

ACTIVITY REPORTING AND PROPOSAL FORM

JUDICIAL COUNCIL DIRECTIVES AOC RESTRUCTURING

DATE	11/20/2012
PREPARED BY	Bob Fleshman
OFFICE NAME	<u>Fiscal Services Office</u>
JUDICIAL COUNCIL DIRECTIVE NUMBER	40
JUDICIAL COUNCIL DIRECTIVE	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.
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 analysis should be part of any request, and there should be a system to prioritize requests.
RESPONSE (check applicable boxes)	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> This directive has been completed and implemented:	
<p>The judicial branch participates in the state budget development process on the timeline established by the state Department of Finance (DOF). Given that budget change requests are due to the DOF by mid-September each year (for the following fiscal year's budget), any requests for additional baseline resources are vetted by the Judicial Council at its August meeting each year. Information presented to the council includes potential benefits and impacts to the courts and AOC.</p> <p>Requests for additional resources from existing branch funding generally occur in conjunction with funding requests associated with the state level funds, which are vetted and developed by the Trial Court Budget Working Group prior to being submitted to the Judicial Council (this item is set for the Oct. 26, 2012, council business meeting).</p> <p>A cost benefit analysis may not be practical for every request for branch funding. For example, requests to cover the costs associated with increased health and retirement expenses, rent increases, or legislatively mandated services would not normally require a cost benefit analysis given the nature of the requests. Funding augmentations requests for new or expanded programs and service, especially those for large scale projects (particularly those with a information technology focus), should require a cost benefit analysis.</p> <p>Beginning with FY 2014-15 funding requests presented to the council in August 2013, any such funding requests will be prioritized as appropriate.</p> <p>UPDATE (Nov. 20, 2012): This directive will be part of a broader review and policy discussion with directives 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 21, 40, 91, and 145 all relating to the development of a cost benefit</p>	

analyses proposal for the AOC which will be provided at a later date.

 File Attachment

This directive is forwarded to the Judicial Council with options for consideration:

 File Attachment

Other:

 File Attachment

TIMELINE AND RESOURCES FOR IMPLEMENTATION

IMPLEMENTATION DATE OR PROJECTED IMPLEMENTATION DATE	Ongoing
RESOURCES REQUIRED FOR IMPLEMENTATION	n/a

ADDITIONAL IMPLEMENTATION INFORMATION (complete only applicable sections)

<input type="checkbox"/> PROCEDURES/ POLICIES UPDATED OR DEVELOPED	<p></p> <p> File Attachment</p>
<input type="checkbox"/> TRAINING UPDATED OR DEVELOPED	<p></p> <p> File Attachment</p>
<input type="checkbox"/> SAVINGS	<p></p> <p> File Attachment</p>
<input type="checkbox"/> COST	<p></p> <p> File Attachment</p>
<input type="checkbox"/> EFFICIENCIES	<p></p> <p> File Attachment</p>
	<p></p>

<input type="checkbox"/> SERVICE LEVEL IMPACT	<input type="text" value="File Attachment"/>
<input type="checkbox"/> OTHER	<input type="text" value="File Attachment"/>
ADMINISTRATIVE DIRECTOR OF THE COURTS (ADOC) REVIEW AND APPROVAL	
ADOC REVIEW	Administrative Director of the Courts Review Date: <input type="text" value="11/30/2012"/>
EXECUTIVE AND PLANNING (E&P) COMMITTEE REVIEW	
E&P REVIEW	Executive and Planning Review Date: <input type="text" value="12/7/2012"/>