



Judicial Council of California
ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICE OF THE COURTS

FINANCE DIVISION

455 Golden Gate Avenue • San Francisco, California 94102-3688
Telephone 415-865-7960 • Fax 415-865-4325 • TDD 415-865-4272

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

WILLIAM C. VICKREY
Administrative Director of the Courts

RONALD G. OVERHOLT
Chief Deputy Director

CHRISTINE M. HANSEN
Director, Finance Division

TO: POTENTIAL BIDDERS

FROM: Administrative Office of the Courts
Finance Division

DATE: **May 10, 2007**

SUBJECT/PURPOSE OF MEMO: **ADDENDUM NO. 1**
ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS

Project Title: Appellate Court Classification and Compensation Study

RFP Number: HR-0407-RB

PROPOSAL DUE DATE: Proposals must be received by **1:00 pm, Wednesday, May 23, 2007**
See Section 1.3 of the RFP for additional key dates.

SUBMISSION OF PROPOSAL: Proposals must be sent to:
Judicial Council of California
Administrative Office of the Courts
Attn: Nadine McFadden, HR-0407-RB
455 Golden Gate Avenue
San Francisco, CA 94102

1. Is it possible to have access to a listing of the 81 classifications specified in section 2.0 of the RFP?

Answer: The 81 classifications are as follows:

Class Code	Class Description
2215	Administrative Specialist I
2216	Administrative Specialist II
2356	Administrative Support Technician
2482	Appellate Court Attorney, A
2483	Appellate Court Attorney, B
2484	Appellate Court Attorney, C
2485	Appellate Court Attorney, D
2355	Appellate Court Records Assistant
2206	Assistant Clerk of the Supreme Court (Los Angeles)
2205	Assistant Clerk/Admin. Supreme Court
2210	Assistant Clerk/Administrator - A
2211	Assistant Clerk/Administrator - B
2341	Assistant Deputy Clerk I
2342	Assistant Deputy Clerk II
2343	Assistant Deputy Clerk III
2218	Assistant Law Librarian I
2219	Assistant Law Librarian II
2367	Automatic Appeals Unit Supervisor
2207	Calendar Coordinator
2469	Chief Supervising Attorney, CA Supreme Court
2212	Clerk of the Court
2208	Clerk/Administrator
2204	Clerk/Administrator Supreme Court
2364	Custodian
2344	Deputy Clerk
2363	Executive Judicial Assistant to APJ
2459	Executive Judicial Assistant to Chief
2528	Executive Secretary to Clerk/Administrator

Class Code	Class Description
2466	Executive Secretary to Clerk/Administrator of Supreme Court
2518	Graduate Legal Assistant
2360	Judicial Assistant
2362	Judicial Assistant to Appellate Justice
2368	Judicial Assistant to SC Justice
2228	Judicial Center Law Librarian
2357	Judicial Secretary I
2358	Judicial Secretary II
2217	Law Librarian
2222	Law Library Technician I
2226	Law Library Technician II
2486	Lead Appellate Court Attorney
2365	Lead Custodian
2359	Lead Judicial Secretary
2497	Lead Supreme Court Attorney
2467	Legal Editorial Assistant
2472	Managing Appellate Court Attorney
2347	Office Assistant I
2348	Office Assistant II
2349	Office Technician I
2350	Office Technician II
2468	Principal Attorney to Chief Justice
2529	Receptionist I
2532	Receptionist II
2481	Reporter of Decisions
2527	Senior Administrative Support Technician
2470	Senior Appellate Court Attorney
2345	Senior Deputy Clerk
2460	Senior Executive Judicial Assistant to Chief
2526	Senior Law Library Technician
2522	Senior Office Technician
2475	Senior Supreme Court Attorney
2533	Senior Supreme Court Paralegal

Class Code	Class Description
2227	Settlement Conf. Coordinator
2233	Supervising Administrative Specialist
2471	Supervising Appellate Court Attorney
2366	Supervising Custodian
2346	Supervising Deputy Clerk
2361	Supervising Judicial Assistant
2477	Supervising Supreme Court Attorney
2491	Supreme Court Attorney, A
2492	Supreme Court Attorney, B
2494	Supreme Court Attorney, C
2495	Supreme Court Attorney, D
2499	Supreme Court Chambers Attorney, A
2500	Supreme Court Chambers Attorney, B
2502	Supreme Court Chambers Attorney, C
2503	Supreme Court Chambers Attorney, D
2505	Supreme Court Chambers Attorney, E
2507	Supreme Court Chambers Attorney, F
2463	Supreme Court Paralegal I
2464	Supreme Court Paralegal II
2536	Supreme Court Records Supervisor

2. Is there an expectation that any employee appeals resulting from classification recommendations (RFP section 3.2.5) are handled by some internal processes within A.O.C. or is the respondent to the RFP expected to recommend an appeal process for such circumstances as part of the scope of work?

Answer: Any appeals would be handled internally by the AOC.

3. Can you explain which agency is the ultimate decision-making authority for issues of compensation policy and philosophy governing the incumbents that would be covered by the work of this classification and compensation study? Is the ultimate authority A.O.C. or some other entity?

Answer: Authority for classification and compensation decisions within the Judicial Branch rests solely with the Chief Justice of California. The AOC will provide the recommendations to the Chief and prepare any documents needed for his approval.

4. Do classification recommendations referenced in RFP section 3.2.7 need to be submitted in the prescribed Department of Personnel Administration (D.P.A.) format?

Answer: No. The AOC uses its own format.

5. Since the labor markets are so different in various parts of California, should the approach include three separate compensation reviews for the three regions included in the study?

Answer: Yes. We will want to know the market for all three regions.

6. Would you identify the number of employees and classifications at each location in the system?

Answer: 848 current active employees in 74 different job classes (plus 7 additional classes with no incumbents):

San Francisco	254 employees, 57 classes (Supreme Court, 147 employees in 43 classes; IDCA 107 employees in 19 classes)
San Jose	45 employees, 15 classes
Sacramento	78 employees, 24 classes
San Diego	62 employees, 21 classes
Riverside	53 employees, 18 classes
Fresno	57 employees, 17 classes
Santa Ana	57 employees, 21 classes
LA	216 employees, 35 classes (Includes 3 Supreme Court employees in 2 classes)
Ventura	26 employees, 7 classes

7. In addition to interviews with employees who request them, does the AOC have any preferences or goals relative to the total number of employees who should be interviewed to validate the information submitted in their questionnaires?

Answer: All employees should be given the opportunity to provide input to the survey and to request individual audits. It may be possible to canvas employees to determine whether they feel their current classifications are accurate, and then only require questionnaires from those who indicate there are differences and inaccuracies. Since the questionnaires will be reviewed by the incumbents' supervisors prior to submission, validation may be needed only for a representative number of questionnaires.

8. Are we correct in interpreting the RFP to conclude that there are three separate salary scales that differ by region?

Answer: The judicial branch currently has 3 geographical pay regions, with Region 1 (Sacramento, Santa Ana, and San Diego) and Region 3 (San Francisco and San Jose) set at different percentages above that base. The current differentials are 2.5 percent for Region 2 and 5.5 percent for Region 3.

9. Has the AOC identified any entities that it uses, or desires to use, to compare compensation with. Are there any such requirements in any of the bargaining agreements?

Answer: The Courts of Appeal and Supreme Court are at-will employers who do not have bargaining units, therefore there are not agreements that would affect this study. We would typically compare our positions to the State of CA Executive Branch, city and county governments in the court locations, colleges and universities, and, for legal positions, mid-size private sector law firms and the Federal 9th Circuit Court of Appeal.