

# Total Compensation Study

State Bar of California

Office of the Chief Trial Counsel

Phase I

May 10, 2016

SUBMITTED BY:

CPS HR  CONSULTING

***Jill Engelmann, Principal Consultant***

241 Lathrop Way  
Sacramento, CA 95815  
t: 916-263-3600 f: 916-263-3613  
[www.cpsr.us](http://www.cpsr.us)



# Table of Contents

Project Scope and Work Plan .....	4
Compensation Study Parameters .....	5
Survey Results .....	12
Supplemental Survey Components .....	16
Appendix A –Labor Market Data Sheets.....	19
Appendix B –Benefits Summary Tables .....	32

## Background/Introduction

The State Bar of California (State Bar) retained CPS HR Consulting (CPS HR) to conduct an agency-wide classification and total compensation study for *all* positions. This project was divided into two phases, with the first phase including all positions in the Office of the Chief Trial Counsel (OCTC) and the second phase including all remaining positions in the State Bar. This report is limited to the total compensation study portion of Phase I; the details of the classification study have been provided in a separate report.

The purpose of the study was to: (i) collect and analyze salary and benefits data for classifications identified as benchmarks within the classification structure proposed in the classification study, (ii) to determine how competitive the State Bar is in its labor market, and (iii) to provide salary recommendations for all classifications in the proposed classification structure. This Draft Total Compensation Report outlines the project scope and work plan, the methodologies utilized in data collection and analysis, and an overview of the results of the labor market base as well as the total compensation analyses.

## Project Scope and Work Plan

---

In order to complete the total compensation study, the following tasks were conducted:

1. Reviewed background materials provided in the pre-proposal meeting and by the State Bar’s project representative. Materials reviewed included organization charts, position listings, classification specifications, and salary schedules.
2. Conducted project initiation meetings with the Chief Operating Officer; Human Resources Director; the Budget and Performance Analyst, who served as the client’s point of contact for the study; the Chief Trial Counsel; and other members of OCTC management to ensure a comprehensive understanding of the study goals, objectives, and to receive their comments, feedback, and concerns with respect to the study and the process.
3. The review and finalization of the project scope, including the determination of the survey classifications (benchmark classifications) and the labor market agencies to be surveyed.
4. Confirmation of the elements of total compensation and other data to be collected, and development of the survey instrument.
  - The survey instrument included a brief description of each classification and requested the monthly minimum and maximum salary for each class. The survey form also requested information on various components of total compensation including cash add-ons, health and welfare benefits, premium pays, retirement practices, and leave benefits. The CPS HR project team researched information provided on each survey agency’s website, including class specifications, budget documents, salary schedules, Memoranda of Understanding (MOUs), benefits summaries, organization charts, and other related documentation in order to accurately complete as much of the survey instrument for each survey agency as possible.
  - Where information was not available, the survey instrument was sent to the identified contact at the survey agency with a request that they complete the missing information and/or provide documents that contained the missing information.
5. Based upon a detailed review of the submitted data and to ensure the data was accurate, the CPS HR consultants contacted each labor market agency and requested clarification on compensation or benefits issues.
6. Preparation of this draft report for the State Bar’s review and comments.

CPS HR will prepare a Final Total Compensation Report once the State Bar has had an opportunity to review and provide feedback on this Draft Total Compensation Report.

## Compensation Study Parameters

---

The first step in conducting this total compensation survey was to determine the basic parameters for the survey, which included:

- Confirmation of State Bar’s compensation policy
- Labor market agencies
- Survey classifications
- Scope of the survey

### State Bar’s Compensation Policy

The State Bar’s compensation policy is a reflection of the State Bar’s goals and objectives in recruiting and retaining qualified staff to manage and perform the functions necessary to conduct the State Bar’s business. The selection of labor market agencies and the labor market position (the point in the labor market at which the State Bar wishes to set its salaries, e.g., market median, mean, or another percentile) are two important policy decisions when developing a compensation plan. As determined through discussions with the Chief Operating Officer, the Human Resources Director, and the Budget and Performance Analyst, the State Bar does not currently have a formalized compensation policy. Given the fact that the State Bar’s compensation policy has not been formalized, CPS HR has provided labor market data based on the median. The labor market median, which is the “middle” of the market, is the data point at which half of the complete range of data is higher, and half of the complete range of data is lower. CPS HR recommends that management within the State Bar work together to establish a formal compensation policy before moving forward with any compensation decisions or actions based on the results of this report.

### Labor Market Agencies

The scope of work included CPS HR consultant identification and recommendation of an appropriate labor market. The determination of an appropriate labor market involves the application of the selection criteria outlined below:

- **Agency Size** – In general, agencies that employ relatively similar numbers of employees may have similar economic demographics. Since it is not possible to find agencies that are exactly the same in terms of this particular selection criteria, the goal is to provide a balanced mix of larger and smaller agencies, thereby minimizing the “skewing” effect when either of these are used exclusively.
- **Geographic Proximity** – When considering a labor market, it is important to consider the geographic proximity of potential agencies, since they may be competitors in the recruitment market for most of the State Bar’s employees. If there are not enough agencies

within the local market with which to conduct a study, then the geographic area may be expanded to include agencies in other closer counties. Since some agencies provide specialized services, or may be surveying higher-level management classes, the recruitment area may be further expanded to include more regional, or even statewide agencies.

- **Industry** – In general, agencies that provide the same types of services are more likely to have similar types of job classes, and are more likely to be recruiting from the same applicant pool as State Bar. For those reasons, the labor market agencies selected should comprise state and local government agencies which include departments responsible for services comparable to those provided by the State Bar.
- **Competing Agencies** – Information regarding the agencies that the State Bar frequently competes with for talent (i.e., has lost employees to or recruited employees from). is also useful in selecting the labor market agencies.

In addition to the above selection criteria, particularly when surveying organizations in different geographic regions, it is important to consider any significant cost of living and cost of wage differences that may exist between the cities these agencies are situated, in and the cities of Los Angeles and San Francisco where the State Bar is located. For that reason, for each of the recommended labor market agencies, CPS HR has identified the following based upon research of a database compiled by the Economic Research Institute (ERI):

- **Cost of Living Differences** – This index measures the differences in the cost-of-living between the location of the State Bar offices and the city in which the comparable agency is located.
- **Cost of Wage (COW) Differences** – This index measures the difference in the cost of wages between the locations of the State Bar offices and the city in which the comparable agency is located. This index is often used as a market indicator because it is a more accurate and stable reflection of the relative cost of wages between different geographic locations. While some locations may have a much higher cost of living, the actual difference in cost of wages rarely reflects such large differences. The table on the following page identifies the difference in cost of wages (in terms of percentage difference) between the listed agency and Los Angeles and San Francisco. For example, the cost of wages in Alameda County is 9.1% greater than Los Angeles and 4.2% lower than San Francisco. Within the local and expanded market, we consider the cost of wage differences to be balanced and within acceptable parameters.

Based upon the selection criteria outlined, Table 1 presents the labor market agencies selected to be included in the salary survey.

**Table 1**  
**State Bar of California**  
**Labor Market Agency General Information**

	Agency	Population	Agency FTEs	Legal Dept. FTEs	Legal Departments	Los Angeles Base COW Difference	San Francisco Base COW Difference
1	Alameda County	1,610,921	9,500	560	Public Defender District Attorney General Counsel	9.1	-4.2
2	Alameda County Superior Court	1,610,921	729		General Counsel	9.1	-4.2
3	California Judicial Council (San Francisco)		754	754	California Judicial Counsel	13	0
4	City of Anaheim	351,433	1,915	33	City Attorney	-0.5	-10.6
5	City of Long Beach	473,577	5,235	106	City Attorney City Prosecutor	-0.2	-10.5
6	City of Los Angeles	3,928,864	32,562	850	City Attorney	0	-10.3
7	City of Oakland	413,577	4,113	74	City Attorney	9.1	-4.2
8	City of San Jose	1,015,785	5,945	77	City Attorney	9.4	-0.5
9	City/County of San Francisco	852,469	30,011	733	City Attorney Public Defender District Attorney	13	0.0
10	Los Angeles County	10,116,705	106,807	4,185	Public Defender District Attorney General Counsel	0	-10.3
11	Los Angeles County Superior Court	10,116,705	4,437	Data Not Available	Data Not Available	0	-10.3
12	Los Angeles Unified School District	10,116,705	59,563	Data Not Available	Legal Services	0	-10.3
13	Orange County	3,145,515	16,148	1,272	Public Defender District Attorney General Counsel	-0.6	-8.7
14	San Francisco County Superior Court	852,469	462	Data Not Available	Data Not Available	13	0
15	Santa Clara County	1,894,605	16,917	939	Public Defender District Attorney General Counsel	9.4	-0.5
16	State of California, Executive Branch	38,800,000	Data Not Available	4,072	Office of the Attorney General	N/A	N/A

Because the State Bar also competes for talent with private sector agencies in the San Francisco and Los Angeles labor markets for all benchmark classifications, CPS HR also collected private

sector base salary data for the cities of San Francisco and Los Angeles for the survey classifications through the Economic Research Institute’s (ERI) database.

## Survey Classifications

To ensure adequate benchmark data was collected from the labor market agencies, the classifications listed below were surveyed.

TABLE 2 STATE BAR OF CALIFORNIA TOTAL COMPENSATION SURVEY SURVEY CLASSIFICATIONS
Assistant Chief Trial Counsel
Chief Trial Counsel
Customer Services Representative ( <i>currently Complaint Analyst I</i> )
Director of Central Administration
Investigator II
Legal Secretary II
Paralegal
Secretary II/Administrative Assistant I
Senior Attorney

The following provides an overview of information the State Bar should be aware of when reviewing the data collected for the survey classifications. The definitions provided below for each survey classification are primarily based on information collected from the classification study (the Position Description Questionnaires and interviews).

- **Assistant Chief Trial Counsel** – The matches reflect management-level classifications with responsibility for planning, organizing, directing, and managing the operations of one or more divisions within a department, which includes managing the work of attorneys, investigators, and other staff; and directing the evaluation, investigation, and prosecution or litigation of complaints and/or other legal matters. Matches require active membership in the California State Bar.
- **Chief Trial Counsel** – The matches reflect executive management-level classifications reporting to a Chief Executive Officer and/or a Board of Trustees with responsibility for directing and managing the overall activities of a legal department, which includes serving as a member of an executive management team; overseeing the development and implementation of policies, procedures, strategic plans, systems, and related initiatives consistent with the mission and operational standards of the agency; and overseeing the

preparation and administration of the department budget and management of attorneys, investigators, and other staff, including management and supervisory levels. Matches require active membership in the California State Bar.

- **Customer Services Representative (Currently Complaint Analyst I)** – The matches reflect journey-level classifications responsible for receiving and responding to complaints and requests for information from callers and walk-in customers; listening to the customer and determining the services needed; providing requested information regarding department policies, processes, and services; directing customers to the appropriate agency, department, or individual; researching, entering, and retrieving information from a customized database system; and performing other various administrative duties such as preparing and mailing letters.
- **Director of Central Administration** – The matches reflect management-level classifications reporting to a department head, with responsibility for planning, organizing, directing, and managing the administrative processes and procedures of the department; directing and managing, through subordinate supervisory staff, administrative support and technical personnel, including Administrative Assistants, Secretaries, Legal Secretaries, and records staff; assisting in the preparation and administration of the department budget; and developing and implementing policies, procedures, systems, and related initiatives.
- **Investigator II** – The matches reflect journey-level classifications responsible for investigating complaints or charges made by the general public, courts, law enforcement, and other parties; determining when evidence is needed to support or dispute the allegations; collecting evidence, ordering case files and insurance files, and issuing subpoenas; researching case and statutory law; locating and interviewing witnesses, respondents, and other relevant parties; and appearing as a witness in administrative, civil, or criminal proceedings if necessary. Note: classifications requiring the Peace Officer Standards and Training certification were not considered a match.
- **Legal Secretary** – The matches reflect journey-level classifications responsible for performing specialized legal secretarial duties, which may include proofing and filing legal pleadings; typing and assembling contracts, legal memoranda, letter opinions, proposals, and/or other documents for filing in state or federal courts; checking the accuracy of legal citations and overseeing the production and distribution of legal documents; reviewing and routing incoming correspondence, law journals, advance sheets, and other legal materials; calendaring court appearances and making appointments; creating and maintaining legal files; screening and routing phone calls; and assisting in the preparation for committee or other meetings, and preparing and distributing notices, agendas, materials, and minutes.
- **Paralegal** – The matches reflect journey-level, para-professional classifications responsible for assisting with case planning, development, and management; performing legal research,

including statutory; interviewing clients; analyzing legal documents and collecting, compiling, and using technical information to make recommendations to an attorney; drafting legal documents, formal discovery requests, notices, interrogatories, motions, and summaries of depositions and court transcripts and witness testimony; locating and contacting witnesses and arranging for the interview and evaluation of witnesses; and assisting with the preparation of witness testimony.

- **Secretary II/Administrative Assistant I** – The matches reflect journey-level clerical classifications responsible for providing clerical and office support, which includes proofreading, collating, tracking, and/or distributing documents; entering data into and retrieving data from an electronic database, verifying that information is entered correctly; completing forms; photocopying, sorting, faxing, and scanning documents; using macros to populate standard letters and memos; creating and maintaining files; drafting non-standard correspondence under direction; receiving, opening, and distributing mail; answering phones and emails, and/or monitoring and forwarding voicemails; running reports; entering, sorting, and filtering data in spreadsheets; and transcribing voicemails, interviews, and/or other media.
- **Senior Attorney** – The matches reflect advanced-journey/lead level attorney classifications responsible for the most complex and difficult cases, trials, and projects; which includes having lead responsibility and serving as “lead chair” on all matters that proceed to trial; providing substantive and technical leadership, project and case management; independently researching, interpreting, and applying legal principles of the most complex nature within the assigned work area. Undertakes and oversees the preparation and presentation of the most significant investigation, trials, research, and other. In survey agencies with multiple levels within the attorney classification series, CPS HR matched the highest, non-supervisory level. Matches require active membership in the California State Bar.

Note: When identifying matches for Assistant Chief Trial Counsel, Chief Trial Counsel, and Senior Attorney, all counties surveyed and the City of Long Beach have comparable classifications in both the litigation area (County Counsel’s or City Attorney’s Office) and the criminal prosecution area (District Attorney’s or Prosecuting Attorney’s Office). Therefore, CPS HR collected data for both areas (litigation and prosecution) and created two separate data sheets for each of the three classifications.

## Survey Scope

The data collected from each agency included:

- General information regarding salary plan structure and future cost of living increases
- Title of each comparable classification
- Minimum and maximum monthly salaries for each comparable class
- Cash add-ons, including: deferred compensation, longevity pay, certification or educational incentive pay, transportation subsidies, and retirement pickup
- Tuition reimbursement

Details of employer health programs including:

- Cafeteria plan practices
- Employer contribution to most commonly used medical, dental, and vision plans
- Employee contribution to most commonly used medical, dental, and vision plans
- Employer retirement practices, including:
  - Type of program offered
  - Benefit offered (e.g., 2%@55, etc.), if applicable
  - Benefit formula (e.g., average of three years, single highest year)
  - Any vesting period
  - Agency contribution to the retirement plan
  - Percentage, if any, of employer's portion paid by the employee
- Social security contributions
- Leave practices, including: vacation, sick leave, holidays, and administrative leave

## Survey Results

---

As indicated in the previous section, the survey involved the collection of base salary and total compensation data for the State Bar’s selected benchmark classifications from each of the selected labor market agencies. Detailed results of the base salary and total compensation analyses are presented in the attached labor market data sheets in **Appendix A** of this report. The ERI base salary data collected for the San Francisco and Los Angeles labor markets was included as two additional data points in the labor market data sheets. However, because the ERI database provides base salary only, the ERI data was not included in the total compensation calculations. If CPS HR determined that a survey agency did not have a comparable classification for a particular benchmark classification, based on research and discussions with representatives from the survey agency, the designation of “No Comparable Class” was utilized.

Within the benefits tables, the designation of N/A (not applicable) is used when the particular survey element is not provided by that agency.

When conducting a salary survey, the intent is to provide general market trends. When identifying comparable classifications within the survey agencies, CPS HR compared the span of control; nature of the work, duties, and responsibilities; and knowledge, skills, and abilities requirements to determine whether these are comparable enough to utilize as a match. CPS HR places less emphasis on the minimum qualifications, such as years of experience required, as these requirements are often arbitrary. With a balanced labor market and the use of whole job analysis, it is reasonable to assume that while some matches will have slightly higher responsibilities and some matches will have slightly lower responsibilities, the overall scope of duties and responsibilities of the combined matches will be balanced. The use of the labor market median as the market comparison point further minimizes the possibility of data being skewed by higher or lower paying agencies.

To provide the State Bar with a summary of study results, Table 3 (base salary analysis) and Table 4 (total compensation analysis) display the following information:

- The title of the State Bar’s survey classifications
- The State Bar’s maximum monthly salary for the survey classification<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> Note: State Bar employees in all classifications surveyed, except for Senior Attorney work a 36.25 hours per week schedule, while employees in all survey agencies (except for City of Oakland) work a 40 hours per week schedule. Consequently, in order to make a like comparison between the salaries of State Bar and the salaries of the survey agencies, the State Bar salaries were converted to a 40 hour per week equivalent. The formula used by CPS HR to convert the salaries of all State Bar classifications, except for Senior Attorney, was: actual monthly salary X 12 = actual annual salary. Actual annual salary/1885 hours per year (36.25 hours per week X 52 weeks) = actual hourly rate. Actual hourly rate X 2080 hours per year (40 X 52 weeks) = converted annual salary. Converted annual salary/12 = converted monthly salary. City of Oakland employees work a 37.5 hours per week schedule. Consequently, City of Oakland salaries were converted using the same formula, except that 1950 hours per year was used instead of 1885 hours per year.

- The number of comparable classes identified within the analysis
- The labor market median monthly maximum salary – this calculation is based upon the maximum monthly salary for each of the comparable classes; the middle of that range of data is then computed to provide the median amount
- The percentage that the State Bar’s converted maximum monthly salary for the survey classification is above or below the median of the labor market; this number indicates what percentage of the State Bar’s salary is required to move it up or down to the market median.

## Base Salary Results

**TABLE 3**  
**State Bar of California**  
**Base Salary Compensation Results**

Classification	State Bar Maximum Base Salary (Converted to 40 hour/week equivalent)	# of matches	Labor Market Median	% State Bar Above or Below Labor Market Median
Assistant Chief Trial Counsel (Litigation)	\$15,815	15	\$18,274	-15.55%
Assistant Chief Trial Counsel (Prosecution)	\$15,815	12	\$18,112	-14.52%
Chief Trial Counsel (Litigation)	\$21,065	15	\$20,734	1.57%
Chief Trial Counsel (Prosecution)	\$21,065	13	\$21,576	-2.43%
Customer Service Representative (Complaint Analyst I)	\$7,295	9	\$4,901	32.82%
Director of Administration	\$14,173	17	10,482	26.04%
Investigator II	\$8,817	16	\$8,215	6.42%
Legal Secretary II	\$7,040	14	\$5,795	17.69%
Paralegal	\$8,025	15	\$6,679	16.77%
Secretary II/Administrative Assistant I	\$6,004	17	\$4,046	32.61%
Senior Attorney (Litigation)	\$13,124	18	\$14,344	-9.30%
Senior Attorney (Prosecution)	\$13,124	12	\$14,481	-10.34%

**Overall  
Average %  
Above/Below** **6.82%**

Analysis of the base salary data indicates that, on average, the State Bar is 6.82% above the labor market median for all survey classes included within the scope of the study.

## Total Compensation Results

In addition to base salary survey results, a total compensation analysis was conducted for all survey classes. This analysis reflects how each classification compares against matched positions in the market once the base salary and the value of cash supplements (such as deferred compensation and retirement pickup) and agency contributions to health and insurance programs are taken into consideration. A summary of the results is displayed in Table 4, which follows the same format as displayed in Table 3.

**TABLE 4**  
**State Bar of California**  
**Total Compensation Results**

Classification	State Bar Maximum Total Compensation	# of matches	Labor Market Median	% State Bar Above or Below Labor Market Median
Assistant Chief Trial Counsel (Litigation)	\$21,232	13	\$24,751	-16.57%
Assistant Chief Trial Counsel (Prosecution)	\$21,232	10	\$24,647	-16.08%
Chief Trial Counsel (Litigation)	\$27,081	13	\$26,782	1.10%
Chief Trial Counsel (Prosecution)	\$27,081	11	\$28,521	-5.32%
Customer Service Representative (Complaint Analyst I)	\$10,185	7	\$7,223	28.88%
Director of Administration	\$19,403	15	\$15,923	17.94%
Investigator II	\$11,945	14	\$12,383	-3.66%
Legal Secretary II	\$9,855	12	\$8,730	11.41%
Paralegal	\$11,014	13	\$9,229	16.20%
Secretary II/Administrative Assistant I	\$8,637	15	\$6,872	20.43%
Senior Attorney (Litigation)	\$17,658	16	\$18,253	-3.37%
Senior Attorney (Prosecution)	\$17,658	10	\$19,356	-9.62%

**Overall  
Average %  
Above/Below**

**3.45%**

On average, for all survey classifications the State Bar is 3.45% above the labor market median for total compensation. In summary, when the value of cash supplements and contributions to health insurance programs was factored in, the State Bar lost approximately 3.4% within the labor market (moving from an average of 6.82% above the labor market median for base salary to an average of 3.45% above the labor market median for total compensation). The greatest contributing factors to the State Bar's loss in the labor market based on total compensation is the State Bar's contribution to retirement.

## Supplemental Survey Components

---

In addition to the base salary and total compensation data collected for the survey, CPS HR collected the following information displayed in the tables presented in **Appendix B**.

- **Table B1 – General Information.** Each agency was asked to provide information regarding the number of employees, the salary plan structure (steps or open range), the number of hours full-time employees work in a week, the date of the next cost of living increase, and the amount of the next cost of living increase. Only six out of the 16 agencies surveyed indicated the date and amount of the next cost of living increase.
- **Table B2 - Retirement Practices.** Each agency was asked to provide information on the type of retirement system the agency has in place: any retirement pick-up on behalf of the employee and the retirement benefit and formula for employees hired after December 31, 2013, the employer contribution to the retirement system, and social security practices. None of the agencies surveyed pay a portion of (pick up) the employee’s contribution. CPS HR used the employer retirement contribution for all employees in the total compensation calculation. The State Bar’s employer contribution rate for their retirement system is lower than all of the agencies surveyed, with the exception of the City of San Jose.
- **Table B3 – Cafeteria Plan, Medical, Dental, and Vision Insurance Practices.** Each agency was asked to provide their practices with regard to the maximum monthly amount paid by the employer to a cafeteria plan and/or to the most commonly selected medical, dental, and vision insurance plans for full family coverage. The State Bar’s maximum employer contribution to the most commonly selected medical, dental, and vision insurance plans is below the median maximum contribution of \$1,725 for general employees and above the median maximum contribution for attorneys and executive employees.
- **Table B4 – Deferred Compensation, Longevity Pay, Education Reimbursement, and Educational Incentive.** Each agency was asked to provide their practices with regard to agency contributions to deferred compensation programs, any longevity pay available to employees, education (tuition) reimbursement benefits, and any educational incentive pay available to employees. Six of the agencies surveyed provide an employer contribution to deferred compensation for some employee groups. The State Bar does not provide an employer contribution to deferred compensation. Five of the agencies surveyed provide longevity compensation. CPS HR used the longevity pay provided at ten years of employment in the total compensation calculation. Thirteen of the agencies surveyed provide some form of education (tuition) reimbursement. The State Bar does not provide any education (tuition) reimbursement benefits. None of the agencies surveyed identified any educational incentives available to employees.

- **Table B5 – Certification Pay, Incentive/Bonus Pay, Public Transit Reimbursement and Bilingual Pay Practices.** Each agency was asked to provide their practices with regard to any certification pay, incentive/bonus pay, transit reimbursement, and bilingual pay available to employees. Only the City of Long Beach and the County of Santa Clara offer certification pay. None of the agencies surveyed offer incentive/bonus pay. Four of the survey agencies offer public transit pay, and nearly all (15 out of 16) agencies provide some form of bilingual pay.
- **Table B6 – Vacation Accrual Rates.** Each agency was asked to provide their practices with regard to the amount of vacation accrued and the maximum accrual at 1 and 10 years, as well as the year of service for maximum accrual. Each agency was also asked to provide their practices/policies with regard to vacation cash-out. The State Bar’s vacation accrual rates are comparable to the vacation accrual rates for the agencies surveyed.
- **Table B7 - Additional Leave Practices.** Each agency was asked to provide their practices with regard to accrual rate and cash-out policy for sick leave, the number of holidays and floating holidays, and administrative leave. The number of days of sick leave accrued by attorneys and general employees at the State Bar is slightly below the median. The number of scheduled holidays and floating holidays provided by the State Bar for attorneys and general employees is above the median number of scheduled and floating holidays provided by the agencies surveyed. Ten of the surveyed agencies offer some form of administrative leave to some employees.

