

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7 IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
8 FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
9

10 RALPH COLEMAN, et al.,

11 Plaintiffs, No. CIV S-90-0520 LKK JFM P

12 vs.

13 ARNOLD SCHWARZENEGGER, et al.,

O R D E R

14 Defendants.

15 \_\_\_\_\_/  
16 The draft version of the Special Master's 16th report on  
17 compliance contained a recommendation that the defendants be  
18 required to develop within 30 days a plan for the enhancement of  
19 compensation paid to California Department of Corrections and  
20 Rehabilitation (CDCR) mental health clinicians and clinical  
21 supervisors to make their salaries competitive with comparable  
22 positions in the private sector and/or comparable categories of  
23 CDCR's medical staff. The draft also set forth the reasons in  
24 some detail. Subsequently, the court has received various  
25 comments and an amicus brief, and finally, the court has received  
26 the special master's final report.

1 By virtue thereof, the court now orders as follows:

2 1) The defendants shall assess and develop a plan to meet  
3 the issues created by the disparity in pay for DMH clinicians  
4 providing mental health services to CDCR inmates in CDCR  
5 institutions and those providing services to CDCR inmates in all  
6 other DMH institutions. The defendants shall submit to the court  
7 the product of such an assessment and a corresponding plan within  
8 60 days of adoption of this order.

9 2) The assessment shall set forth the experience of DMH in  
10 filling its relevant vacancies over the last three (3) years.

11 3) The defendants shall submit monthly reports to the  
12 Special Master on staffing and staffing vacancies in all DMH  
13 hospitals with programs providing mental health services to CDCR  
14 inmates until such time as the pay differential issue has been  
15 resolved.

16 IT IS SO ORDERED.

17 DATED: February 6, 2007.

18  
19   
20 LAWRENCE K. KARLTON  
21 SENIOR JUDGE  
22 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
23  
24  
25  
26