

**SUPREME JUDICIAL COURT
TASK FORCE FOR HIRING IN THE JUDICIAL BRANCH**

**ACTION PLAN FOR HIRING AND PROMOTION OF EMPLOYEES
OF THE TRIAL COURT RECORDER, CLERKS
AND REGISTERS OF PROBATE**

November 8, 2011

SCOTT HARSHBARGER, CHAIR

RANDY S. CHAPMAN

STEPHEN P. CROSBY

KATHLEEN M. DENNEHY

KATHLEEN M. DONOVAN

RUTH ELLEN FITCH

MICHAEL B. KEATING

HON. JAMES F. MCHUGH

HARRY SPENCE

STEVEN H. WRIGHT

ACTION PLAN FOR HIRING AND PROMOTION OF
EMPLOYEES OF THE TRIAL COURT RECORDER, CLERKS
AND REGISTERS OF PROBATE

I. BACKGROUND

The Task Force on Hiring in the Judicial Branch was appointed by the Supreme Judicial Court on December 7, 2010, with a mandate to “make recommendations designed to ensure a fair system with transparent procedures in which the qualifications of an applicant are the sole criterion in hiring and promotion” in the Probation Department and throughout the Trial Court. This is our fifth report. Our Preliminary Report, dated January 19, 2011, focused on the Probation Department and made several recommendations for immediate action.¹ On February 10, 2011, we followed that report with an “Action Plan for Reform and Renewal of Probation Department Hiring and Promotion Practices.”² The Action Plan contained a description of nationally recognized best practices for hiring and promotion, a series of short-term and long-term hiring and promotion recommendations, and a series of recommendations for structural reforms designed to ensure that hiring and promotion are transparent and based on merit alone. Those practices lie at the heart of both reports we issued thereafter, specifically the Action Plans for hiring and promotion of court officers³ and Trial Court administrative employees.⁴

The Supreme Judicial Court adopted many of our recommendations.⁵ At the Court’s request, we are now monitoring implementation of the first phase of the Probation Action Plan, which is designed to begin rebuilding the HR and recruiting

¹ The Preliminary Report can be found at <http://www.mass.gov/courts/sjc/docs/tf-judbranch-hiring-interim-report-011911.pdf>.

² The Action Plan can be found at <http://www.mass.gov/courts/sjc/docs/tf-judbranch-hiring-actionplan-021011.pdf>. The Supreme Judicial Court’s statement regarding the Plan can be found at <http://www.mass.gov/courts/sjc/media/sjcpr-022411.html>

³ That Action Plan, and the Supreme Judicial Court’s statement about the Plan, can be found at <http://www.mass.gov/courts/press/pr050611.html>.

⁴ That Action Plan, and the Supreme Judicial Court’s statement about the plan, can be found <http://www.mass.gov/courts/press/pr090811.html>.

⁵ All of the reports and judicial responses to them can be found at <http://www.mass.gov/courts/sjc/tf-hiring-judicial-branch.html>

infrastructure within the Department and to fill key leadership positions with high quality candidates recruited from within and without the Department.

Following release of the Action Plan dealing with administrators and in keeping with our mandate to examine hiring and promotion practices throughout the Trial Court, we turned our attention to hiring and promotion of employees of the Trial Court Recorder, Clerks and Registers of Probate. As we have throughout our work, we interviewed knowledgeable individuals and reviewed pertinent documents. Again, however, we also relied on information gained from interviews and documents acquired since the Task Force was created.⁶ We likewise have drawn on the collective experience of Task Force members who are leaders and managers in the private, public and non-profit sectors and on what we have learned during our nearly eleven months of assessing the quality and style of leadership in the judicial branch. As in the case of the previous Action Plans, we examined current hiring and promotion practices with an eye toward identifying areas where changes would ensure a fair, transparent system focused on applicants' qualifications. We continue to express our gratitude for the insights provided by the individuals who took the time to meet and share their thoughts with us.

II. FINDINGS

A. Overview.

Historically, the Trial Court Recorder, Clerks and Registers have functioned as record keepers for the particular court by which they were employed. In many locations, they, along with the First Justice and Chief Probation officer, are part of a tripartite team that collaboratively runs the courthouse. Their record keeping function is important for assuring that justice is done, for the integrity of the judicial process is greatly enhanced when case records are made and maintained by court employees other than those who made the decisions the records reflect. The fifteen Clerks of the Superior Court are elected every six years,⁷ as are the fourteen Registers of Probate.⁸ Clerks of the Boston

⁶ A complete list of the individuals from whom we have heard and their titles is attached as Appendix A.

⁷ See Massachusetts Constitution Amendment Article XIX; G.L. c. 54, § 155; G.L. c. 221, § 3.

⁸ See Massachusetts Constitution Amendment Article XIX; G.L. c. 54, § 156; G.L. c. 217, § 4.

Municipal Court,⁹ the District Court,¹⁰ the Juvenile Court¹¹ and the Housing Court¹² are appointed by the Governor, with the advice and consent of the Council,¹³ and hold their office “during good behavior.” Land Court record keeping is the responsibility of the Recorder, who is also appointed by the Governor, with the Council’s advice and consent, and who also serves during good behavior.¹⁴

The Recorder, Clerks and Registers are also magistrates and, in that capacity, have duties in addition to their record keeping responsibilities. For example, they set bail when a judge is unavailable and hold hearings to determine whether there is probable cause to believe that a probationer has violated his or her terms of probation.¹⁵ They hear and decide appeals from fines levied by municipal officers in building code cases,¹⁶ conduct hearings in certain motor vehicle cases,¹⁷ exercise various powers under the Uniform Probate Code,¹⁸ hear and decide so-called small claims cases,¹⁹ issue warrants,²⁰ and perform other like functions.

B. Administration of the Offices of Clerks and Registers, and the Recorder.

The Recorder and each of the Clerks and Registers is the administrative head of his or her office. Accordingly, each has the power to hire a statutorily specified number of

⁹ See G.L. c. 218, § 8.

¹⁰ Ibid.

¹¹ See G.L. c. 218, § 58.

¹² See G.L. c. 185C, § 9.

¹³ The Council is created by Part II, c. 2, § 3, art. 1, of the Massachusetts Constitution, as amended by art. 16 of the Amendments. See Part II, c. 2, § 1, arts. 1 and 4, of the Massachusetts Constitution.

¹⁴ See G.L. C. 185, § 6.

¹⁵ See G.L. c. 221, § 62C.

¹⁶ See G.L. c. 40U, § 15.

¹⁷ See G.L. c. 90C, § 3.

¹⁸ See G.L. c. 190B, § 1-307.

¹⁹ See G.L. c. 218, § 21.

²⁰ See G.L. c. 218, § 3.

assistant clerks²¹ as well as other office staff.²² In all, the Clerks, Registers and Recorder currently employ approximately 2500 assistants, deputies and clerical employees. The Recorder, the Clerks and the Registers are responsible for management of their offices.²³

In their hiring and promotion decisions, the Recorder, Clerks and Registers are subject to standards promulgated by the Chief Justice for Administration and Management (CJAM), with the advice of the advisory committee on personnel standards.²⁴ Those standards are contained in the Trial Court's Personnel Policies and Procedure Manual.²⁵ The Manual contains minimum requirements for hiring and promotion applicable to all Trial Court positions and was discussed extensively in our Action Plan regarding administrative personnel.²⁶ We will not repeat that discussion here. It is important, though, to highlight several aspects of the hiring and promotion process in the offices of Recorder, Clerks and Registers that are affected by the Manual, for many of those processes mirror those found elsewhere in the Trial Court.

First of all, the CJAM's role in hiring and promotion is limited to reviewing hiring decisions to ensure that standards contained in the Manual have been met.²⁷ Those standards are not rigorous. They require posting of vacancies but do not require any active outreach. In practice, the Trial Court's posting site is difficult to find.²⁸ The role of the Trial Court's Human Resources Department (HRD) is small, generally limited to assistance in preparation of job descriptions and reviewing the Recorder, Clerk or

²¹ See, e.g., G.L. c. 185, §6; 218, § 10. First assistant Superior Court clerks in the ten counties are appointed by the Supreme Judicial Court. First assistant clerks also serve as assistant clerks of the Supreme Judicial Court.

²² The number of office staff positions is determined by the Trial Court based on need and available funding.

²³ See, e.g., G.L. c. 185, § 6; c. 185C, § 9; G.L. c. 211B, § 10A; G.L. c. 212, § 14A; G.L. c. 217, § 2.

²⁴ See G.L. c. 211B, § 8.

²⁵ The Manual is available at <http://www.mass.gov/courts/admin/hr/tableofcontents.html>.

²⁶ See Action Plan for Hiring and Promotion of Trial Court Administrative Employees at 8-11 (August 9, 2011) (<http://www.mass.gov/courts/press/pr090811.html>).

²⁷ See G.L. c. 211B, §§ 8, 9 (xxvii).

²⁸ The difficulty is of no immediate consequence because a "hard" hiring freeze has been in place since October, 2008, and, with employees retiring at the rate of about 20 per month, has decreased the Trial Court workforce by about 16% over the past three years.

Register's certification that the hiring of a proposed new employee meets the Manual's requirements. Moreover, HRD review is limited to the contents of the certification package, with no spot or routine audit to determine whether the certification accurately reflects what occurred during the hiring process. "Referral sources" are required as part of the certification package but the form on which the sources must be reported contains a series of generic categories – newspapers, courthouse postings, job hotlines, etc. – with "other" as a possibility and no requirement to explain what the "other" was.

In addition, almost everyone we interviewed agreed that the job descriptions used for many positions were written so broadly and loosely that almost anyone who applied would meet the qualifications they contain. Thus, the descriptions contain little guidance for applicants and hiring teams regarding the essential qualifications and competencies a particular job requires. The breadth of those descriptions devalues certificates of compliance with the Manual's standards and, in some cases, masks an incomplete understanding by the applicant and the appointing authority of the skills and qualifications needed to perform successfully the functions of a particular job.

The Manual addresses promotions as well as hiring but, again, its requirements are procedural, largely tracking the requirements for hiring. Still more fundamental to the system's failure to appropriately value the importance of human resource development is the absence of any system for performance reviews. In that regard, the offices of Recorder, Clerk and Register are not unique for, as we noted in our prior Action Plan, there is no performance review process for any Trial Court employees save judges.²⁹ The recently expired contract between the Trial Court and the Office & Professional Employees International Union, Local 6, which represents the vast majority of employees in the offices, does contain a performance review process but requires that reviewers be trained before the process can be implemented. The training has never occurred. Moreover, the contract does not tie performance reviews to salary increases, which presumptively occur in steps every twelve months for the first seven years that an employee spends in a given position. The absence of a formal review process, of course, makes it difficult to determine the basis for promotion or discipline under the progressive discipline system required by both the union contract and the Manual. As one presenter

²⁹ See G.L. c. 211, § 26.

put it, the absence of performance reviews contributes to a culture where some employees think that “if they have a pulse and seniority, they should be promoted.”

Beyond training for performance reviewers, a number of presenters focused on the need for standardized orientation and training for all new employees of the Recorder, Clerk and Register. Over the past ten years, the Trial Court has been applying standardized metrics to analyze case-flow processing. For part of that time, it has been deploying a computerized case management system called MassCourts which, although tailored to each department, has a common look and feel across all departments and is designed to allow court employees to record like events and results in a common fashion. But, as one presenter said, there is no uniform training for new employees in the operation of the system or in other aspects of case flow processing. As a consequence, the presenter explained, methods for handling the same kind of case in two different divisions can differ so dramatically that a stranger would be hard pressed to conclude that both divisions were part of the same Trial Court. These procedural differences undermine the value of having a unified MassCourts case management system. Indeed, the lack of uniform training extends even to basic issues such as HR requirements, protocols, dress codes and other employee standards.

The lack of common training has tangible impacts. First, it can make life difficult for lawyers and litigants who have similar matters pending in different divisions. Insofar as promotion is concerned, the absence of common standards can make cross-divisional promotion very difficult, effectively locking some people into or out of a promotional chain. The consequence is likely to be complacency or a lack of incentive for advancement, both of which tend to degrade the quality of service the Trial Court is able to offer the public.

III. RECOMMENDATIONS

As we turn to recommendations, it is important to recognize the great number of talented, hard-working and imaginative employees who now occupy positions in the offices of Recorder, Clerk and Register. Many have held their present positions for years and have acquired a deep expertise in the sometimes arcane procedural requirements that now fill nearly 1800 finely printed pages of the standard trial and appellate rule book. On a daily basis, they use that expertise to guide novices and experts alike through what can

sometimes seem like a bewildering procedural maze. In a time of diminishing human resources, many have taken on extra duties, worked extra hours and volunteered to work in different locations in order to keep the system moving forward. They deserve the gratitude and thanks of all who use the Trial Court system.

As we said in our last report, the employees in those offices deserve to work, and the public expects them to work, in an environment where dedication, excellence and merit are the sole criteria for hiring and promotion. To some extent, the fact that elected Clerks and Registers face the voters every six years provides an incentive for maintaining an environment of that type. Other incentives can flow from the constant interaction between the staff and the public in all of the offices. Nevertheless, we believe that standards and processes for recruitment, hiring and promotion should be sufficiently robust and rigorous to support those incentives for performance and that, as all presenters told us, greater HR capacity and leadership in certain areas would be beneficial. Specifically, we make the following recommendations.

A. Best Practices.

In three of the four reports we issued thus far, we identified principles that lie at the heart of a best-practices approach to hiring and promotion. The majority are not currently used in the judicial branch.³⁰ Robust, proactive recruiting is one of those practices. The quality of the employees ultimately hired flows directly from the size and quality of the pool of applicants. At a high level, a successful approach to recruiting includes creation of mission statements coupled with the development and maintenance of up-to-date job descriptions that include statements of required job knowledge and competencies. Once those have been prepared, HRD should undertake active outreach to attract qualified applicants. That outreach should employ multiple, even unconventional, channels that have been carefully selected for their potential to attract the applicants most likely to add value to the Trial Court's operations. Those channels must include electronic media and sites that desirable applicants now commonly use in their search for

³⁰ The practices involve a well-defined mission statement, well-developed job descriptions and competencies, multi-channel sourcing of candidates, objective review and screening of applicants, behaviorally based interviews, candidate assessments and use of a comprehensive applicant tracking system. See *Action Plan for Reform and Renewal of Probation Department Hiring Practices* at 7-10 (February 10, 2011) (<http://www.mass.gov/courts/sjc/docs/tf-judbranch-hiring-actionplan-021011.pdf>.)

employment. The outreach effort also should involve active recruiting at schools, community centers and other places where people with the necessary qualifications likely gather.

Proactive recruiting by HRD need not displace or even suppress recruiting by each appointing authority. Parallel efforts can be perfectly compatible. But development and exercise of robust recruiting protocols for all Trial Court positions helps to ensure that outreach efforts reach all segments of the society, reach all who are willing to work for the salary the position provides and reach all of those with the skill and energy to think beyond the entry-level positions where they start to advanced positions they may one day occupy. The workforce as a whole can only benefit from such efforts.

Once applications are received, there must be an objective review of the applicants' qualifications so that those incapable of meeting minimum standards are quickly identified. Again we think HRD has a role in this process. To be sure, interpersonal skills and compatibility with coworkers in a particular environment are significant components of an applicant's ability to succeed in a given office. At the same time, each Trial Court Department operates across the Commonwealth. The divisions of each Department are engaged in a common mission that is executed through use of common tools. Qualifications for employment in each division should flow from well-designed mission statements and job descriptions that contain courtwide qualifications that are essential for success. Although it makes sense for each appointing authority to make the final decisions as to the applicants who are hired to work in his or her office, it makes little sense for each of them to make in isolation a decision as to whether a particular applicant meets common, statewide minimum qualifications for a courtwide position.³¹ Any other view enhances the notion that each office is its own idiosyncratic island, not one part of a network staffed by skilled professionals engaged in common pursuits.

Behaviorally based interviews and candidate assessments should follow and, if properly used, will yield the candidates most likely to succeed. To ensure transparency and permit improvements in the process, all aspects of all applications -- e.g. the date the

³¹ As noted below, HRD's role could be advisory rather than determinative. The point is that a standard yardstick ought to be used to measure conformity to common, courtwide characteristics.

application was received, verification of credentials (degrees, etc), interview dates, dates interviewed, etc. -- should be recorded in a comprehensive applicant tracking system maintained by HRD.³²

B. The Role of the Human Resources Department.

In our last Action Plan, we observed that

“[e]ffective hiring and effective promotion require particular skills and familiarity with the rapid evolution of proven practices throughout the public and private sectors. A sound and effective HRD has an essential role in proactively leading the process for designing appropriate job descriptions, effecting outreach into places where competent applicants are likely to be found, conducting the initial screenings to ensure that the appointing authority leaders spend their time interviewing and otherwise processing applicants likely to provide services of the highest quality and in training those who act on behalf of the appointing authority in the interviewing and other skills most likely to reveal desirable applicant qualities.”^[33]

Those thoughts were expressed in the context of our analysis of hiring of Trial Court departmental administrative staff and the central AOTC staff but they apply equally here and we recommend that the HRD be configured so that, when Trial Court hiring begins anew, it can provide effective oversight of the hiring, promotion and discipline of all Trial Court employees. For the sake of emphasis, we repeat that the specific tasks committed to HRD with respect to all Trial Court employees should include the following:

- Assist management in developing updated mission statements and competencies for all Trial Court appointing authorities and in articulating core Trial Court values;
- Rewrite the personnel Manual, with the advice of the advisory committee on personnel standards, to set new recruiting requirements that spell out in more detail the rigorous outreach that must accompany efforts to hire all new

³² In establishing a central screening role for HRD, care must be taken to ensure that the process is and remains both quick and restrained. Quick because it will be a hindrance to smooth operations if it becomes a bottleneck in the hiring process. Restrained because the power to pick from among qualified candidates is with the hiring authority, so HRD’s role is to say whether the applicant is qualified or not qualified, not to rank those who are qualified.

³³ See Action Plan for Hiring and Promotion of Trial Court Administrative Employees at 18 (August 9, 2011)(<http://www.mass.gov/courts/press/pr090811.html>).

employees, steps that must be followed in processing the resulting applications and HRD's role in screening and tracking applications;

- Establish precise and accurate descriptions and a process for their review by employees and their supervisors to ensure that they share a common understanding of what is expected of the employee;
- Create of a recruiting division charged with finding ways to attract qualified applicants for all available Trial Court positions;
- Facilitate recruitment of new employees via Facebook, Linked In and other social media to which potential applicants for employment are routinely turning to discover employment opportunities;
- Require that all applications for all Trial Court employees be forwarded to HRD for screening to ensure that they meet the minimum requirements for the position. This independent review will ensure that minimum qualifications are truly met;
- Establish precise and accurate descriptions and a process for their review by employees and their supervisors to ensure that they share a common understanding of what is expected of the employee;
- Design performance evaluations for use by all appointing authorities across the Trial Court;
- Conduct, either independently or through the Judicial Institute, training for evaluators and interviewers to use during hiring, promotion and disciplinary processes;

Implementation of these recommendations does not mean stripping or even weakening the decision-making power of the Recorder, of the Clerks or of the Registers any more than it means weakening the final decision-making power of other Trial Court appointing authorities. We continue to recognize that every appointing authority must have the power to fashion a team that will best help him or her achieve the organization's overall goals. A reformulated HRD, however, is crucial to enable appointing authorities to attract the best possible applicants and to spend their time interviewing applicants who are most likely to be the best employees.

C. Performance Evaluations

We laid out recommendations regarding creation and use of performance evaluations in our last Action Plan³⁴ and recommended in that Plan that the evaluations be used for all Trial Court employees. We reiterate that recommendation here.

We have heard it said that now is not the time to institute a performance evaluation system for two reasons. First, many employees are currently working in a position different from the one for which they were hired and trained and it would be unfair to evaluate their performance in an area with which they may not be completely familiar or comfortable. Second, promulgation of a performance evaluation system now might increase the anxiety of many good, hard-working employees who are already worried about the economic conditions in which the Trial Court finds itself and the possible impact of those conditions on their job security.

We recognize the force of those arguments and the legitimate concerns on which they rest. But they miss two fundamentally important points. First, the primary purpose of the performance evaluation system we propose is not to seek out and terminate underperformers, but rather is to afford all employees a chance to perform up to minimum standards, and superior employees the chance to excel and to compete for positions of greater responsibility over time. Second, there will never be an ideal time to institute an evaluation system that has the potential for creating necessary, constructive and fundamental change in the Trial Court culture.

Clearly, no performance evaluation system can be turned on with a flip of a switch. First of all, any fair performance appraisal is dependent upon the employee and supervisor sharing an understanding of the employee's job duties, performance expectations and the appraisal system. Creation of job descriptions that clearly set forth what the employee is expected to do is therefore essential. Then, the reviewing tools must be thought through carefully. Reviewers must be trained so that employees performing like tasks are reviewed with like criteria. A proposed system must be piloted and tested before it can be widely deployed. A fair and effective system must take account of employees who are working out of position at the time they are reviewed. And to give the

³⁴ See Action Plan for Hiring and Promotion of Trial Court Administrative Employees at 21-23 (August 9, 2011)(<http://www.mass.gov/courts/press/pr090811.html>).

system teeth, the results of the performance reviews, when satisfactorily tested and deployed, should play a role in determining step increases in compensation. The role the evaluations should play must likewise be thought through carefully and deliberately.

In sum, there must be a deliberative, thoughtful start and consistent, steady progress toward creation and deployment of any performance evaluation system. The result will be a far stronger basis for ensuring fair, transparent and merit-based employee development, promotion and discipline than currently exists. We are convinced that now is the time to start the process. Waiting for the “ideal” time to do so will simply ensure that the process forever remains beyond reach somewhere over the horizon.

D. Training

Finally, we recommend that all employees hired in the offices of the Recorder, the Clerks and the Registers undergo a period of standardized training at some point soon after they begin working. Clearly, they will need some immediate local training in order to perform the functions for which they were hired. But that local training should be followed as soon as practicable by standardized training on matters that are common to all Trial Court employees and to all employees of the Department in which they work. The former category includes such things as how they fit into the Trial Court’s overall mission. Indeed, one presenter suggested that they be shown the new juror video so that they know the generic identity and roles of the other players in the system and the importance of the function they have been engaged to perform. Training of that type is not solely the province of Trial Court trainers. Management must first decide upon the nature of the common elements and practices on which employees will be trained.

Beyond that, though, they ought to be given standardized training in the functions they perform in common with other employees in similar positions. As noted earlier, this is a single Trial Court in which the employees of each division of each department perform the same functions as their counterparts in other divisions. Increasingly, they do so through use of common tools such as MassCourts. Moreover, and for a variety of reasons, Clerks and Registers are cooperating with each other on temporary transfers of employees to help with excessive workloads. One presenter observed that, by and large, employees like the transfers because it gives them an opportunity to see how similar functions are performed in other divisions. Another noted the importance of “loaning”

well-qualified employees to another office in response for requests for help so that well-qualified employees would be forthcoming when the lender became a borrower. Common training in common tasks, therefore, enhances both employee interests and the interests of the Trial Court as a whole.

Our focus, of course, is on hiring and promotion and, with respect to the latter, common training on common tasks facilitates upward mobility. As noted earlier, if different divisions of a single department perform the same function in substantially different ways, it is very difficult for an employee trained in one division to succeed in another or even to know about and apply courtwide best practices when promoted to a supervisory position in the division where he or she has been employed. Common training on common functions, therefore, enhances the likelihood that promotions are truly merit-based and continually infuse the Trial Court with new supervisors of the highest quality.

IV. CONCLUSION

The foregoing recommendations are made with recognition that, even if formally implemented, they cannot succeed unless the Trial Court develops a culture that encourages their success. As we said in our last report, because leadership sets the tone and establishes the culture, leadership must be committed to ensuring that the primary components of that culture are transparency in the hiring and promotion process at every level of administrative operations and creation of an environment that seeks out, attracts and retains, at every position and at every level, the most qualified applicants available. The role of the central HRD should be clarified and clearly understood by all who rely on its services. The path toward clarifying and enhancing that role requires a performance plan, with goals that are objective, quantifiable and measurable. At the end of the day, though, a reformatted HRD that is neither supported nor empowered will fail. It is, therefore, the responsibility of the court system as a whole to support the continuous professional development of each of its employees to ensure constant and continuous improvement in the quality of justice provided to the citizens of the Commonwealth. Maintenance of such a culture requires identification of the Trial Court's core values and relentless adherence to those values by all leaders and administrators at all levels. Once the key values have been identified, those values must permeate all Trial Court activities,

so that any remaining traces of favoritism or the idea that an inside track is necessary for advancement are replaced by the certainty that merit is the one and only path to success throughout our judicial system.

APPENDIX A

Task Force on Hiring in the Judicial Branch -- Meetings and Presenters

December 10, 2010

Initial meeting of the Task Force – member presentations

December 17, 2010

Paul Ware, Esq., Goodwin Procter

Kevin Martin, Esq., Goodwin Procter

Ronald P. Corbett, Jr., Acting Administrator, Office of the Commissioner of Probation

January 7, 2011

Paul Dietl, Chief Human Resources Officer, Executive Office for Administration and Finance, Human Resources Division

Michelle Heffernan, Deputy General Counsel, Executive Office for Administration and Finance, Human Resources Division

Hon. Robert A. Mulligan, Chief Justice for Administration and Management

January 14, 2011

David Holway, National President, National Association of Government Employees (“NAGE”)

Margaret Thompson, Probation Officer, Suffolk Superior Court, President Local RI-229, NAGE

Michael Manning, NAGE Counsel

Larry Dullea, Assistant Chief Probation Officer, Barnstable County/Plymouth, President, NAGE Local 118

Rita McCarthy, Chief Probation Officer, Dedham District Court, President, Massachusetts Chief Probation Officers Association

Daniel Passacantilli, Chief Probation Officer, Essex Juvenile Court, Executive Board Member, Massachusetts Chief Probation Officers Association

Bernard O’Donnell, Chief Probation Officer, Clinton District Court, Vice President, Massachusetts Chief Probation Officers Association

Edward Dalton, Retired Massachusetts Probation Department Regional Supervisor

January 21, 2011

Kate Donovan, presentation of national study

John Larivee, CEO, Community Resources for Justice

Len Engel, Managing Associate for Policy, Community Resources for Justice

January 28, 2011

Edward P. Ryan, Jr., Esq., O'Connor & Ryan, P.C.

Martin Healy, Chief Operating Officer and Chief Legal Counsel, Massachusetts Bar Association

Denise Squillante, Esq., President, Massachusetts Bar Association and Family Law Practitioner

Donald Cochran, Former Commissioner, Massachusetts Probation Department

Daniel Conley, District Attorney for Suffolk County

February 4, 2011

Hon. Barbara Rouse, Chief Justice, Superior Court Department

Hon. Paula Carey, Chief Justice, Probate and Family Court Department

Hon. Lynda Connolly, Chief Justice, District Court Department

Hon. Michael Edgerton, Chief Justice, Juvenile Court Department

February 25, 2011

Thomas Connolly, Director of Security for the Trial Court

Mark Conlon, Acting Director of Human Resources for the Trial Court

March 4, 2011

David Holway, National President SEIU/NAGE

Rich Caroselli, Assistant Chief Court Officer

Dave Abbott, Court Officer

Ed Tietz, Associate Court Officer

Michael Manning, NAGE Staff Attorney

March 11, 2011

Michael Sullivan, Clerk Magistrate, Middlesex Superior Court

Keith McDonough, Clerk Magistrate, Lawrence District Court

Patrick McDermott, Register, Norfolk Probate and Family Court

March 25, 2011

Hon. Robert A. Mulligan, Chief Justice for Administration and Management

Robert Panneton, Chief of Staff for the Trial Court

April 8, 2011

Leo V. Boyle, Esq., Meehan, Boyle, Black & Fitzgerald

Martin Healy, Chief Operating Officer and Chief Legal Counsel, Massachusetts Bar Association

April 15, 2011

Hon. Robert Cordy, Associate Justice, Supreme Judicial Court

Ronald P. Corbett, Jr., Acting Commissioner of Probation

April 22, 2011

Meeting of the Task Force – member discussion

May 6, 2011

Robert P. Panneton, Chief of Staff for the Trial Court
Robert Manning, Business Manager and General Counsel, OPEIU Local 6
Virginia Dean, HR Consultant to Ronald Corbett, Acting Commissioner of Probation

May 20, 2011

Stephen J. Carroll, Director of Court Facilities Bureau
Paul Edgar, Former Director of HR for the Trial Court
Marilyn J. Wellington, Former Chief of Staff for the Trial Court

June 10, 2011

Ronald P. Corbett, Jr., Acting Commissioner of Probation
Mark Conlon, Acting Director of Human Resources for the Trial Court

June 24, 2011

Stephen V. Price, Executive Director, Office of Community Corrections
Kimberly Norton, Fiscal Manager, Office of Community Corrections

July 21, 2011

Ronald P. Corbett, Jr., Acting Commissioner of Probation
Pamela J. Wood, Jury Commissioner

August 5, 2011

Ronald P. Corbett, Jr., Acting Commissioner of Probation
Virginia Dean, HR Consultant to Ronald Corbett, Acting Commissioner of Probation

August 16, 2011

Hon. Robert Cordy, Associate Justice, Supreme Judicial Court
Hon. Margot Botsford, Associate Justice, Supreme Judicial Court

August 25, 2011

Hon. Paula Carey, Chief Justice, Probate and Family Court Department
Hon. Michael Edgerton, Chief Justice, Juvenile Court Department
Mark Conlon, Acting Director of Human Resources for the Trial Court

September 16, 2011

Ronald P. Corbett, Jr., Acting Commissioner of Probation
Hon. Lynda Connolly, Chief Justice, District Court Department
Robert Manning, Business Manager and General Counsel, OPEIU Local 6
Robert A. Tomasone, Clerk, Somerville District Court

October 7, 2011

Michael Sullivan, Clerk Magistrate, Middlesex Superior Court

Keith McDonough, Clerk Magistrate, Lawrence District Court

Patrick McDermott, Register, Norfolk Probate and Family Court

Dan J. Hogan, Clerk Magistrate, Central Division, Boston Municipal Court Department

Gary D. Wilson, Trial Court Magistrate, Suffolk Superior Court

Whitney J. Brown, Clerk, Gardner District Court

Brian P. Lees, Clerk Magistrate, Hampden Superior Court

October 28, 2011

Meeting of the Task Force – member discussions

November 4, 2011

Hon. Robert Cordy, Associate Justice, Supreme Judicial Court

Hon. Margot Botsford, Associate Justice, Supreme Judicial Court