## **143 – REDUCTION IN FORCE**

- A. A reduction in force (RIF) is the reduction in the number of employees. Some RIF reasons may be a reduction in funding, lack of work, curtailment of work, or reorganization.
- B. Procedures
  - 1. If the Supreme Court determines a reduction in force is necessary, the State Court Administrator will work with the appointing authority to develop a reduction in force plan which includes an analysis of business needs to determine the appropriate job-related criteria to use. The Supreme Court must receive the plan within 60 days of notification and may approve, reject, or amend the plan.
  - 2. If a judgeship is eliminated, the reduction of one district court support staff position for each judgeship eliminated is required unless unique circumstances are demonstrated by the affected district.
    - a. The presiding judge of any district in which a judgeship is eliminated will submit the reduction in force plan within 60 days notification of abolishment of the judgeship.
    - b. If the judgeship eliminated is in a single judge chamber, the court recorder or court reporter associated with that judgeship will be identified for reduction in force.
    - c. If the judgeship is in a multi-judge chamber, the presiding judge will identify the classification of the position(s) to be eliminated according to the job-related criteria in the next section.
    - d. If the presiding judge believes that unique circumstances exist and a position should be retained, a request to retain the position with accompanying documentation may be forwarded to the State Court Administrator within 60 days of notification.
- C. Job-Related Criteria
  - 1. In selecting the employees who will remain with the Court System, only jobrelated criteria will be used. The criteria used will be determined based on the reason for the reduction force and the determination of the business area's needs.
  - 2. Job-related criteria may include:
    - a. The duties or workload of the employees which have been eliminated or substantially reduced;
    - b. The acquired knowledge and demonstrated skills of the employees;
    - c. The demonstrated work performance of the employees;
    - d. The length of service of the employees; and

e. The extent of training needed to be fully productive in different jobs.

## D. Notice

- 1. An employee who will be terminated as a result of a reduction in force will be given a written notice at least 60 days prior to termination. The written notice will state:
  - a. The reason the employee's position was selected for elimination;
  - b. The effective date of the termination; and
  - c. Any services provided by the Court System to assist the employee in obtaining another job.
- 2. The appointing authority may authorize the expenditure of up to \$500 to assist the employee in preparing resumes, or other expenses related to seeking employment.
- 3. The termination will be recorded as a reduction in force. A copy of the decision and the reasons will be placed in the personnel file.
- 4. A regular employee who has successfully completed the employee's introductory period may, in accordance with the Court System Conflict Resolution Dismissal or Reduction in Force policy, file a grievance regarding a reduction in force.
- E. Preference for Reemployment
  - 1. Prior to termination, an employee being terminated due to reduction in force has the right to transfer to a vacant position being filled for which the employee is qualified. If more than one employee requests a transfer to a vacant position, the appointing authority will select the candidate.
  - 2. Within two years after an employee has been terminated as a result of a reduction in force, the employee will be considered an internal employee for the purpose of applying for a position for which the employee is qualified.
  - 3. An employee who is transferred or rehired under this section to a lower classification will be placed at a step in the lower classification consistent with the employee's years of service in the terminated position.

Approved by the Supreme Court 4/1/12