



A Legislative Summary Document Regarding
Office of Court Administration

Contents
Key Findings from Previous Audits and Reviews
Most Recent Performance Measure Certification
Quality Assurance Team Reviews
Information System Vulnerability Assessments
Travel Expenditures

Prepared for the 78th Legislature
by the State Auditor's Office

January 2003

SAO No. 03-351

This is not an audit report and, with the exception of any audit report summaries, the material in this document has not been subjected to all of the tests and confirmations performed in an audit.

Office of Court Administration

SAO Contact: Julie Ivie
(512) 936-9500

Key Findings from Previous Audits and Reviews

January 1, 2001–December 31, 2002

An Audit Report on 19 Agencies' Compliance With Historically Underutilized Business Requirements

(Report No. 01-035, August 2001)

Self-reported information received from the Office of Court Administration (Office) indicates that the Office did not comply with certain provisions of the Historically Underutilized Business (HUB) regulations identified in the Texas Administrative Code (TAC) and Chapters 111 and 2161 of the Texas Government Code in fiscal year 2000. However, we determined that the Office made a “good-faith effort” to comply with TAC and the Texas Government Code.

Results of Entity Compliance With Historically Underutilized Business (HUB) Requirements - Fiscal Year 2000				
Compliance Requirement				Did the Entity Make a “Good-Faith Effort”? ^b
Planning	Outreach ^a	Reporting	Subcontracting	
No material noncompliance	Unable to identify HUB Coordinator job responsibilities to comply with TAC, Section 111.26 Did not sponsor HUB forums (TAC, Section 111.27)	No material noncompliance	No process to determine if contractors are making a “good-faith effort” (TAC, Section 111.14)	Yes

^a Most of the agencies had not developed and implemented a mentor protégé program during fiscal year 2000. Of the HUB requirements, the mentor protégé program requirement had the latest effective date (June 2000). The agencies indicated there was not enough time to design and implement the program in the last quarter of the fiscal year.

^b The State Auditor’s Office, in consultation with the General Services Commission, determined that an entity did not make a “good-faith effort” if it had noncompliance in at least three of the four basic HUB areas: planning, outreach, reporting, and subcontracting. (The General Services Commission was abolished effective September 1, 2001, and the newly created Texas Building and Procurement Commission subsequently assumed most of its responsibilities.)

Status of Corrective Action: In December 2002, the Office reported that it had implemented corrective action on three areas of noncompliance (HUB coordinator, HUB forums, and subcontracting) and partially implemented corrective action on one area of noncompliance (mentor protégé program). This information has not been audited.

Most Recent Performance Measure Certification

Fiscal Year 1998–Fiscal Year 2003

The results of *An Audit on Performance Measures at 11 State Agencies–Phase 13* (Report No. 00-030, May 2000) for this entity are summarized below.

Period	Goal/Strategy	Measure	Certification Results
2000	1 Court Administration	Number of hours of legal research for customers	Inaccurate
2000	1 Court Administration	Number of technology pilot projects initiated	Certified with Qualification
Total Measures Certified Without Qualification^a			0/2 (0%)
Data Reliability Percentage (Certified and Certified with Qualification)			1/2 (50%)

^a The percentage of unqualified certifications is presented because it is used in determining an entity’s eligibility for performance rewards as established in the General Appropriations Act [77th Legislature, Article IX, Sec. 6.31(d)(2)].

Office of Court Administration

SAO Contact: Julie Ivie
(512) 936-9500

Category	Definition
Certified	Reported performance is accurate within +/-5 percent, and controls appear adequate to ensure accurate collection and reporting of performance data.
Certified with Qualification	Reported performance is within +/-5 percent, but the controls over data collection and reporting are not adequate to ensure the continued accuracy of performance data.
Factors Prevent Certification	Actual performance cannot be determined because of inadequate controls and insufficient documentation.
Inaccurate	Reported performance is not within +/-5 percent of actual performance, or there is an error rate of at least 5 percent in the supporting documentation.
Not Applicable	A justifiable reason exists for not reporting performance.

Quality Assurance Team Reviews

Conducted by the Legislative Budget Board and State Auditor's Office

Completed Projects

Quality Assurance Team Annual Report – January 2002

The Office of Court Administration (Office) completed the State Telecommunications Network Infrastructure project at a total cost of \$290,925.

Ongoing Projects

Quality Assurance Team Annual Report – January 2003

Appellate Court Case Management (ACCM) — In September 1997, the Office began to develop and incorporate technology to facilitate data sharing, systems integration, and data aggregation for the Appellate Court Systems (includes Supreme Court and Court of Criminal Appeals) and software applications. The time line and costs have continued to increase because of complexity in the development and rollout of the management system and the amount of personalization required for the Supreme Court and Court of Criminal Appeals. Current expenditures are \$4,130,734.

Appellate Court Technology (ACT) — In September 1998, the Office continued its project to maintain and upgrade a local area network and wide area network for the appellate judicial system. Cost increases are due to the purchase of new workstations and printers. Current expenditures are \$5,719,289.

Trial Court Case Management (TCCM) — The Office began replacing the DOS case management system in February 2001. The Office is coordinating with the Department of Information Resources to establish statewide contracts for courts to use in acquiring case management software and to establish an application service provider arrangement for courts to use. The cost decrease represents a reduction in scope and return to original project time line. Current expenditures are \$190,635.

Trial Court Data Management (TCDM) — February 2001 was the start date for the Office's project to develop an electronic method for the collection and retrieval of trial court statistics and to replace the DOS/Clipper database. Project scope and costs have changed based on requirements definition and guidance from the Judicial Council subcommittee and the Judicial Committee on Information Technology. Current expenditures are \$199,461.

Project	Function	Initial Budget	Current Budget	Budget Change	Initial End Date	Current End Date	Time Change
ACCM	Improve data sharing	\$2,360,244	\$4,495,186	\$2,134,942	08/31/01	08/31/03	24 months
ACT	Maintain and upgrade networks	\$3,848,235	\$7,394,032	\$3,545,797	08/31/01	08/31/03	24 months
TCCM	Replace case management system	\$1,886,264	\$708,694	(\$1,177,570)	08/31/03	08/31/03	None
TCDM	Electronic statistics collection	\$865,753	\$1,148,128	\$282,375	08/31/03	08/31/03	None

Office of Court Administration

SAO Contact: Julie Ivie
(512) 936-9500

Information System Vulnerability Assessments

The State Auditor’s Office (SAO) and/or the Department of Information Resources performed one or more information system vulnerability assessments at the Office of Court Administration between January 2000 and November 2002. Detailed results of this work are confidential under Texas Government Code, Section 2054.077(c). The SAO’s Legislative Summary Document titled “Information System Vulnerability Assessments” provides general information about the results of information system vulnerability assessments.

Travel Expenditures

Travel Expenditures by Appropriation Year (unaudited)			
	2000	2001	2002
In-State Travel	\$ 259,745	\$ 299,344	\$ 336,021
Out-of-State Travel	0	14,627	21,270
Foreign Travel	0	0	0
Other Travel Costs	(749)	0	1,840
Total Travel Expenditures	\$ 258,995	\$ 313,971	\$ 359,131
Limit on Travel Expenditures (Cap)	263,563	340,914	0 ^a
Expenditures in Excess of Cap	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 21,270^b

^a Caps apply to total travel in appropriation years 2000 and 2001, but caps apply only to out-of-state travel and foreign travel in appropriation year 2002. Caps, calculated by the Comptroller of Public Accounts, have been adjusted for any increases requested by the Office and approved by the Legislative Budget Board in accordance with the General Appropriations Act.

^b The excess expenditures may be reduced or eliminated because the Office is working with the Comptroller of Public Accounts to identify the correct cap amount for appropriation year 2002, in accordance with Article IX, Sec 5.09, of the General Appropriations Act, 76th Legislature.

Source: Uniform Statewide Accounting System (USAS) as of November 30, 2002. Amounts are subject to change as agencies continue to record additional expenditures or adjustments.