 31, 2012.

#	Directive *	Timeline	Status	Status Updates
	<p>grants should be sought in accordance with well-articulated AOC-wide priorities, as established by the Judicial Council. The Administrative Director and the Judicial Council should develop written policies and guidelines that control the pursuit and acceptance of grants and other funding, including utilizing a cost-benefit analysis.</p> <hr/>			

\* This document retains the wording presented by the Judicial Council's Executive and Planning Committee approved by the Judicial Council on August 31, 2012.