

**FY21 Budget Performance Review**

**Supreme Court - 677**

**Lead Administrator: Jari Askins**

**Lead Financial Officer: Marilyn Anderson**

**Agency Mission**

To provide fair and impartial justice for all

**Division and Program Descriptions**

**Division or Program Number and Name**

**Administrative Services**

The Administrative Director and staff assist the Chief Justice in the administrative duties of the Oklahoma judicial system, including accounting, payroll, training, data systems, research and other responsibilities. The Administrative Office of the Court also provides leadership and administrative support for various judicial boards and commissions.

**Justices & Staff**

The Supreme Court makes final determination of issues of a civil nature. The Supreme Court has administrative responsibility for the entire Oklahoma judicial system. Support staff is responsible for handling Justice's calendars, preparing dockets for Conferences and circulating proposed opinions and orders. Staff attorneys aid the Justices in research and drafting proposed opinions.

**Supreme Court Clerk**

As the Court's record-keeper the Clerk maintains official hearing records, operates recording and timing equipment and ensures that proper courtroom procedures are preserved. The Clerk's office maintains operational contact with the parties and attorneys for all cases and is the repository for all filings made in connection with any case. The Clerk also serves as the Clerk of the Court of Criminal Appeals, the Court of Civil Appeals, the Court of the Judiciary and the Court of Tax Review.

**Court of Civil Appeals**

Responsible for the majority of appellate decisions, with offices in Oklahoma City and Tulsa

**Alternative Dispute Resolution**

Administers the Dispute Resolution Act providing convenient access to conflict resolution (mediation) services to Oklahoma citizens using certified volunteer mediators. It also promulgates rules and establishes jurisdictional guidelines for mediation programs.

**Management Information Services**

Responsible for the Oklahoma Supreme Court Network (OSCN), designed to provide the public and the Bar with access to the public legal documents of the state of Oklahoma. Media, business and private entities all benefit from the information provided by OSCN at no cost. OSCN provides access to thousands of published Oklahoma appellate cases, statutes, Attorney General's opinions, certiorari dispositions, court rules, forms, and many other documents.

**FY'20 Budgeted Department Funding By Source**

Dept. #	Department Name	Appropriations	Federal	Revolving	Local <sup>1</sup>	Other <sup>2</sup>	Total
0100001	Justices and Staff	6,137,841		32,500			\$6,170,341
0200001	Administrative Office of the Courts	2,490,946	800,000	4,204,069			\$7,495,015
3000001	Court of Civil Appeals - OKC	3,214,000					\$3,214,000
3000002	Court of Civil Appeals - Tulsa	3,275,710					\$3,275,710
4000001	Alternative Dispute Resolution			1,371,357			\$1,371,357
8000001	Supreme Court Clerk	882,950		74,500			\$957,450
8800002	Management Information Services			16,945,504			\$16,945,504
							\$0
<b>Total</b>		<b>\$16,001,447</b>	<b>\$800,000</b>	<b>\$22,627,930</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$39,429,377</b>

1. Please describe source of Local funding not included in other categories:
2. Please describe source(s) and % of total of "Other" funding if applicable:

**FY'19 Carryover by Funding Source**

	Appropriations	Federal	Revolving	Local <sup>1</sup>	Other <sup>2</sup>	Total
Carryover	\$663,172	\$0	\$10,319,700	\$0	\$0	\$10,982,872
	\$0					\$0

1. Please describe source of Local funding not included in other categories:
2. Please describe source(s) and % of total of "Other" funding if applicable:

**What changes did the agency make between FY'19 and FY'20?**

- 1.) Are there any services no longer provided because of budget cuts?  
None
- 2.) What services are provided at a higher cost to the user?  
None
- 3.) What services are still provided but with a slower response rate?  
None
- 4.) Did the agency provide any pay raises that were not legislatively/statutorily required?  
Yes

FY21 Budget Performance Review							
Supreme Court - 677							
Lead Administrator: Jari Askins				Lead Financial Officer: Marilyn Anderson			
FY'21 Requested Funding By Department and Source							
Dept. #	Department Name	Appropriations	Federal	Revolving	Other <sup>1</sup>	Total	% Change
0100001	Justices and Staff	\$6,562,904	\$0	\$32,500	\$0	\$6,595,404	6.89%
0200001	Administrative Office of the Courts	\$2,490,946	\$800,000	\$4,329,006	\$0	\$7,619,952	1.67%
3000001	Court of Civil Appeals - OKC	\$3,214,000	\$0	\$39,904	\$0	\$3,253,904	1.24%
3000002	Court of Civil Appeals - Tulsa	\$3,275,710	\$0	\$40,486	\$0	\$3,316,196	1.24%
4000001	Alternative Dispute Resolution	\$0	\$0	\$1,408,865	\$0	\$1,408,865	2.74%
8000001	Supreme Court Clerk	\$882,950	\$0	\$74,500	\$0	\$957,450	0.00%
8800002	Management Information Services	\$0	\$0	\$17,879,368	\$0	\$17,879,368	5.51%
<b>Total</b>		<b>\$16,426,510</b>	<b>\$800,000</b>	<b>\$23,804,629</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$41,031,139</b>	<b>4.06%</b>
1. Please describe source(s) and % of total of "Other" funding for each depar							
FY'21 Top Five Operational Appropriation Funding Requests							
Request by Priority	Request Description	Appropriation Request Amount (\$)					
Request 1:	Judicial Pay Increase	\$425,063					
Request 2:							
Request 3:							
Request 4:							
Request 5:							
<b>Top Five Request Subtotal:</b>						<b>\$425,063</b>	
<b>Total Increase above FY-20 Budget (including all requests)</b>						<b>\$ 425,063</b>	
Difference between Top Five requests and total requests:						\$0	
Does the agency have any costs associated with the Pathfinder retirement system and federal employees?							
No							
How would the agency be affected by receiving the same appropriation for FY '21 as was received in FY '20? (Flat/ 0% change)							
Service will be provided at approximately same level.							
How would the agency handle a 2% appropriation reduction in FY '21?							
A reduction in appropriations would not allow the Court to replace staff reduced by budget cuts in the last few years.							
Is the agency seeking any fee increases for FY '21?							
						Fee Increase Request (\$)	Statutory change required? (Yes/No)
Increase 1	No						
Increase 2							
What are the agency's top 2-3 capital or technology (one-time) requests, if applicable?							
						Appropriated Amount (\$)	Submitted to LRCPC? (Yes/No)
Priority 1	None						
Priority 2							
Priority 3							
Federal Funds							
CFDA	Federal Program Name	Agency Dept.	FY 20 budgeted	FY 19	FY 18	FY 17	FY 16
	Court Improvement Project	200005	800,000	800,000	800,000	750,000	750,000
Federal Government Impact							
1.) How much federal money received by the agency is tied to a mandate by the Federal Government? None							
2.) Are any of those funds inadequate to pay for the federal mandate? n/a							
3.) What would the consequences be of ending all of the federal funded programs for your agency? We would no longer be able to fund the Court Improvement Project							
4.) How will your agency be affected by federal budget cuts in the coming fiscal year? Unless the available funding is reduced by a large amount it will not affect the Court Improvement Project							
5.) Has the agency requested any additional federal earmarks or increases? No							
FY'20 Budgeted FTE							
Division #	Division Name	Supervisors	Classified	Unclassified	\$0 - \$35 K	\$35 K - \$70 K	\$70 K - \$\$\$
0200001	Administration	6		20		13	7
0100001	Justices & Staff	2		40		7	33
8000001	Supreme Court Clerk	1		10		9	1
3000001	Court of Appeals - OKC	1		21		4	17
3000002	Court of Appeals - Tulsa	1		22		4	18
4000001	Alternative Dispute Resolution	1		2		1	1
8800002	MIS	7		64		43	21
<b>Total</b>		<b>19</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>179</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>81</b>	<b>98</b>

FY21 Budget Performance Review						
Supreme Court - 677						
Lead Administrator: Jari Askins				Lead Financial Officer: Marilyn Anderson		
FTE History						
Division #	Division Name	2020 Budgeted	2019	2018	2016	2011
	ALL FTE	179.0	184.0	181.0	185.0	184.0
<b>Total</b>		<b>179.0</b>	<b>184.0</b>	<b>181.0</b>	<b>185.0</b>	<b>184.0</b>
Performance Measure Review						
Program Name	FY 19	FY 18	FY 17	FY 16	FY 15	
The Courts do not have performance measures						
Revolving Funds (200 Series Funds)						
<i>Please provide fund number, fund name, description, and revenue source</i>	FY'17-19 Avg. Revenues		FY'17-19 Avg. Expenditures		June '19 Balance	
<b>Fund number: Fund name</b>						
200 Information Systems Revolving Fund	\$14,255,385		\$16,983,104		\$6,753,200	
205 Supreme Court Revolving Fund	\$0		\$32,734		\$106,797	
210 Supreme Court Administrative Revolving Fund	\$0		\$1,967,596		\$2,910,553	
215 Law Library Revolving Fund	\$1,893,301		\$2,095,999		\$1,187,737	
220 Alternative Dispute Resolution Revolving Fund (new)	\$0		\$0		\$0	
230 State Judicial Revolving Fund	\$49,553,889		\$49,414,829		\$424,297	
240 Judicial Center Revolving Fund	\$2,503		\$1,130		\$6,080	