

MISSOURI JUDICIARY



FY 2012 BUDGET REQUEST

with Governor's Recommendations

JUDICIAL BUDGET

FISCAL YEAR 2012

HONORABLE WILLIAM RAY PRICE, JR.

THOMAS F. SIMON

Clerk

751-4144

Chief Justice

751-4513

GREGORY LINHARES

State Courts Administrator

751-4377

Supreme Court Building

Jefferson City, Missouri



Supreme Court of Missouri
P. O. Box 150
Jefferson City, Mo. 65102

WILLIAM RAY PRICE, JR.

CHIEF JUSTICE

(573) 751-4513

FAX (573) 751-7365

william.price@courts.mo.gov

January 21, 2011

The Honorable Jay Nixon
Governor of Missouri
State Capitol, Room 216
Jefferson City, Missouri 65101

Dear Governor Nixon:

On behalf of Missouri's Judiciary, I am submitting with this letter our fiscal year 2012 budget.

We understand this year will present financial challenges. Since fiscal year 2009 we have worked with you to achieve necessary withholdings. We will continue to do so, and we remain willing to discuss ways in which we can work together to achieve greater long-term efficiencies as well. As an example, this budget request book has been streamlined to one-half of its previous size, to make it cheaper and simpler to understand.


While we continue to work toward achieving efficiencies, there remain areas in which we request your approval of additional expenditures. Our requests for new expenditures are listed below. They represent core needs and statutory obligations.

1. Federal Executive Order 13166 and the U.S. Department of Justice policy guidelines mandate that courts provide interpreting and translating services to non-English speaking individuals who use the court system in order to have meaningful access to the courts. Failure to provide such services may be a violation of the Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and may result in the loss of future federal grant dollars. We are requesting \$595,740 to meet this need.
2. As required by RSMo 478.320, the budget includes a request for three associate circuit judges, one for each of the following counties: Clay, Polk and Warren. This is the third year we have requested a judgeship for Clay County based on population.

3. We are requesting \$4.9 million to allow drug courts to operate at or near capacity to maximize their benefit. Drug courts are far more efficient and effective than incarceration for their target population.
4. Lastly, we have included a request that will enable us to maximize the federal reimbursement for work done on child support cases. We ask for additional FTE authorization and federal spending authority to fully utilize the circuit courts' federal funds.

We are keenly aware of the state's revenue situation and we are committed to working with you and the General Assembly. In light of the current difficulties, the twenty-three items listed on the following page, while needed, will not be formally requested. I am available to meet with you to discuss the needs of the judiciary and any initiatives we are undertaking. In addition, please feel free to contact Greg Linhares, State Courts Administrator, should you or your staff have a specific budget question.

Sincerely,



William Ray Price, Jr.
Chief Justice

FY12 Judiciary Budgetary Needed but not Requested

HB Section	Decision Item	Description	Funding Source	Dollar Amount	FTE
12.300	State Law Library	The Official State Law Library provides legal research services to all three branches of government, other libraries and the general public.	General Revenue	\$ 200,000	0.00
12.300	Cost of Operations	The cost to maintain the historical Supreme Court building increase each year.	General Revenue	\$ 23,000	0.00
12.300	Judicial Conference	Section 476.330 RSMo directs the Judicial Conference to meet at least once a year. This brings the judges together to develop and make recommendations which is required by this statute.	General Revenue	\$ 125,000	0.00
12.300	Supreme Court Law Clerk Salary and Retention	This provides financial incentive to recruit qualified law students and help retain the existing law clerks.	General Revenue	\$ 70,236	0.00
12.300	Supreme Court Ongoing Computer Upgrades	This would provide funds for a four year replacement cycle for computers.	General Revenue	\$ 51,850	0.00
12.300	National Center of State Courts Dues	It provide specialized assistance and consulting to the courts to assist in providing efficient and effective court administration.	General Revenue	\$ 155,683	0.00
12.305	Cost of Court Technologies	The judiciary leveraged technology to improve the efficiency and effectiveness of the courts. The operational cost of these technologies increases each year as inflation and vendors' rate escalate.	General Revenue	\$ 1,952,987	0.00
12.315	Electronic Court Case Filing Implementation	The existing technologies used for case initiation with some Missouri prosecutors and electronic document management will be expanded to streamline court workflow processes, expedite case management and improve records management statewide.	General Revenue	\$ 1,416,973	0.00
12.315	Juror Service Enhancements	To develop and implement a website to provide potential and sitting jurors with 24-hour access to complete qualification questionnaires, excusals, disqualifications, deferrals, and accept a summons on-line pursuant to state statute.	General Revenue	\$ 250,380	0.00
12.315	Case Management System Migration	The Judiciary has developed and maintains 24 automated applications that integrate with Judicial Information System and will need to be modified to integrate with a new version of the case management.	General Revenue	\$ 2,608,820	0.00
12.320	Increase in the Judicial Education Transfer	Develop and implement training curriculum for Pro se, Drug Court and CourTools training for court personnel.	General Revenue	\$ 275,000	0.00
12.330	Building Manager Repositioning	The Western District's building manager performs and oversees all maintenance and repairs of the Western District's building. The position would be reclassified to be more in line with positions in the state merit system.	General Revenue	\$ 10,788	0.00

FY12 Judiciary Budgetary Needed but not Requested

HB Section	Decision Item	Description	Funding Source	Dollar Amount	FTE
12.330	Building Utility Increase	The Western District is responsible for the maintenance and upkeep of their building. The annualized growth rate of building utilities is 4.48%.	General Revenue	\$ 8,212	0.00
12.330/ 12.335/ 12.340	Appellate Ongoing Computer Upgrades	This would provide funds for a four year replacement cycle for computer.	General Revenue	\$ 129,762	0.00
12.330/ 12.335/ 12.340	Appellate Law Clerk Salary and Retention	This provides financial incentive to recruit qualified law students and help retain the existing law clerks.	General Revenue	\$ 576,121	0.00
12.330/ 12.335/ 12.340	Appellate Security Improvements	Implement security procedures and equipment to achieve a safe and secure environment for citizens and court employees.	General Revenue	\$ 116,666	0.00
12.330/ 12.335/ 12.340	Appellate Law Library	Section 477.150 RSMo, requires the state to pay for the legal research material which the Courts deem necessary to carry out their duties.	General Revenue	\$ 63,461	0.00
12.345	Cost to Implement HB 1550	House Bill 1550, passed in 2008, provides for juvenile court jurisdiction termination age to change from seventeen to eighteen for status offenses.	General Revenue	\$ 3,226,470	27.00
12.345	Clerk Caseload Management	A system of relative case weights is used to develop weighted workload per FTE for each office to allow comparison of offices.	General Revenue	\$ 6,851,164	222.81
12.345	Juvenile Caseload Management	A system of relative case weights is used to develop weighted workload per FTE for each office to allow comparison of offices.	General Revenue	\$ 5,775,821	143.74
12.345	Drug Court Staff	To assist in the expansion of drug court services to circuits that are in the early stages of their drug court programs.	General Revenue	\$ 498,202	8.00
12.345	Reimbursable Family Court Administrator	To assist in the expansion of family court services to circuits that are in the early stages of the family court programs.	General Revenue	\$ 88,548	2.00
12.345	Single County Juvenile Conversion	Per Section 211.393 RSMo, the ten single county circuits have the right to annually request that their county paid juvenile staff be converted to the state payroll. This year the 23rd and 31st Circuit submitted a request.	General Revenue	\$ 5,011,590	125.49
Total General Revenue Needed but not Requested				\$ 29,486,734	529.04

TABLE OF CONTENTS


	<u>Page</u>		<u>Page</u>
Organizational Chart.....	1	Southern District.....	96
Budget Summaries		Core.....	97
State Audit Report.....	2	CIRCUIT COURT.....	108
Programs Subject to Missouri Sunset Act.....	7	Core.....	115
One-Time Request Summary.....	8	Access to Justice Interpreter Services.....	169
Report 1A.....	9	Judgeship Determined by Population.....	179
SUPREME COURT.....	10	Federal FTE Authority Increase.....	184
Core.....	14	DRUG COURTS.....	190
State Courts Administrator.....	28	Drug Courts Coordinating Commission Transfer.....	192
Core.....	31	Core.....	193
Court Improvement Projects.....	37	Drug Court Treatment Expansion Transfer.....	197
Core.....	38	Drug Courts Coordinating Commission.....	202
Statewide Court Automation.....	43	Core.....	203
Core.....	44	Drug Court Treatment Expansion.....	213
Judicial Education Transfer.....	49	COMMISSION ON RETIREMENT, REM. AND DISCIPLINE.....	222
Core.....	50	Core.....	223
Judicial Education.....	54	APPELLATE JUDICIAL COMMISSION.....	230
Core.....	55	Core.....	231
COURT OF APPEALS.....	74	SENTENCING COMMISSION.....	236
Western District.....	82	Core.....	237
Core.....	83	OTHER SUBMISSIONS	
Eastern District.....	89	Fund Financial Summaries.....	242
Core.....	90	Estimated Appropriation Request.....	267
		Flexibility Request.....	268
		Core Reconciliations.....	269

Page

BUDGET BOOK PROGRAM DESCRIPTIONS:

Adjudication and Treatment.....	207
Basic Civil Legal Services.....	24
Court Appointed Special Advocate (CASA).....	158
Court of Appeals.....	103
Court Technology.....	64
Domestic Relations Resolution.....	163
Juvenile Justice.....	142
Permanency Planning.....	147
Single County Circuit Juvenile Court Personnel Reimb.....	167
Supreme Court.....	21
Technical Assistance.....	60
Training.....	69
Trial Courts.....	125

ORGANIZATIONAL CHART OF MISSOURI'S JUDICIAL BRANCH



**State Auditor's Reports, Oversight Evaluations, and Missouri Sunset Act Reports
Senate Bill 299**

Judiciary	Type of Report	Date Issued	Website
Supreme Court of Missouri	State Audit Report	August 25, 2003	Http://www.auditor.mo.gov
Office of State Courts Administrator	State Audit Report	January 2006	Http://www.auditor.mo.gov
Statewide Court Automation Report	Oversight Evaluation	March 14, 2001	Http://www.moga.mo.gov/oversight.audits
Court of Appeals – Western District	State Audit Report	July 24, 1990	
Court of Appeals – Eastern District	State Audit Report	May 31, 1990	
Court of Appeals – Southern District	State Audit Report	September 28, 1990	
MISSOURI COUNTIES:			
Adair County	State Audit Report	December 2008	Http://www.auditor.mo.gov
Andrew County	State Audit Report	January 2009	Http://www.auditor.mo.gov
Atchison County	State Audit Report	May 2010	Http://www.auditor.mo.gov
Audrain County	State Audit Report	November 2008	Http://www.auditor.mo.gov
Barry County	State Audit Report	January 2010	Http://www.auditor.mo.gov
Barton County	State Audit Report	January 2009	Http://www.auditor.mo.gov
Bates County	State Audit Report	July 2010	Http://www.auditor.mo.gov
Benton County	State Audit Report	July 2010	Http://www.auditor.mo.gov
Bollinger County	State Audit Report	May 2009	Http://www.auditor.mo.gov
Boone County	State Audit Report	December 2005	Http://www.auditor.mo.gov
Buchanan County	State Audit Report	May 24, 1999	Http://www.auditor.mo.gov
Butler County	State Audit Report	September 2009	Http://www.auditor.mo.gov
Caldwell County	State Audit Report	September 2009	Http://www.auditor.mo.gov
Callaway County	State Audit Report	September 2008	Http://www.auditor.mo.gov
Camden County	State Audit Report	April 2008	Http://www.auditor.mo.gov
Cape Girardeau County	State Audit Report	February 2006	Http://www.auditor.mo.gov
Carroll County	State Audit Report	October 2009	Http://www.auditor.mo.gov
Carter County	State Audit Report	May 2009	Http://www.auditor.mo.gov
Cass County	State Audit Report	May 4, 2004	Http://www.auditor.mo.gov
Cedar County	State Audit Report	January 2009	Http://www.auditor.mo.gov

**State Auditor's Reports, Oversight Evaluations, and Missouri Sunset Act Reports
Senate Bill 299**

Chariton County	State Audit Report	January 2009	Http://www.auditor.mo.gov
Christian County	State Audit Report	June 2010	Http://www.auditor.mo.gov
Clark County	State Audit Report	November 2009	Http://www.auditor.mo.gov
Clay County	State Audit Report	September 2006	Http://www.auditor.mo.gov
Clinton County	State Audit Report	December 2006	Http://www.auditor.mo.gov
Cole County	State Audit Report	April 2008	Http://www.auditor.mo.gov
Cooper County	State Audit Report	November 2009	Http://www.auditor.mo.gov
Crawford County	State Audit Report	July 2010	Http://www.auditor.mo.gov
Dade County	State Audit Report	October 2009	Http://www.auditor.mo.gov
Dallas County	State Audit Report	April 2010	Http://www.auditor.mo.gov
Daviess County	State Audit Report	April 2010	Http://www.auditor.mo.gov
DeKalb County	State Audit Report	December 2008	Http://www.auditor.mo.gov
Dent County	State Audit Report	December 2006	Http://www.auditor.mo.gov
Douglas County	State Audit Report	September 2006	Http://www.auditor.mo.gov
Dunklin County	State Audit Report	December 2009	Http://www.auditor.mo.gov
Franklin County	State Audit Report	September 2008	Http://www.auditor.mo.gov
Gasconade County	State Audit Report	November 2006	Http://www.auditor.mo.gov
Gentry County	State Audit Report	July 2010	Http://www.auditor.mo.gov
Greene County	State Audit Report	March 22, 2000	Http://www.auditor.mo.gov
Grundy County	State Audit Report	December 2009	Http://www.auditor.mo.gov
Harrison County	State Audit Report	March 2010	Http://www.auditor.mo.gov
Henry County	State Audit Report	September 2009	Http://www.auditor.mo.gov
Hickory County	State Audit Report	July 2010	Http://www.auditor.mo.gov
Holt County	State Audit Report	December 2009	Http://www.auditor.mo.gov
Howard County	State Audit Report	December 2007	Http://www.auditor.mo.gov
Howell County	State Audit Report	July 2010	Http://www.auditor.mo.gov
Iron County	State Audit Report	January 2009	Http://www.auditor.mo.gov
Jackson County	State Audit Report	December 22, 2000	Http://www.auditor.mo.gov
Jasper County (Assoc. Div.)	State Audit Report	September 19, 2000	Http://www.auditor.mo.gov

**State Auditor's Reports, Oversight Evaluations, and Missouri Sunset Act Reports
Senate Bill 299**

Jefferson County	State Audit Report	November 2007	Http://www.auditor.mo.gov
Johnson County	State Audit Report	May 2005	Http://www.auditor.mo.gov
Knox County	State Audit Report	July 2009	Http://www.auditor.mo.gov
Laclede County	State Audit Report	September 2009	Http://www.auditor.mo.gov
Lafayette County	State Audit Report	February 10, 2003	Http://www.auditor.mo.gov
Lawrence County	State Audit Report	August 2007	Http://www.auditor.mo.gov
Lewis County	State Audit Report	July 2010	Http://www.auditor.mo.gov
Lincoln County	State Audit Report	January 2009	Http://www.auditor.mo.gov
Linn County	State Audit Report	April 2009	Http://www.auditor.mo.gov
Livingston County	State Audit Report	April 2009	Http://www.auditor.mo.gov
Macon County	State Audit Report	May 2009	Http://www.auditor.mo.gov
Madison County	State Audit Report	September 2009	Http://www.auditor.mo.gov
Maries County	State Audit Report	December 2009	Http://www.auditor.mo.gov
Marion County	State Audit Report	December 2007	Http://www.auditor.mo.gov
McDonald County	State Audit Report	July 2010	Http://www.auditor.mo.gov
Mercer County	State Audit Report	June 2010	Http://www.auditor.mo.gov
Miller County	State Audit Report	July 2009	Http://www.auditor.mo.gov
Mississippi County	State Audit Report	May 2009	Http://www.auditor.mo.gov
Moniteau County	State Audit Report	November 2009	Http://www.auditor.mo.gov
Monroe County	State Audit Report	January 2009	Http://www.auditor.mo.gov
Montgomery County	State Audit Report	January 2009	Http://www.auditor.mo.gov
Morgan County	State Audit Report	November 2009	Http://www.auditor.mo.gov
New Madrid County	State Audit Report	August 1, 2000	Http://www.auditor.mo.gov
Newton County	State Audit Report	September 28, 2001	Http://www.auditor.mo.gov
Nodaway County	State Audit Report	October 2009	Http://www.auditor.mo.gov
Oregon County	State Audit Report	May 2009	Http://www.auditor.mo.gov
Osage County	State Audit Report	July 2010	Http://www.auditor.mo.gov
Ozark County	State Audit Report	February 2007	Http://www.auditor.mo.gov
Pemiscot County	State Audit Report	December 2009	Http://www.auditor.mo.gov

**State Auditor's Reports, Oversight Evaluations, and Missouri Sunset Act Reports
Senate Bill 299**

Perry County	State Audit Report	May 2010	Http://www.auditor.mo.gov
Pettis County	State Audit Report	March 10, 2004	Http://www.auditor.mo.gov
Phelps County	State Audit Report	September 2009	Http://www.auditor.mo.gov
Pike County	State Audit Report	February 2009	Http://www.auditor.mo.gov
Platte County	State Audit Report	August 2005	Http://www.auditor.mo.gov
Polk County	State Audit Report	September 2009	Http://www.auditor.mo.gov
Pulaski County	State Audit Report	October 2009	Http://www.auditor.mo.gov
Putnam County	State Audit Report	September 2010	Http://www.auditor.mo.gov
Ralls County	State Audit Report	September 2007	Http://www.auditor.mo.gov
Randolph County	State Audit Report	November 2009	Http://www.auditor.mo.gov
Ray County	State Audit Report	September 2007	Http://www.auditor.mo.gov
Reynolds County	State Audit Report	January 2009	Http://www.auditor.mo.gov
Ripley County	State Audit Report	August 2007	Http://www.auditor.mo.gov
St. Charles County	State Audit Report	August 24, 2004	Http://www.auditor.mo.gov
St. Clair County	State Audit Report	February 2010	Http://www.auditor.mo.gov
St. Francois County	State Audit Report	February 2009	Http://www.auditor.mo.gov
St. Louis County (muni)	State Audit Report	May 2007	Http://www.auditor.mo.gov
St. Louis City	State Audit Report	March 11, 2003	Http://www.auditor.mo.gov
Ste. Genevieve County	State Audit Report	December 2009	Http://www.auditor.mo.gov
Saline County	State Audit Report	December 27, 1999	Http://www.auditor.mo.gov
Schuyler County	State Audit Report	June 2008	Http://www.auditor.mo.gov
Scotland County	State Audit Report	October 2009	Http://www.auditor.mo.gov
Scott County	State Audit Report	September 2006	Http://www.auditor.mo.gov
Shannon County	State Audit Report	March 2007	Http://www.auditor.mo.gov
Shelby County	State Audit Report	May 2009	Http://www.auditor.mo.gov
Stoddard County	State Audit Report	May 2010	Http://www.auditor.mo.gov
Stone County	State Audit Report	January 2010	Http://www.auditor.mo.gov
Sullivan County	State Audit Report	November 2007	Http://www.auditor.mo.gov
Taney County	State Audit Report	September 13, 2002	Http://www.auditor.mo.gov

**State Auditor's Reports, Oversight Evaluations, and Missouri Sunset Act Reports
Senate Bill 299**

Texas County	State Audit Report	December 2009	Http://www.auditor.mo.gov
Vernon County	State Audit Report	July 2010	Http://www.auditor.mo.gov
Warren County	State Audit Report	December 2009	Http://www.auditor.mo.gov
Washington County	State Audit Report	December 2008	Http://www.auditor.mo.gov
Wayne County	State Audit Report	January 2009	Http://www.auditor.mo.gov
Webster County	State Audit Report	February 2010	Http://www.auditor.mo.gov
Worth County	State Audit Report	July 2010	Http://www.auditor.mo.gov
Wright County	State Audit Report	May 2009	Http://www.auditor.mo.gov

As per §55.030 and §55.160, RSMo, a County Auditor issues audit reports for 1st and 2nd class counties, so there are no state audit reports available.

Programs Subject to Missouri Sunset Act

Program	Statutes Establishing	Sunset Date	Review Status
Statewide Court Automation Fund Fee	§488.027, RSMo	September 1, 2013	

**JUDICIARY
FISCAL YEAR 2012
ONE-TIME REQUEST SUMMARY**

Decision Item Number	Decision Item Name	Organization Name	Approp.	General Revenue	Federal Funds	Other Funds	Total One-Time
1100001	Judgeship Determined by Population	Circuit Courts (E&E)	5274	\$ 7,872	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 7,872
Total FY 2012 One-time Requests				\$ 7,872	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 7,872

JUDICIARY REPORT 1A FY2012 GOVERNOR RECOMMENDATION FINANCIAL SUMMARY

	FY 2010 ACTUAL DOLLAR	FY 2011 BUDGET DOLLAR	FY 2012 DEPT REQ DOLLAR	FY 2012 GOV REC DOLLAR
SUPREME COURT	10,723,107	8,580,329	8,580,329	8,580,329
OFFICE OF STATE COURTS ADMINISTRATOR	20,556,441	25,965,170	26,031,972	26,031,972
COURTS OF APPEAL	10,550,238	10,874,350	10,874,350	10,874,350
CIRCUIT COURTS	135,299,743	138,322,556	139,424,239	138,322,556
DRUG COURTS	5,725,500	5,725,500	10,646,001	5,725,500
COMM ON RETIR DISCIPL & REMOV	197,571	220,644	220,644	220,644
APPELLATE JUDICIAL COMMISSION	3,390	7,741	7,741	7,741
SENTENCING COMMISSION	60,178	78,983	78,983	78,983
DEPARTMENT TOTAL	\$183,116,168	\$189,775,273	\$195,864,259	\$189,842,075
GENERAL REVENUE	158,983,384	169,074,144	175,019,883	169,074,144
JUDICIARY - FEDERAL	3,703,911	10,408,187	10,551,434	10,474,989
FEDERAL BUDGET STAB-MEDICAID RE	6,633,935	0	0	0
THIRD PARTY LIABILITY COLLECT	300,157	380,563	380,563	380,563
STATEWIDE COURT AUTOMATION	4,946,317	4,446,202	4,446,202	4,446,202
SUP COURT PUBLICATION REVOLV	73,802	150,000	150,000	150,000
MISSOURI CASA	81,149	100,000	100,000	100,000
CRIME VICTIMS COMP FUND	887,200	887,200	887,200	887,200
CIRCUIT COURTS ESCROW FUND	1,514,104	505,500	505,500	505,500
BASIC CIVIL LEGAL SERVICES	5,576,944	3,293,476	3,293,476	3,293,476
STATE COURT ADMIN REVOLVING	142,064	230,000	230,000	230,000
DOM RELATIONS RESOLUTION-JUD	273,201	300,000	300,000	300,000
CRIMINAL NONSUPPORT COURT RESO	0	1	1	1

INTRODUCTION
TO THE
SUPREME COURT BUDGET

Article V, section 2 of the Missouri Constitution establishes the Supreme Court as the highest court of the judiciary, the third branch of government along with the executive and the legislative branches. The Supreme Court has general superintending control over all courts and tribunals, and its role is to ensure a stable and predictable system of justice by serving as the final arbiter of disputes involving the state's constitution and laws. As such, it hears and decides many of the most important legal issues affecting Missouri citizens, businesses, organizations and even factions of government. The Supreme Court also appoints and supervises a clerk, a state courts administrator and other staff to aid in the administration of the courts. It establishes rules of procedure, transfers judicial personnel among courts and has budgetary authority within the judiciary.

The budget of the Supreme Court is divided into two components: Core and Basic Civil Legal Services.

Supreme Court Workload Growth

	<u>Actual 1999</u>		<u>Actual 2000</u>		<u>Actual 2001</u>		<u>Actual 2002</u>		<u>Actual 2003</u>		<u>Actual 2004</u>	
	<u>Filed</u>	<u>Disposed</u>										
APPEALS	53	77	92	81	70	84	93	80	108	132	97	91
WRITS	229	242	193	176	227	221	204	197	215	288	192	215
MOTIONS	514	456	677	617	688	565	680	694	725	607	739	624
APPLICATIONS TO TRANSFER	447	456	681	670	627	627	473	467	412	397	333	359
	<u>Actual 1999</u>		<u>Actual 2000</u>		<u>Actual 2001</u>		<u>Actual 2002</u>		<u>Actual 2003</u>		<u>Actual 2004</u>	
OPINIONS		89		87		87		90		111		112
LAW STUDENT EXAM APPLICATION		1,774		1,594		1,656		1,711		1,413		1,373
COURT REPORTERS TESTED		33		30		21		63		80		120
ATTORNEY STATUS MAINTAINED		29,527		30,202		30,958		31,741		32,000		32,500

Supreme Court Workload Growth

	<u>Actual 2005</u>		<u>Actual 2006</u>		<u>Actual 2007</u>		<u>Actual 2008</u>		<u>Actual 2009</u>		<u>Actual 2010</u>	
	<u>Filed</u>	<u>Disposed</u>										
APPEALS	121	144	137	117	86	90	72	57	63	80	67	65
WRITS	262	262	266	273	260	244	228	224	271	290	201	194
MOTIONS	954	789	715	665	789	682	736	636	773	789	625	649
APPLICATIONS TO TRANSFER	367	376	378	371	386	387	374	363	376	377	376	368
	<u>Actual 2005</u>		<u>Actual 2006</u>		<u>Actual 2007</u>		<u>Actual 2008</u>		<u>Actual 2009</u>		<u>Actual 2010</u>	
OPINIONS		118		101		130		105		131		90
LAW STUDENT EXAM APPLICATION		1,748		1,461		1,483		1,622		1,599		1,759
COURT REPORTERS TESTED		162		171		162		156		115		112
ATTORNEY STATUS MAINTAINED		33,689		35,219		36,120		37,043		37,859		38,747

JUDICIARY REPORT 9 FY2012 GOVERNOR RECOMMENDATION

DECISION ITEM SUMMARY

Budget Unit								
Decision Item	FY 2010	FY 2010	FY 2011	FY 2011	FY 2012	FY 2012	FY 2012	FY 2012
Budget Object Summary	ACTUAL	ACTUAL	BUDGET	BUDGET	DEPT REQ	DEPT REQ	GOV REC	GOV REC
Fund	DOLLAR	FTE	DOLLAR	FTE	DOLLAR	FTE	DOLLAR	FTE
JUDICIAL PROCEEDINGS & REVIEW								
CORE								
PERSONAL SERVICES								
GENERAL REVENUE	3,549,760	60.53	3,816,660	74.00	3,816,660	74.00	3,816,660	74.00
JUDICIARY - FEDERAL	150,324	3.60	485,026	8.00	485,026	8.00	485,026	8.00
FEDRAL BUDGET STAB-MEDICAID RE	142,740	3.07	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00
BASIC CIVIL LEGAL SERVICES	47,951	0.72	51,968	1.00	51,968	1.00	51,968	1.00
TOTAL - PS	3,890,775	67.92	4,353,654	83.00	4,353,654	83.00	4,353,654	83.00
EXPENSE & EQUIPMENT								
GENERAL REVENUE	873,482	0.00	866,409	0.00	866,409	0.00	866,409	0.00
FEDRAL BUDGET STAB-MEDICAID RE	235,633	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00
SUP COURT PUBLICATION REVOLV	73,802	0.00	149,700	0.00	149,700	0.00	149,700	0.00
BASIC CIVIL LEGAL SERVICES	1,170	0.00	10,266	0.00	10,266	0.00	10,266	0.00
TOTAL - EE	1,184,087	0.00	1,026,375	0.00	1,026,375	0.00	1,026,375	0.00
PROGRAM-SPECIFIC								
SUP COURT PUBLICATION REVOLV	0	0.00	300	0.00	300	0.00	300	0.00
BASIC CIVIL LEGAL SERVICES	5,500,319	0.00	3,200,000	0.00	3,200,000	0.00	3,200,000	0.00
TOTAL - PD	5,500,319	0.00	3,200,300	0.00	3,200,300	0.00	3,200,300	0.00
TOTAL	10,575,181	67.92	8,580,329	83.00	8,580,329	83.00	8,580,329	83.00
GRAND TOTAL	\$10,575,181	67.92	\$8,580,329	83.00	\$8,580,329	83.00	\$8,580,329	83.00

CORE DECISION ITEM

Judiciary	Budget Unit <u>11095C</u>
Supreme Court	
Core	

1. CORE FINANCIAL SUMMARY

	FY 2012 Budget Request					FY 2012 Governor's Recommendation			
	GR	Federal	Other	Total		GR	Federal	Other	Total
PS	3,816,660	485,026	51,968	4,353,654	PS	3,816,660	485,026	51,968	4,353,654
EE	866,409	0	159,966	1,026,375	EE	866,409	0	159,966	1,026,375
PSD	0	0	3,200,300 E	3,200,300 E	PSD	0	0	3,200,300 E	3,200,300 E
Total	4,683,069	485,026	3,412,234 E	8,580,329 E	Total	4,683,069	485,026	3,412,234 E	8,580,329 E
FTE	74.00	8.00	1.00	83.00	FTE	74.00	8.00	1.00	83.00

Est. Fringe	2,258,436	269,917	108,058	2,636,411
--------------------	-----------	---------	---------	-----------

Note: Fringes budgeted in House Bill 5 except for certain fringes budgeted directly to MoDOT, Highway Patrol, and Conservation.

Est. Fringe	2,258,436	269,917	108,058	2,636,411
--------------------	-----------	---------	---------	-----------

Note: Fringes budgeted in House Bill 5 except for certain fringes budgeted directly to MoDOT, Highway Patrol, and Conservation.

Other Funds: Basic Civil Legal Services Fund (0757) - \$3,262,234 E
 Supreme Court Publications Revolving Fund (0525) - \$150,000

Other Funds: Basic Civil Legal Services Fund (0757) - \$3,262,234 E
 Supreme Court Publications Revolving Fund (0525) - \$150,000

2. CORE DESCRIPTION

Article V, Section 3 of the Missouri Constitution gives the Supreme Court exclusive appellate jurisdiction in all cases involving the validity of a United States Treaty or statute, the validity of a Missouri statute or constitutional provision, the construction of revenue laws of the state, the title to any state office and in all cases where the punishment imposed is death. The Supreme Court has general superintending control over all Missouri courts and tribunals. The Supreme Court has original jurisdiction to issue certain motions and writs. The Court is also required to establish rules of practice and procedure in Missouri courts.

3. PROGRAM LISTING (list programs included in this core funding)


Supreme Court (page 21)
 Basic Civil Legal Services (page 24)

CORE DECISION ITEM

Judiciary	Budget Unit <u>11095C</u>
Supreme Court	
Core	

4. FINANCIAL HISTORY

	FY 2008 Actual	FY 2009 Actual	FY 2010 Actual	FY 2011 Current Yr.
Appropriation (All Funds)	8,438,597	9,705,793	11,403,255	8,580,329
Less Reverted (All Funds)	0	(235,389)	(30,000)	N/A
Budget Authority (All Funds)	8,438,597	9,470,404	11,373,255	N/A
Actual Expenditures (All Funds)	8,185,596	8,903,052	10,723,107	N/A
Unexpended (All Funds)	253,001	567,352	650,148	N/A
Unexpended, by Fund:				
General Revenue	10,740	10,694	26,432	N/A
Federal	324,424	335,245	334,724	N/A
Other	(82,163)	221,413	288,992	N/A



NOTES:

The FY 08 Basic Civil Legal Services appropriation was increased by \$215,000.

The FY 09 Basic Civil Legal Services appropriation was increased by \$900,000.

The FY 10 Basic Civil Legal Services appropriation was increased by \$2,500,000.

The FY10 expenditures for the National Center for State Courts dues were included in the Supreme Court core since no funds were appropriated in FY11.

CORE RECONCILIATION DETAIL

JUDICIARY**JUDICIAL PROCEEDINGS & REVIEW**

5. CORE RECONCILIATION DETAIL

	Budget Class	FTE	GR	Federal	Other	Total	Explanation
TAFP AFTER VETOES							
	PS	83.00	3,816,660	485,026	51,968	4,353,654	
	EE	0.00	866,409	0	159,966	1,026,375	
	PD	0.00	0	0	3,200,300	3,200,300	
	Total	83.00	4,683,069	485,026	3,412,234	8,580,329	
DEPARTMENT CORE REQUEST							
	PS	83.00	3,816,660	485,026	51,968	4,353,654	
	EE	0.00	866,409	0	159,966	1,026,375	
	PD	0.00	0	0	3,200,300	3,200,300	
	Total	83.00	4,683,069	485,026	3,412,234	8,580,329	
GOVERNOR'S RECOMMENDED CORE							
	PS	83.00	3,816,660	485,026	51,968	4,353,654	
	EE	0.00	866,409	0	159,966	1,026,375	
	PD	0.00	0	0	3,200,300	3,200,300	
	Total	83.00	4,683,069	485,026	3,412,234	8,580,329	

FLEXIBILITY REQUEST FORM

BUDGET UNIT NUMBER 11095C	DEPARTMENT: Judiciary
BUDGET UNIT NAME: Judicial Proceedings and Review	DIVISION: Supreme Court

1. Provide the amount by fund of personal service flexibility and the amount by fund of expense and equipment flexibility you are requesting in dollar and percentage terms and explain why the flexibility is needed. If flexibility is being requested among divisions, provide the amount by fund of flexibility you are requesting in dollar and percentage terms and explain why the flexibility is needed.

DEPARTMENT REQUEST

	General Revenue				
PS	\$	381,666		10%	
E&E	\$	86,641		10%	

2. Estimate how much flexibility will be used for the budget year. How much flexibility was used in the Prior Year Budget and the Current Year Budget? Please specify the amount.

PRIOR YEAR ACTUAL AMOUNT OF FLEXIBILITY USED	CURRENT YEAR ESTIMATED AMOUNT OF FLEXIBILITY THAT WILL BE USED	BUDGET REQUEST ESTIMATED AMOUNT OF FLEXIBILITY THAT WILL BE USED
General Revenue PS \$ (75,000) -2.0% E&E \$ 75,000 9.3%	HB 12.300 language allows for up to 25% flexibility between personal service and expense and equipment. The Supreme Court does not have an estimate of the amount of that flexibility that might be used in FY 11.	10% flexibility is being requested for FY 12. The Supreme Court does not have an estimate on the amount of flexibility that might be used if approved.

3. Please explain how flexibility was used in the prior and/or current years.

PRIOR YEAR EXPLAIN ACTUAL USE	CURRENT YEAR EXPLAIN PLANNED USE
Funds were used for library costs.	The Supreme Court does not have an estimate at this time of how much flex will be used in managing the \$5 million Governor's withhold.

JUDICIARY REPORT 10 FY2012 GOVERNOR RECOMMENDATION

DECISION ITEM DETAIL

Budget Unit	FY 2010	FY 2010	FY 2011	FY 2011	FY 2012	FY 2012	FY 2012	FY 2012
Decision Item	ACTUAL	ACTUAL	BUDGET	BUDGET	DEPT REQ	DEPT REQ	GOV REC	GOV REC
Budget Object Class	DOLLAR	FTE	DOLLAR	FTE	DOLLAR	FTE	DOLLAR	FTE
JUDICIAL PROCEEDINGS & REVIEW								
CORE								
SUPREME COURT JUDGE (CH)	139,534	1.00	139,534	1.00	139,534	1.00	139,534	1.00
SUPREME COURT JUDGE	822,204	6.00	822,206	6.00	822,206	6.00	822,206	6.00
FISCAL OFFICER I	90,816	2.00	90,816	2.00	90,816	2.00	90,816	2.00
ACCOUNTING SPECIALIST	0	0.00	3,982	0.28	3,982	0.28	3,982	0.28
ADMINISTRATIVE SECRETARY	58,249	1.00	58,556	1.00	58,556	1.00	58,556	1.00
DEPUTY COMMUNICATIONS COUNCIL	50,076	1.00	50,076	1.00	50,076	1.00	50,076	1.00
DEPUTY CLERK BAR ENROLLMENT	133,272	3.00	132,272	3.00	71,468	2.00	71,468	2.00
DEPUTY CLERK II	138,583	3.00	280,308	5.00	314,640	6.00	314,640	6.00
DEPUTY CLERK	79,728	1.00	79,728	1.00	0	0.00	0	0.00
COURT CLERK IV	45,060	1.00	45,060	1.00	45,060	1.00	45,060	1.00
DIRECTOR COURT EN BANC	0	0.00	0	0.00	79,728	1.00	79,728	1.00
DIRECTOR BAR ENROLLMENT	0	0.00	0	0.00	54,360	1.00	54,360	1.00
GENERAL SERVICES SUPERV ISOR	13,050	0.25	0	0.00	52,200	1.00	52,200	1.00
ASSISTANT MAINTENANCE SUPV	26,964	0.75	35,952	1.00	0	0.00	0	0.00
MAINTENANCE SUPERVISOR	48,138	1.00	52,200	1.00	35,952	1.00	35,952	1.00
MAINTENANCE WORKER I	119,376	3.74	134,004	4.00	134,004	4.00	134,004	4.00
MICROFILM OPERATOR	0	0.00	14,599	1.00	14,599	1.00	14,599	1.00
CLERK TYPIST I	3,366	0.18	9,829	1.00	9,829	1.00	9,829	1.00
CLERK TYPIST II	35,952	1.00	35,952	1.00	35,952	1.00	35,952	1.00
SECRETARY III	126,264	3.00	127,776	3.00	127,776	3.00	127,776	3.00
CLERK	120,030	3.41	294,207	10.22	266,319	9.22	266,319	9.22
KEY ENTRY OPERATOR	0	0.00	26,904	1.00	26,904	1.00	26,904	1.00
RESEARCH ASSISTANT	48,871	1.44	41,771	1.50	41,771	1.50	41,771	1.50
LAW CLERK	670,930	13.73	647,472	14.00	647,472	14.00	647,472	14.00
CLERK OF THE SUPREME COURT	106,984	1.00	106,984	1.00	106,984	1.00	106,984	1.00
COMMUNICATIONS COUNSEL	79,728	1.00	79,728	1.00	79,728	1.00	79,728	1.00
MARSHAL	40,968	1.00	40,968	1.00	40,968	1.00	40,968	1.00
DIRECTOR LIBRARY & PUBLIC SRVC	29,324	0.45	70,000	1.00	70,000	1.00	70,000	1.00
JUDICIAL EXECUTIVE ASSISTANT	304,823	5.91	360,592	7.00	360,592	7.00	360,592	7.00
COMMISSION COUNSEL	62,952	1.00	62,952	1.00	62,952	1.00	62,952	1.00
CHIEF DEPUTY CLERK	69,948	1.00	69,948	1.00	69,948	1.00	69,948	1.00
DIGEST EDITOR	26,234	0.51	25,578	1.00	25,578	1.00	25,578	1.00

JUDICIARY REPORT 10 FY2012 GOVERNOR RECOMMENDATION

DECISION ITEM DETAIL

Budget Unit	FY 2010	FY 2010	FY 2011	FY 2011	FY 2012	FY 2012	FY 2012	FY 2012
Decision Item	ACTUAL	ACTUAL	BUDGET	BUDGET	DEPT REQ	DEPT REQ	GOV REC	GOV REC
Budget Object Class	DOLLAR	FTE	DOLLAR	FTE	DOLLAR	FTE	DOLLAR	FTE
JUDICIAL PROCEEDINGS & REVIEW								
CORE								
SECRETARY I	23,220	0.60	35,316	1.00	35,316	1.00	35,316	1.00
DEPUTY MARSHAL	64,032	2.00	64,032	2.00	64,032	2.00	64,032	2.00
COMPUTER INFORMATION TECH	39,871	0.94	42,504	1.00	42,504	1.00	42,504	1.00
DATA PROCESSING OFFICER	61,620	1.00	61,620	1.00	61,620	1.00	61,620	1.00
ASSISTANT LIBRARIAN	37,296	1.00	37,296	1.00	37,296	1.00	37,296	1.00
LIBRARIAN ASSISTANT	27,132	1.00	27,132	1.00	27,132	1.00	27,132	1.00
ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT	44,220	1.00	44,220	1.00	44,220	1.00	44,220	1.00
STAFF COUNSEL	101,580	1.00	101,580	1.00	101,580	1.00	101,580	1.00
SENIOR JUDGE	380	0.01	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00
TOTAL - PS	3,890,775	67.92	4,353,654	83.00	4,353,654	83.00	4,353,654	83.00
TRAVEL, IN-STATE	90,046	0.00	51,500	0.00	51,500	0.00	51,500	0.00
TRAVEL, OUT-OF-STATE	9,579	0.00	16,500	0.00	16,500	0.00	16,500	0.00
FUEL & UTILITIES	365	0.00	300	0.00	300	0.00	300	0.00
SUPPLIES	564,854	0.00	567,375	0.00	567,375	0.00	567,375	0.00
PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT	32,149	0.00	20,200	0.00	20,200	0.00	20,200	0.00
COMMUNICATION SERV & SUPP	171,247	0.00	91,209	0.00	91,209	0.00	91,209	0.00
PROFESSIONAL SERVICES	59,034	0.00	83,200	0.00	83,200	0.00	83,200	0.00
HOUSEKEEPING & JANITORIAL SERV	6,706	0.00	6,000	0.00	6,000	0.00	6,000	0.00
M&R SERVICES	37,649	0.00	45,000	0.00	45,000	0.00	45,000	0.00
COMPUTER EQUIPMENT	81,433	0.00	29,325	0.00	29,325	0.00	29,325	0.00
MOTORIZED EQUIPMENT	17,942	0.00	20,000	0.00	20,000	0.00	20,000	0.00
OFFICE EQUIPMENT	16,681	0.00	21,541	0.00	21,541	0.00	21,541	0.00
OTHER EQUIPMENT	21,514	0.00	15,000	0.00	15,000	0.00	15,000	0.00
PROPERTY & IMPROVEMENTS	6,312	0.00	5,000	0.00	5,000	0.00	5,000	0.00
BUILDING LEASE PAYMENTS	52,566	0.00	32,525	0.00	32,525	0.00	32,525	0.00
EQUIPMENT RENTALS & LEASES	3,745	0.00	9,162	0.00	9,162	0.00	9,162	0.00
MISCELLANEOUS EXPENSES	12,265	0.00	11,938	0.00	11,938	0.00	11,938	0.00
REBILLABLE EXPENSES	0	0.00	600	0.00	600	0.00	600	0.00
TOTAL - EE	1,184,087	0.00	1,026,375	0.00	1,026,375	0.00	1,026,375	0.00
PROGRAM DISTRIBUTIONS	5,500,319	0.00	3,200,000	0.00	3,200,000	0.00	3,200,000	0.00

JUDICIARY REPORT 10 FY2012 GOVERNOR RECOMMENDATION**DECISION ITEM DETAIL**

Budget Unit	FY 2010	FY 2010	FY 2011	FY 2011	FY 2012	FY 2012	FY 2012	FY 2012
Decision Item	ACTUAL	ACTUAL	BUDGET	BUDGET	DEPT REQ	DEPT REQ	GOV REC	GOV REC
Budget Object Class	DOLLAR	FTE	DOLLAR	FTE	DOLLAR	FTE	DOLLAR	FTE
JUDICIAL PROCEEDINGS & REVIEW								
CORE								
REFUNDS	0	0.00	300	0.00	300	0.00	300	0.00
TOTAL - PD	5,500,319	0.00	3,200,300	0.00	3,200,300	0.00	3,200,300	0.00
GRAND TOTAL	\$10,575,181	67.92	\$8,580,329	83.00	\$8,580,329	83.00	\$8,580,329	83.00
GENERAL REVENUE	\$4,423,242	60.53	\$4,683,069	74.00	\$4,683,069	74.00	\$4,683,069	74.00
FEDERAL FUNDS	\$528,697	6.67	\$485,026	8.00	\$485,026	8.00	\$485,026	8.00
OTHER FUNDS	\$5,623,242	0.72	\$3,412,234	1.00	\$3,412,234	1.00	\$3,412,234	1.00

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

Judiciary		
Supreme Court		
Supreme Court		
	Supreme Court	Total
GR	\$4,640,469	\$4,640,469
FEDERAL	\$150,000	\$150,000
OTHER	\$85,000	\$85,000
TOTAL	\$4,875,469	\$4,875,469

1. What does this program do?

- Seven Judges serve on the Missouri Supreme Court, which sit en banc, but are authorized to sit in Divisions of three or four.
- The Chief Justice presides over the Court and handles many administrative details. Traditionally, the Chief Justice is the spokesperson for the Missouri court system.
- The Court hears and determines cases of statewide significance and concern.
- The Court promulgates rules and instructions for use in all Missouri courts.
- The Court Clerk en Banc's office carries out day-to-day staff functions, provides legal and administrative assistance to the Court's boards and commissions, oversees the official roll of attorney's licensed in Missouri, provides administrative assistance to the State Board of Law Examiners, supervises the annual enrollment and testing of the Certified Court Reporters, and provides fiscal support to offices and programs within the Supreme Court.
- Staff Counsel has three primary responsibilities - processes capital murder cases, reviews notices of appeals and transcripts, and docket cases.
- The Court maintains Missouri's only State Law Library housing legal reference materials and resources along with many rare books and documents.

2. What is the authorization for this program, i.e., federal or state statute, etc.? (Include the federal program number, if applicable.)

Missouri Constitution Article V, Section 1

3. Are there federal matching requirements? If yes, please explain.

No.


PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

Judiciary
 Supreme Court
 Supreme Court


4. Is this a federally mandated program? If yes, please explain.

No.

5. Provide actual expenditures for the prior three fiscal years.



FY 2011 Planned Expenditures



6. What are the sources of the "Other" funds?
 Supreme Court Publications Revolving Fund

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

Judiciary	
Supreme Court	
Supreme Court	
7a. Provide an effectiveness measure. See pages 11-12.	7b. Provide an efficiency measure. See pages 11-12.
7c. Provide the number of clients/individuals served (if applicable). numerous attorneys and the general public	7d. Provide a customer satisfaction measure, if available. All requests for appeals are given due consideration.

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

Judiciary
Supreme Court
Basic Civil Legal Services

	Supreme Court	Court Improvement	Total
GR	\$0	\$0	\$0
FEDERAL	\$0	\$0	\$0
OTHER	\$4,972,496	\$27,504	\$5,000,000
TOTAL	\$4,972,496	\$27,504	\$5,000,000

1. What does this program do?

The Basic Civil Legal Services Fund, passed in SB 447 (2003), provides low income Missourians with equal access to the civil justice system. Moneys must be paid to the Office of State Courts Administrator and credited to the Basic Civil Legal Services Fund, which is administered by the Supreme Court.

In addition to other fees authorized by law, the clerk of each court shall collect the following fees on the filing of any civil and criminal action or proceeding, including an appeal: Supreme Court and Court of Appeals \$20.00; Circuit Courts \$10.00; and Associate Circuit Courts \$8.00.

The Basic Civil Legal Services Fund provided legal services for over 23,000 cases in 2009. Over 40% of legal services cases are family law cases and the majority of these involve assisting victims of domestic violence. Reducing domestic violence increases worker productivity, decreases violent crimes, reduces the need for police intervention, and reduces the number of children subjected to abuse at home. Other cases handled by the program involve critical issues of housing and problems of legal immigrants. Legal services programs work to ensure adults and children have access to Medicaid benefits. Access to these benefits reduces the number of emergency room visits and reduces the elderly's need for assisted living. These positive outcomes save a substantial amount of taxpayer money.

2. What is the authorization for this program, i.e., federal or state statute, etc.? (Include the federal program number, if applicable.)

§477.650 and 488.031, RSMo

3. Are there federal matching requirements? If yes, please explain.

No.


4. Is this a federally mandated program? If yes, please explain.

No.

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

Judiciary
 Supreme Court
 Basic Civil Legal Services

5. Provide actual expenditures for the prior three fiscal years.



6. What are the sources of the "Other " funds?

Basic Civil Legal Services Fund.

7a. Provide an effectiveness measure.

Case results are overwhelmingly positive, with a success rate exceeding 80% in cases litigated or taken to an administrative hearing.

7b. Provide an efficiency measure.

N/A

7c. Provide the number of clients/individuals served (if applicable)

There are four regional Legal Aid Offices located in Kansas City, St. Louis, Columbia, and Springfield. It is estimated that legal assistance from the Basic Civil Legal Services Fund benefited approximately 52,000 Missourians in 2009, a significant portion of which are children.

7d. Provide a customer satisfaction measure, if available.

Refer to 7a.

JUDICIARY REPORT 9 FY2012 GOVERNOR RECOMMENDATION
DECISION ITEM SUMMARY

Budget Unit								
Decision Item	FY 2010	FY 2010	FY 2011	FY 2011	FY 2012	FY 2012	FY 2012	FY 2012
Budget Object Summary	ACTUAL	ACTUAL	BUDGET	BUDGET	DEPT REQ	DEPT REQ	GOV REC	GOV REC
Fund	DOLLAR	FTE	DOLLAR	FTE	DOLLAR	FTE	DOLLAR	FTE
NATIONAL CENTER STATE COURTS								
CORE								
EXPENSE & EQUIPMENT								
FEDRAL BUDGET STAB-MEDICAID RE	147,926	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00
TOTAL - EE	147,926	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00
TOTAL	147,926	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00
GRAND TOTAL	\$147,926	0.00	\$0	0.00	\$0	0.00	\$0	0.00

JUDICIARY REPORT 10 FY2012 GOVERNOR RECOMMENDATION

DECISION ITEM DETAIL

Budget Unit	FY 2010	FY 2010	FY 2011	FY 2011	FY 2012	FY 2012	FY 2012	FY 2012
Decision Item	ACTUAL	ACTUAL	BUDGET	BUDGET	DEPT REQ	DEPT REQ	GOV REC	GOV REC
Budget Object Class	DOLLAR	FTE	DOLLAR	FTE	DOLLAR	FTE	DOLLAR	FTE
NATIONAL CENTER STATE COURTS								
CORE								
PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT	147,926	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00
TOTAL - EE	147,926	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00
GRAND TOTAL	\$147,926	0.00	\$0	0.00	\$0	0.00	\$0	0.00
GENERAL REVENUE	\$0	0.00	\$0	0.00	\$0	0.00	\$0	0.00
FEDERAL FUNDS	\$147,926	0.00	\$0	0.00	\$0	0.00	\$0	0.00
OTHER FUNDS	\$0	0.00	\$0	0.00	\$0	0.00	\$0	0.00

INTRODUCTION
TO THE
OFFICE OF THE STATE COURT ADMINISTRATOR BUDGET

Acting under the direction of the Supreme Court of Missouri, as allowed by the State Constitution (Article V, Section 4), the Office of State Courts Administrator (OSCA) is responsible for providing administrative and technical support to the courts of Missouri as they pursue a judicial system that is accessible, equitable, and swift. The duties and responsibilities assigned to the State Courts Administrator are broad in scope and relate to all levels of the state court system.

Since the appointment of the first state courts administrator in 1970, the office has been responsible for providing technical assistance, education and training programs, court technology, administrative procedure evaluation, compilation of statistics, and case processing support to the courts. The office also assists courts in developing and implementing court improvement projects in such areas as child abuse and neglect, juvenile services, family preservation, criminal history reporting, debt collection and judgment enforcement, crime victims' rights, mediation services, alcohol and drug abuse treatment and prevention, and the implementation of time standards for case disposition. With the passage of SB 420 in 1994, the office has worked with the Missouri Court Automation Committee to automate all the courts in the state and, through the use of advanced technologies, provides Missouri citizens with the most timely and responsive judicial system possible. The office is organized into four divisions: Administration; Court Programs, Research, and Education; Court Services; and Information Technology. OSCA also performs functions including legal services and human resources for circuit courts.

The budget for OSCA is divided into four major components: OSCA, Court Improvement Projects, Statewide Court Automation, and Judicial Education.

“THIS PAGE WAS INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK.”

JUDICIARY REPORT 9 FY2012 GOVERNOR RECOMMENDATION

DECISION ITEM SUMMARY

Budget Unit								
Decision Item	FY 2010	FY 2010	FY 2011	FY 2011	FY 2012	FY 2012	FY 2012	FY 2012
Budget Object Summary	ACTUAL	ACTUAL	BUDGET	BUDGET	DEPT REQ	DEPT REQ	GOV REC	GOV REC
Fund	DOLLAR	FTE	DOLLAR	FTE	DOLLAR	FTE	DOLLAR	FTE
STATE COURTS ADMINISTRATOR								
CORE								
PERSONAL SERVICES								
GENERAL REVENUE	5,834,915	122.46	6,338,105	136.00	6,338,105	136.00	6,338,105	136.00
FEDRAL BUDGET STAB-MEDICAID RE	315,469	6.29	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00
TOTAL - PS	6,150,384	128.75	6,338,105	136.00	6,338,105	136.00	6,338,105	136.00
EXPENSE & EQUIPMENT								
GENERAL REVENUE	3,823,354	0.00	4,784,831	0.00	4,784,831	0.00	4,784,831	0.00
FEDRAL BUDGET STAB-MEDICAID RE	397,566	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00
CRIME VICTIMS COMP FUND	887,200	0.00	887,200	0.00	887,200	0.00	887,200	0.00
STATE COURT ADMIN REVOLVING	21,020	0.00	29,277	0.00	29,277	0.00	29,277	0.00
TOTAL - EE	5,129,140	0.00	5,701,308	0.00	5,701,308	0.00	5,701,308	0.00
PROGRAM-SPECIFIC								
STATE COURT ADMIN REVOLVING	0	0.00	723	0.00	723	0.00	723	0.00
TOTAL - PD	0	0.00	723	0.00	723	0.00	723	0.00
TOTAL	11,279,524	128.75	12,040,136	136.00	12,040,136	136.00	12,040,136	136.00
GRAND TOTAL	\$11,279,524	128.75	\$12,040,136	136.00	\$12,040,136	136.00	\$12,040,136	136.00


CORE DECISION ITEM

Judiciary					Budget Unit 11101C				
Office of State Courts Administrator									
Core									
1. CORE FINANCIAL SUMMARY									
	FY 2012 Budget Request					FY 2012 Governor's Recommendation			
	GR	Federal	Other	Total		GR	Federal	Other	Total
PS	6,338,105	0	0	6,338,105	PS	6,338,105	0	0	6,338,105
EE	4,784,831	0	916,477	5,701,308	EE	4,784,831	0	916,477	5,701,308
PSD	0	0	723	723	PSD	0	0	723	723
Total	11,122,936	0	917,200	12,040,136	Total	11,122,936	0	917,200	12,040,136
FTE	136.00	0.00	0.00	136.00	FTE	136.00	0.00	0.00	136.00
Est. Fringe	3,527,155	0	0	3,527,155	Est. Fringe	3,527,155	0	0	3,527,155
<i>Note: Fringes budgeted in House Bill 5 except for certain fringes budgeted directly to MoDOT, Highway Patrol, and Conservation.</i>					<i>Note: Fringes budgeted in House Bill 5 except for certain fringes budgeted directly to MoDOT, Highway Patrol, and Conservation.</i>				
Other Funds:	Crime Victims' Compensation Fund (0681) - \$887,200 State Courts Administration Revolving Fund (0831) - \$30,000				Other Funds:	Crime Victims' Compensation Fund (0681) - \$887,200 State Courts Administration Revolving Fund (0831) - \$30,000			
2. CORE DESCRIPTION									
Acting under the direction of the Supreme Court of Missouri, the Office of State Courts Administrator is responsible for providing administrative and technical support to the courts of Missouri as they pursue a judicial system that is accessible, equitable, and swift. Since the appointment of the first courts administrator in 1970, the office has been assigned the responsibility to provide fiscal services, technical assistance, education and training programs, automated systems development, implementation and support, compilation of statistics, and case processing assistance to the courts.									
3. PROGRAM LISTING (list programs included in this core funding)									
Technical Assistance (page 60) Court Technology (page 64) Training (page 69)									

Judiciary	Budget Unit <u>11101C</u>
Office of State Courts Administrator	
Core	

4. FINANCIAL HISTORY

	FY 2008 Actual	FY 2009 Actual	FY 2010 Actual	FY 2011 Current Yr.
Appropriation (All Funds)	11,855,530	12,040,134	12,040,136	12,040,136
Less Reverted (All Funds)	0	(1,064,445)	(715,004)	N/A
Budget Authority (All Funds)	11,855,530	10,975,689	11,325,132	N/A
Actual Expenditures (All Funds)	11,845,352	10,968,825	11,279,524	N/A
Unexpended (All Funds)	10,178	6,864	45,608	N/A
Unexpended, by Fund:				
General Revenue	949	5,479	35,192	N/A
Federal	0	0	1,436	N/A
Other	9,229	1,385	8,980	N/A



Reverted includes Governor's standard 3 percent reserve (when applicable) and any extraordinary withholdings.

NOTES:

CORE RECONCILIATION DETAIL

JUDICIARY
STATE COURTS ADMINISTRATOR

5. CORE RECONCILIATION DETAIL

	Budget Class	FTE	GR	Federal	Other	Total	Explanation
TAFP AFTER VETOES							
	PS	136.00	6,338,105	0	0	6,338,105	
	EE	0.00	4,784,831	0	916,477	5,701,308	
	PD	0.00	0	0	723	723	
	Total	136.00	11,122,936	0	917,200	12,040,136	
DEPARTMENT CORE ADJUSTMENTS							
Core Reallocation	940 7083	EE	0.00	297,846	0	0	297,846 Federal Budget Stabilization Fund Replacement correction
Core Reallocation	940 0039	EE	0.00	(297,846)	0	0	(297,846) Federal Budget Stabilization Fund Replacement correction
NET DEPARTMENT CHANGES		0.00	0	0	0	0	
DEPARTMENT CORE REQUEST							
	PS	136.00	6,338,105	0	0	6,338,105	
	EE	0.00	4,784,831	0	916,477	5,701,308	
	PD	0.00	0	0	723	723	
	Total	136.00	11,122,936	0	917,200	12,040,136	
GOVERNOR'S RECOMMENDED CORE							
	PS	136.00	6,338,105	0	0	6,338,105	
	EE	0.00	4,784,831	0	916,477	5,701,308	
	PD	0.00	0	0	723	723	
	Total	136.00	11,122,936	0	917,200	12,040,136	

FLEXIBILITY REQUEST FORM

BUDGET UNIT NUMBER 11101C	DEPARTMENT: Judiciary
BUDGET UNIT NAME: Office of State Courts Administrator	DIVISION: Office of State Courts Administrator

1. Provide the amount by fund of personal service flexibility and the amount by fund of expense and equipment flexibility you are requesting in dollar and percentage terms and explain why the flexibility is needed. If flexibility is being requested among divisions, provide the amount by fund of flexibility you are requesting in dollar and percentage terms and explain why the flexibility is needed.

DEPARTMENT REQUEST

General Revenue			
PS	\$	633,811	10%
E&E	\$	478,483	10%

2. Estimate how much flexibility will be used for the budget year. How much flexibility was used in the Prior Year Budget and the Current Year Budget? Please specify the amount.

PRIOR YEAR ACTUAL AMOUNT OF FLEXIBILITY USED	CURRENT YEAR ESTIMATED AMOUNT OF FLEXIBILITY THAT WILL BE USED	BUDGET REQUEST ESTIMATED AMOUNT OF FLEXIBILITY THAT WILL BE USED
Flex was not available in FY10.	HB 12.305 language allows for up to 25% flexibility between personal service and expense and equipment. OSCA plans to use this flexibility to manage the \$5 million Governor's withhold.	10% flexibility is being requested for FY12. OSCA will use these funds to assist in managing any budget restrictions that are placed on the Judiciary.

3. Please explain how flexibility was used in the prior and/or current years.

PRIOR YEAR EXPLAIN ACTUAL USE	CURRENT YEAR EXPLAIN PLANNED USE
N/A	OSCA does not have an estimate at this time of how much flex will be used in managing the \$5 million Governor's withhold.

JUDICIARY REPORT 10 FY2012 GOVERNOR RECOMMENDATION

DECISION ITEM DETAIL

Budget Unit	FY 2010	FY 2010	FY 2011	FY 2011	FY 2012	FY 2012	FY 2012	FY 2012
Decision Item	ACTUAL	ACTUAL	BUDGET	BUDGET	DEPT REQ	DEPT REQ	GOV REC	GOV REC
Budget Object Class	DOLLAR	FTE	DOLLAR	FTE	DOLLAR	FTE	DOLLAR	FTE
STATE COURTS ADMINISTRATOR								
CORE								
ADMINISTRATOR	118,450	1.00	118,450	1.00	118,450	1.00	118,450	1.00
DEP ST CT ADM AND DIVISION DIR	20,843	0.19	21,749	0.20	21,749	0.20	21,749	0.20
DIVISION DIRECTOR	172,808	2.00	259,212	3.00	259,212	3.00	259,212	3.00
PROGRAM MANAGER	614,180	8.83	627,204	9.00	627,204	9.00	627,204	9.00
PROGRAM COORDINATOR I	198,492	4.00	198,492	4.00	198,492	4.00	198,492	4.00
PROGRAM COORDINATOR II	325,272	6.00	318,431	6.07	318,431	6.00	318,431	6.00
PROGRAM SPECIALIST I	31,703	0.97	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00
PROGRAM SPECIALIST II	133,651	3.72	143,244	4.00	143,244	4.00	143,244	4.00
PROGRAM SPECIALIST III	469,748	11.68	517,527	13.00	517,527	13.00	517,527	13.00
PROGRAM SPECIALIST IV	218,022	4.75	229,512	5.00	229,512	5.00	229,512	5.00
SUPPORT SPECIALIST III	616,867	13.12	635,378	13.73	635,378	13.80	635,378	13.80
SUPPORT SPECIALIST II	162,738	3.92	166,152	4.00	166,152	4.00	166,152	4.00
SUPPORT TECHNICIAN I	120,958	3.72	155,892	5.00	155,892	5.00	155,892	5.00
SUPPORT TECHNICIAN II	60,079	2.00	60,204	2.00	60,204	2.00	60,204	2.00
SUPPORT TECHNICIAN III	43,231	1.06	40,968	1.00	40,968	1.00	40,968	1.00
COMPUTER INFORMATION TECH. I	188,750	4.77	198,084	6.00	198,084	6.00	198,084	6.00
COMPUTER INFORMATION TECH. II	676,510	14.99	624,808	15.00	624,808	15.00	624,808	15.00
COMPUTER INFORMATION TECH. III	701,042	13.93	702,942	14.00	702,942	14.00	702,942	14.00
COMPUTER INFO TECH SPEC I	324,956	6.00	325,092	6.00	325,092	6.00	325,092	6.00
COMPUTER INFO TECH SUPV I	54,360	1.00	54,360	1.00	54,360	1.00	54,360	1.00
COMPUTER INFO TECH SPEC II	70,493	1.13	62,952	1.00	62,952	1.00	62,952	1.00
COMPUTER INFO TECH SUPV II	173,077	2.79	178,932	3.00	178,932	3.00	178,932	3.00
COMP INFO TECHNOLOGY MGR I	258,492	4.00	258,492	4.00	258,492	4.00	258,492	4.00
SECRETARY II	69,791	2.74	76,992	3.00	76,992	3.00	76,992	3.00
SECRETARY TO DIVISION DIRECTOR	92,121	2.53	109,836	3.00	109,836	3.00	109,836	3.00
SECRETARY III	139,712	4.90	142,608	5.00	142,608	5.00	142,608	5.00
CLERK I	0	0.00	21,060	1.00	21,060	1.00	21,060	1.00
CLERK II	26,640	1.00	26,640	1.00	26,640	1.00	26,640	1.00
CLERK III	31,176	1.00	31,176	1.00	31,176	1.00	31,176	1.00
TECHNICAL ASST	31,716	1.00	31,716	1.00	31,716	1.00	31,716	1.00
SUPREME COURT JUDGE (CH)	4,506	0.01	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00
TOTAL - PS	6,150,384	128.75	6,338,105	136.00	6,338,105	136.00	6,338,105	136.00

JUDICIARY REPORT 10 FY2012 GOVERNOR RECOMMENDATION

DECISION ITEM DETAIL

Budget Unit	FY 2010	FY 2010	FY 2011	FY 2011	FY 2012	FY 2012	FY 2012	FY 2012
Decision Item	ACTUAL	ACTUAL	BUDGET	BUDGET	DEPT REQ	DEPT REQ	GOV REC	GOV REC
Budget Object Class	DOLLAR	FTE	DOLLAR	FTE	DOLLAR	FTE	DOLLAR	FTE
STATE COURTS ADMINISTRATOR								
CORE								
TRAVEL, IN-STATE	14,559	0.00	15,936	0.00	15,936	0.00	15,936	0.00
TRAVEL, OUT-OF-STATE	3,836	0.00	12,842	0.00	11,842	0.00	11,842	0.00
FUEL & UTILITIES	273	0.00	0	0.00	1,000	0.00	1,000	0.00
SUPPLIES	8,512	0.00	108,825	0.00	78,825	0.00	78,825	0.00
PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT	12,671	0.00	28,162	0.00	28,162	0.00	28,162	0.00
COMMUNICATION SERV & SUPP	1,290,204	0.00	997,126	0.00	1,327,126	0.00	1,327,126	0.00
PROFESSIONAL SERVICES	58,650	0.00	44,531	0.00	84,531	0.00	84,531	0.00
HOUSEKEEPING & JANITORIAL SERV	26	0.00	3,505	0.00	3,505	0.00	3,505	0.00
M&R SERVICES	2,979,720	0.00	3,971,803	0.00	3,631,803	0.00	3,631,803	0.00
COMPUTER EQUIPMENT	465,132	0.00	374,424	0.00	374,424	0.00	374,424	0.00
MOTORIZED EQUIPMENT	0	0.00	11	0.00	11	0.00	11	0.00
OFFICE EQUIPMENT	505	0.00	15,069	0.00	15,069	0.00	15,069	0.00
OTHER EQUIPMENT	570	0.00	9,926	0.00	9,926	0.00	9,926	0.00
PROPERTY & IMPROVEMENTS	11,205	0.00	10	0.00	10	0.00	10	0.00
BUILDING LEASE PAYMENTS	42,335	0.00	52,107	0.00	52,107	0.00	52,107	0.00
EQUIPMENT RENTALS & LEASES	326	0.00	1,279	0.00	1,279	0.00	1,279	0.00
MISCELLANEOUS EXPENSES	5,738	0.00	5,741	0.00	5,741	0.00	5,741	0.00
REBILLABLE EXPENSES	234,878	0.00	60,011	0.00	60,011	0.00	60,011	0.00
TOTAL - EE	5,129,140	0.00	5,701,308	0.00	5,701,308	0.00	5,701,308	0.00
REFUNDS	0	0.00	723	0.00	723	0.00	723	0.00
TOTAL - PD	0	0.00	723	0.00	723	0.00	723	0.00
GRAND TOTAL	\$11,279,524	128.75	\$12,040,136	136.00	\$12,040,136	136.00	\$12,040,136	136.00
GENERAL REVENUE	\$9,658,269	122.46	\$11,122,936	136.00	\$11,122,936	136.00	\$11,122,936	136.00
FEDERAL FUNDS	\$713,035	6.29	\$0	0.00	\$0	0.00	\$0	0.00
OTHER FUNDS	\$908,220	0.00	\$917,200	0.00	\$917,200	0.00	\$917,200	0.00

JUDICIARY REPORT 9 FY2012 GOVERNOR RECOMMENDATION

DECISION ITEM SUMMARY

Budget Unit								
Decision Item	FY 2010	FY 2010	FY 2011	FY 2011	FY 2012	FY 2012	FY 2012	FY 2012
Budget Object Summary	ACTUAL	ACTUAL	BUDGET	BUDGET	DEPT REQ	DEPT REQ	GOV REC	GOV REC
Fund	DOLLAR	FTE	DOLLAR	FTE	DOLLAR	FTE	DOLLAR	FTE
COURT IMPROVEMENT PROJECTS								
CORE								
PERSONAL SERVICES								
JUDICIARY - FEDERAL	1,590,028	38.92	2,217,578	44.25	2,284,380	46.25	2,284,380	46.25
BASIC CIVIL LEGAL SERVICES	27,204	1.00	30,942	1.00	30,942	1.00	30,942	1.00
TOTAL - PS	1,617,232	39.92	2,248,520	45.25	2,315,322	47.25	2,315,322	47.25
EXPENSE & EQUIPMENT								
JUDICIARY - FEDERAL	1,302,064	0.00	5,308,649	0.00	5,308,649	0.00	5,308,649	0.00
BASIC CIVIL LEGAL SERVICES	300	0.00	300	0.00	300	0.00	300	0.00
TOTAL - EE	1,302,364	0.00	5,308,949	0.00	5,308,949	0.00	5,308,949	0.00
PROGRAM-SPECIFIC								
JUDICIARY - FEDERAL	190,903	0.00	301,000	0.00	301,000	0.00	301,000	0.00
TOTAL - PD	190,903	0.00	301,000	0.00	301,000	0.00	301,000	0.00
TOTAL	3,110,499	39.92	7,858,469	45.25	7,925,271	47.25	7,925,271	47.25
GRAND TOTAL	\$3,110,499	39.92	\$7,858,469	45.25	\$7,925,271	47.25	\$7,925,271	47.25

CORE DECISION ITEM

Judiciary	Budget Unit <u>11102C</u>
Office of State Courts Administrator	
Core - Court Improvement Projects	

1. CORE FINANCIAL SUMMARY

	FY 2012 Budget Request					FY 2012 Governor's Recommendation			
	GR	Federal	Other	Total		GR	Federal	Other	Total
PS	0	2,284,380	30,942	2,315,322	PS	0	2,284,380	30,942	2,315,322
EE	0	5,308,649 E	300	5,308,949 E	EE	0	5,308,649 E	300	5,308,949 E
PSD	0	301,000 E	0	301,000 E	PSD	0	301,000 E	0	301,000 E
Total	0	7,894,029 E	31,242	7,925,271 E	Total	0	7,894,029 E	31,242	7,925,271 E
FTE	0.00	46.25	1.00	47.25	FTE	0.00	46.25	1.00	47.25

Est. Fringe	0	1,271,257	17,219	1,288,477
--------------------	---	-----------	--------	-----------

Note: Fringes budgeted in House Bill 5 except for certain fringes budgeted directly to MoDOT, Highway Patrol, and Conservation.

Est. Fringe	0	1,271,257	17,219	1,288,477
--------------------	---	-----------	--------	-----------

Note: Fringes budgeted in House Bill 5 except for certain fringes budgeted directly to MoDOT, Highway Patrol, and Conservation.

Other Funds: Basic Civil Legal Services Fund (0757) - \$31,242

Other Funds: Basic Civil Legal Services Fund (0757) - \$31,242

2. CORE DESCRIPTION

The Court Improvement Projects' core budget item provides the appropriation authority to accept and expend a variety of grants and other monies for programs and services provided to the public by the Missouri judiciary. These are federal/other funds.

The judiciary's grant program is focused on fulfilling mandates and developing new ways to make the judicial branch more effective and responsive to the needs of Missouri citizens. Initiatives such as improved processing of child abuse and neglect cases and automation of criminal history information as well as adult protection orders promote safety for Missouri families by addressing specific problems.

3. PROGRAM LISTING (list programs included in this core funding)


- Basic Civil Legal Services (page 24)
- Technical Assistance (page 60)
- Court Technology (page 64)
- Trial Courts (page 125)
- Permanency Planning (page 147)

CORE DECISION ITEM

Judiciary	Budget Unit	11102C
Office of State Courts Administrator		
Core - Court Improvement Projects		

4. FINANCIAL HISTORY

	FY 2008 Actual	FY 2009 Actual	FY 2010 Actual	FY 2011 Current Yr.
Appropriation (All Funds)	7,792,978	7,858,469	7,858,469	7,858,469
Less Reverted (All Funds)	0	0	0	N/A
Budget Authority (All Funds)	7,792,978	7,858,469	7,858,469	N/A
Actual Expenditures (All Funds)	5,200,765	4,594,759	3,110,499	N/A
Unexpended (All Funds)	2,592,213	3,263,710	4,747,970	N/A
Unexpended, by Fund:				
General Revenue	0	0	0	N/A
Federal	2,588,552	3,259,939	4,744,232	N/A
Other	3,661	3,771	3,738	N/A



Reverted includes Governor's standard 3 percent reserve (when applicable) and any extraordinary withholdings.

NOTES:

CORE RECONCILIATION DETAIL

JUDICIARY
COURT IMPROVEMENT PROJECTS

5. CORE RECONCILIATION DETAIL

	Budget Class	FTE	GR	Federal	Other	Total	Explanation
TAFP AFTER VETOES							
	PS	45.25	0	2,217,578	30,942	2,248,520	
	EE	0.00	0	5,308,649	300	5,308,949	
	PD	0.00	0	301,000	0	301,000	
	Total	45.25	0	7,827,227	31,242	7,858,469	
DEPARTMENT CORE ADJUSTMENTS							
Core Reallocation	984 8378 PS	2.00	0	66,802	0	66,802	FTE transfer to Federal funds from Other funds
	NET DEPARTMENT CHANGES	2.00	0	66,802	0	66,802	
DEPARTMENT CORE REQUEST							
	PS	47.25	0	2,284,380	30,942	2,315,322	
	EE	0.00	0	5,308,649	300	5,308,949	
	PD	0.00	0	301,000	0	301,000	
	Total	47.25	0	7,894,029	31,242	7,925,271	
GOVERNOR'S RECOMMENDED CORE							
	PS	47.25	0	2,284,380	30,942	2,315,322	
	EE	0.00	0	5,308,649	300	5,308,949	
	PD	0.00	0	301,000	0	301,000	
	Total	47.25	0	7,894,029	31,242	7,925,271	

JUDICIARY REPORT 10 FY2012 GOVERNOR RECOMMENDATION

DECISION ITEM DETAIL

Budget Unit	FY 2010	FY 2010	FY 2011	FY 2011	FY 2012	FY 2012	FY 2012	FY 2012
Decision Item	ACTUAL	ACTUAL	BUDGET	BUDGET	DEPT REQ	DEPT REQ	GOV REC	GOV REC
Budget Object Class	DOLLAR	FTE	DOLLAR	FTE	DOLLAR	FTE	DOLLAR	FTE
COURT IMPROVEMENT PROJECTS								
CORE								
DIVISION DIRECTOR	50,070	0.58	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00
PROGRAM MANAGER	0	0.00	71,544	1.00	54,451	1.00	54,451	1.00
PROGRAM COORDINATOR I	154,352	3.06	101,544	2.00	101,544	2.00	101,544	2.00
PROGRAM SPECIALIST I	26,491	0.84	31,716	1.00	98,518	3.00	98,518	3.00
PROGRAM SPECIALIST II	211,044	6.00	225,906	4.50	225,906	4.50	225,906	4.50
PROGRAM SPECIALIST III	540,242	13.45	689,290	13.00	689,290	13.00	689,290	13.00
PROGRAM SPECIALIST IV	104,860	2.33	258,600	5.00	258,600	5.00	258,600	5.00
SUPPORT SPECIALIST III	0	0.00	214,712	3.00	214,712	3.00	214,712	3.00
SUPPORT SPECIALIST II	0	0.00	42,513	1.00	42,513	1.00	42,513	1.00
SUPPORT TECHNICIAN I	27,204	1.00	30,942	1.00	30,942	1.00	30,942	1.00
COMPUTER INFORMATION TECH. I	78,648	2.00	118,404	3.00	118,404	3.00	118,404	3.00
COMPUTER INFORMATION TECH. II	135,075	3.00	131,814	3.00	135,075	3.00	135,075	3.00
COMPUTER INFORMATION TECH. III	198,248	3.89	230,723	4.00	230,723	4.00	230,723	4.00
SECRETARY II	6,246	0.25	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00
SECRETARY III	27,204	1.00	27,204	1.00	27,204	1.00	27,204	1.00
CLERK II	29,706	1.19	37,440	1.50	37,440	1.50	37,440	1.50
TEMPORARY APPOINTMENT	15,237	0.74	6,168	0.25	20,000	0.25	20,000	0.25
TEMPORARY HELP	12,605	0.59	30,000	1.00	30,000	1.00	30,000	1.00
TOTAL - PS	1,617,232	39.92	2,248,520	45.25	2,315,322	47.25	2,315,322	47.25
TRAVEL, IN-STATE	182,282	0.00	285,000	0.00	285,000	0.00	285,000	0.00
TRAVEL, OUT-OF-STATE	35,501	0.00	35,000	0.00	35,000	0.00	35,000	0.00
FUEL & UTILITIES	0	0.00	10,000	0.00	10,000	0.00	10,000	0.00
SUPPLIES	42,403	0.00	100,300	0.00	100,300	0.00	100,300	0.00
PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT	12,960	0.00	200,000	0.00	200,000	0.00	200,000	0.00
COMMUNICATION SERV & SUPP	35,002	0.00	66,649	0.00	66,649	0.00	66,649	0.00
PROFESSIONAL SERVICES	517,860	0.00	2,500,000	0.00	2,500,000	0.00	2,500,000	0.00
HOUSEKEEPING & JANITORIAL SERV	0	0.00	10,000	0.00	10,000	0.00	10,000	0.00
M&R SERVICES	53,857	0.00	350,000	0.00	350,000	0.00	350,000	0.00
COMPUTER EQUIPMENT	19,598	0.00	700,000	0.00	700,000	0.00	700,000	0.00
MOTORIZED EQUIPMENT	0	0.00	45,000	0.00	45,000	0.00	45,000	0.00
OFFICE EQUIPMENT	3,390	0.00	4,200	0.00	4,200	0.00	4,200	0.00
OTHER EQUIPMENT	18,652	0.00	150,000	0.00	150,000	0.00	150,000	0.00

JUDICIARY REPORT 10 FY2012 GOVERNOR RECOMMENDATION

DECISION ITEM DETAIL

Budget Unit	FY 2010	FY 2010	FY 2011	FY 2011	FY 2012	FY 2012	FY 2012	FY 2012
Decision Item	ACTUAL	ACTUAL	BUDGET	BUDGET	DEPT REQ	DEPT REQ	GOV REC	GOV REC
Budget Object Class	DOLLAR	FTE	DOLLAR	FTE	DOLLAR	FTE	DOLLAR	FTE
COURT IMPROVEMENT PROJECTS								
CORE								
PROPERTY & IMPROVEMENTS	0	0.00	1,000	0.00	1,000	0.00	1,000	0.00
BUILDING LEASE PAYMENTS	1,899	0.00	6,200	0.00	6,200	0.00	6,200	0.00
EQUIPMENT RENTALS & LEASES	1,954	0.00	10,600	0.00	10,600	0.00	10,600	0.00
MISCELLANEOUS EXPENSES	32,675	0.00	35,000	0.00	35,000	0.00	35,000	0.00
REBILLABLE EXPENSES	344,331	0.00	800,000	0.00	800,000	0.00	800,000	0.00
TOTAL - EE	1,302,364	0.00	5,308,949	0.00	5,308,949	0.00	5,308,949	0.00
PROGRAM DISTRIBUTIONS	190,903	0.00	300,000	0.00	300,000	0.00	300,000	0.00
DEBT SERVICE	0	0.00	1,000	0.00	1,000	0.00	1,000	0.00
TOTAL - PD	190,903	0.00	301,000	0.00	301,000	0.00	301,000	0.00
GRAND TOTAL	\$3,110,499	39.92	\$7,858,469	45.25	\$7,925,271	47.25	\$7,925,271	47.25
GENERAL REVENUE	\$0	0.00	\$0	0.00	\$0	0.00	\$0	0.00
FEDERAL FUNDS	\$3,082,995	38.92	\$7,827,227	44.25	\$7,894,029	46.25	\$7,894,029	46.25
OTHER FUNDS	\$27,504	1.00	\$31,242	1.00	\$31,242	1.00	\$31,242	1.00

JUDICIARY REPORT 9 FY2012 GOVERNOR RECOMMENDATION

DECISION ITEM SUMMARY

Budget Unit								
Decision Item	FY 2010	FY 2010	FY 2011	FY 2011	FY 2012	FY 2012	FY 2012	FY 2012
Budget Object Summary	ACTUAL	ACTUAL	BUDGET	BUDGET	DEPT REQ	DEPT REQ	GOV REC	GOV REC
Fund	DOLLAR	FTE	DOLLAR	FTE	DOLLAR	FTE	DOLLAR	FTE
STATEWIDE COURT AUTOMATION								
CORE								
PERSONAL SERVICES								
STATEWIDE COURT AUTOMATION	1,539,241	31.62	1,561,021	34.00	1,561,021	34.00	1,561,021	34.00
TOTAL - PS	1,539,241	31.62	1,561,021	34.00	1,561,021	34.00	1,561,021	34.00
EXPENSE & EQUIPMENT								
STATEWIDE COURT AUTOMATION	3,107,076	0.00	2,884,681	0.00	2,884,681	0.00	2,884,681	0.00
TOTAL - EE	3,107,076	0.00	2,884,681	0.00	2,884,681	0.00	2,884,681	0.00
PROGRAM-SPECIFIC								
STATEWIDE COURT AUTOMATION	300,000	0.00	500	0.00	500	0.00	500	0.00
TOTAL - PD	300,000	0.00	500	0.00	500	0.00	500	0.00
TOTAL	4,946,317	31.62	4,446,202	34.00	4,446,202	34.00	4,446,202	34.00
GRAND TOTAL	\$4,946,317	31.62	\$4,446,202	34.00	\$4,446,202	34.00	\$4,446,202	34.00

CORE DECISION ITEM

Judiciary	Budget Unit <u>11103C</u>
Office of State Courts Administrator	
Core - Statewide Court Automation	

1. CORE FINANCIAL SUMMARY

	FY 2012 Budget Request					FY 2012 Governor's Recommendation			
	GR	Federal	Other	Total		GR	Federal	Other	Total
PS	0	0	1,561,021	1,561,021	PS	0	0	1,561,021	1,561,021
EE	0	0	2,884,681 E	2,884,681 E	EE	0	0	2,884,681 E	2,884,681 E
PSD	0	0	500 E	500 E	PSD	0	0	500 E	500 E
Total	0	0	4,446,202 E	4,446,202 E	Total	0	0	4,446,202 E	4,446,202 E
FTE	0.00	0.00	34.00	34.00	FTE	0.00	0.00	34.00	34.00
Est. Fringe	0	0	868,708	868,708	Est. Fringe	0	0	868,708	868,708
<i>Note: Fringes budgeted in House Bill 5 except for certain fringes budgeted directly to MoDOT, Highway Patrol, and Conservation.</i>					<i>Note: Fringes budgeted in House Bill 5 except for certain fringes budgeted directly to MoDOT, Highway Patrol, and Conservation.</i>				
Other Funds: Statewide Court Automation Fund (0270) - \$4,446,202					Other Funds: Statewide Court Automation Fund (0270) - \$4,446,202				

2. CORE DESCRIPTION

Statutorily created, the fundamental strategic goal of the Statewide Court Automation Project is to build "an integrated court system that renders geography largely irrelevant. . . with greater efficiency, wider access, and enhanced accountability" for the litigant and taxpayer. This is a continuation of a long-term plan to develop an "information infrastructure" that was started in 1996. This plan includes installation and ongoing development of case management and other software packages.

3. PROGRAM LISTING (list programs included in this core funding)


Court Technology (page 64)

CORE DECISION ITEM

Judiciary	Budget Unit <u>11103C</u>
Office of State Courts Administrator	
Core - Statewide Court Automation	

4. FINANCIAL HISTORY

	FY 2008 Actual	FY 2009 Actual	FY 2010 Actual	FY 2011 Current Yr.
Appropriation (All Funds)	5,525,736 E	5,590,453	5,046,202 E	4,446,202 E
Less Reverted (All Funds)	0	0	0	N/A
Budget Authority (All Funds)	5,525,736	5,590,453	5,046,202	N/A
Actual Expenditures (All Funds)	4,829,425	5,437,051	4,946,316	N/A
Unexpended (All Funds)	696,311	153,402	99,886	N/A
Unexpended, by Fund:				
General Revenue	0	0	0	N/A
Federal	0	0	0	N/A
Other	696,311	153,402	99,886	N/A



Reverted includes Governor's standard 3 percent reserve (when applicable) and any extraordinary withholdings.

NOTES:

- The FY 2008 appropriation was increased by \$1,125,000.
- The FY 2009 appropriation was increased by \$1,144,251.
- The FY 2010 appropriation was increased by \$600,000.

CORE RECONCILIATION DETAIL

JUDICIARY
STATEWIDE COURT AUTOMATION

5. CORE RECONCILIATION DETAIL

	Budget Class	FTE	GR	Federal	Other	Total	Explanation
TAFP AFTER VETOES							
	PS	34.00	0	0	1,561,021	1,561,021	
	EE	0.00	0	0	2,884,681	2,884,681	
	PD	0.00	0	0	500	500	
	Total	34.00	0	0	4,446,202	4,446,202	
DEPARTMENT CORE REQUEST							
	PS	34.00	0	0	1,561,021	1,561,021	
	EE	0.00	0	0	2,884,681	2,884,681	
	PD	0.00	0	0	500	500	
	Total	34.00	0	0	4,446,202	4,446,202	
GOVERNOR'S RECOMMENDED CORE							
	PS	34.00	0	0	1,561,021	1,561,021	
	EE	0.00	0	0	2,884,681	2,884,681	
	PD	0.00	0	0	500	500	
	Total	34.00	0	0	4,446,202	4,446,202	

JUDICIARY REPORT 10 FY2012 GOVERNOR RECOMMENDATION

DECISION ITEM DETAIL

Budget Unit	FY 2010	FY 2010	FY 2011	FY 2011	FY 2012	FY 2012	FY 2012	FY 2012
Decision Item	ACTUAL	ACTUAL	BUDGET	BUDGET	DEPT REQ	DEPT REQ	GOV REC	GOV REC
Budget Object Class	DOLLAR	FTE	DOLLAR	FTE	DOLLAR	FTE	DOLLAR	FTE
STATEWIDE COURT AUTOMATION								
CORE								
DIVISION DIRECTOR	119,937	1.00	119,937	1.00	119,937	1.00	119,937	1.00
PROGRAM MANAGER	28,076	0.39	71,544	1.00	0	0.00	0	0.00
PROGRAM COORDINATOR II	150,192	2.78	159,852	3.00	216,104	4.00	216,104	4.00
PROGRAM SPECIALIST III	302,588	7.67	265,744	8.00	281,036	8.00	281,036	8.00
PROGRAM SPECIALIST IV	139,224	3.00	139,224	3.00	139,224	3.00	139,224	3.00
COMPUTER INFO TECH TRAINEE	25,677	0.75	0	0.00	34,236	1.00	34,236	1.00
COMPUTER INFORMATION TECH. I	139,724	3.51	39,468	1.00	159,229	3.00	159,229	3.00
COMPUTER INFORMATION TECH. II	16,898	0.38	90,120	2.00	44,469	1.00	44,469	1.00
COMPUTER INFORMATION TECH. III	249,149	4.96	322,524	7.00	214,178	5.00	214,178	5.00
COMPUTER INFO TECH SPEC I	172,608	3.18	157,440	4.00	157,440	4.00	157,440	4.00
COMP INFO TECHNOLOGY MGR I	131,352	2.00	131,352	2.00	131,352	2.00	131,352	2.00
SECRETARY TO DIVISION DIRECTOR	36,612	1.00	36,612	1.00	36,612	1.00	36,612	1.00
SECRETARY III	27,204	1.00	27,204	1.00	27,204	1.00	27,204	1.00
TOTAL - PS	1,539,241	31.62	1,561,021	34.00	1,561,021	34.00	1,561,021	34.00
TRAVEL, IN-STATE	159,224	0.00	237,282	0.00	237,282	0.00	237,282	0.00
TRAVEL, OUT-OF-STATE	17,841	0.00	42,013	0.00	42,013	0.00	42,013	0.00
SUPPLIES	11,791	0.00	37,924	0.00	37,924	0.00	37,924	0.00
PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT	55,169	0.00	100,545	0.00	100,545	0.00	100,545	0.00
COMMUNICATION SERV & SUPP	670,230	0.00	878,965	0.00	878,965	0.00	878,965	0.00
PROFESSIONAL SERVICES	69,485	0.00	64,704	0.00	64,704	0.00	64,704	0.00
HOUSEKEEPING & JANITORIAL SERV	0	0.00	888	0.00	888	0.00	888	0.00
M&R SERVICES	681,115	0.00	604,717	0.00	604,717	0.00	604,717	0.00
COMPUTER EQUIPMENT	1,332,444	0.00	864,006	0.00	864,006	0.00	864,006	0.00
MOTORIZED EQUIPMENT	0	0.00	1	0.00	1	0.00	1	0.00
OFFICE EQUIPMENT	1,399	0.00	183	0.00	183	0.00	183	0.00
OTHER EQUIPMENT	4,355	0.00	1,920	0.00	1,920	0.00	1,920	0.00
BUILDING LEASE PAYMENTS	1,090	0.00	17,983	0.00	17,983	0.00	17,983	0.00
EQUIPMENT RENTALS & LEASES	0	0.00	1	0.00	1	0.00	1	0.00
MISCELLANEOUS EXPENSES	13,537	0.00	5,970	0.00	5,970	0.00	5,970	0.00
REBILLABLE EXPENSES	89,396	0.00	27,579	0.00	27,579	0.00	27,579	0.00
TOTAL - EE	3,107,076	0.00	2,884,681	0.00	2,884,681	0.00	2,884,681	0.00

JUDICIARY REPORT 10 FY2012 GOVERNOR RECOMMENDATION

DECISION ITEM DETAIL

Budget Unit	FY 2010	FY 2010	FY 2011	FY 2011	FY 2012	FY 2012	FY 2012	FY 2012
Decision Item	ACTUAL	ACTUAL	BUDGET	BUDGET	DEPT REQ	DEPT REQ	GOV REC	GOV REC
Budget Object Class	DOLLAR	FTE	DOLLAR	FTE	DOLLAR	FTE	DOLLAR	FTE
STATEWIDE COURT AUTOMATION								
CORE								
PROGRAM DISTRIBUTIONS	300,000	0.00	500	0.00	500	0.00	500	0.00
TOTAL - PD	300,000	0.00	500	0.00	500	0.00	500	0.00
GRAND TOTAL	\$4,946,317	31.62	\$4,446,202	34.00	\$4,446,202	34.00	\$4,446,202	34.00
GENERAL REVENUE	\$0	0.00	\$0	0.00	\$0	0.00	\$0	0.00
FEDERAL FUNDS	\$0	0.00	\$0	0.00	\$0	0.00	\$0	0.00
OTHER FUNDS	\$4,946,317	31.62	\$4,446,202	34.00	\$4,446,202	34.00	\$4,446,202	34.00

JUDICIARY REPORT 9 FY2012 GOVERNOR RECOMMENDATION
DECISION ITEM SUMMARY

Budget Unit								
Decision Item	FY 2010	FY 2010	FY 2011	FY 2011	FY 2012	FY 2012	FY 2012	FY 2012
Budget Object Summary	ACTUAL	ACTUAL	BUDGET	BUDGET	DEPT REQ	DEPT REQ	GOV REC	GOV REC
Fund	DOLLAR	FTE	DOLLAR	FTE	DOLLAR	FTE	DOLLAR	FTE
JUDICIAL TRNG & ED TRANSFER								
CORE								
FUND TRANSFERS								
GENERAL REVENUE	1,122,426	0.00	1,395,363	0.00	1,395,363	0.00	1,395,363	0.00
FEDRAL BUDGET STAB-MEDICAID RE	97,675	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00
TOTAL - TRF	1,220,101	0.00	1,395,363	0.00	1,395,363	0.00	1,395,363	0.00
TOTAL	1,220,101	0.00	1,395,363	0.00	1,395,363	0.00	1,395,363	0.00
GRAND TOTAL	\$1,220,101	0.00	\$1,395,363	0.00	\$1,395,363	0.00	\$1,395,363	0.00

CORE DECISION ITEM

Judiciary	Budget Unit <u>11107C</u>
Office of State Courts Administrator	
Core - Judicial Education Transfer	

1. CORE FINANCIAL SUMMARY

FY 2012 Budget Request					FY 2012 Governor's Recommendation				
	GR	Federal	Other	Total		GR	Federal	Other	Total
PS	0	0	0	0	PS	0	0	0	0
EE	0	0	0	0	EE	0	0	0	0
Transfer	1,395,363	0	0	1,395,363	Transfer	1,395,363	0	0	1,395,363
Total	1,395,363	0	0	1,395,363	Total	1,395,363	0	0	1,395,363
FTE	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	FTE	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Est. Fringe	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	Est. Fringe	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>
<i>Note: Fringes budgeted in House Bill 5 except for certain fringes budgeted directly to MoDOT, Highway Patrol, and Conservation.</i>					<i>Note: Fringes budgeted in House Bill 5 except for certain fringes budgeted directly to MoDOT, Highway Patrol, and Conservation.</i>				

Other Funds:

Other Funds:

2. CORE DESCRIPTION

See Judicial Education core description.

3. PROGRAM LISTING (list programs included in this core funding)


See Judicial Education program listing.

CORE DECISION ITEM

Judiciary	Budget Unit <u>11107C</u>
Office of State Courts Administrator	
Core - Judicial Education Transfer	

4. FINANCIAL HISTORY

	<u>FY 2008 Actual</u>	<u>FY 2009 Actual</u>	<u>FY 2010 Actual</u>	<u>FY 2011 Current Yr.</u>
Appropriation (All Funds)	1,395,363	1,395,363	1,395,363	1,395,363
Less Reverted (All Funds)	0	(267,688)	(175,262)	N/A
Budget Authority (All Funds)	1,395,363	1,127,675	1,220,101	N/A
Actual Expenditures (All Funds)	1,395,363	1,116,291	1,220,101	N/A
Unexpended (All Funds)	0	11,384	0	N/A
Unexpended, by Fund:				
General Revenue	0	11,384	0	N/A
Federal	0	0	0	N/A
Other	0	0	0	N/A



Reverted includes Governor's standard 3 percent reserve (when applicable) and any extraordinary withholdings.

NOTES:

CORE RECONCILIATION DETAIL

JUDICIARY**JUDICIAL TRNG & ED TRANSFER**

5. CORE RECONCILIATION DETAIL

	Budget Class	FTE	GR	Federal	Other	Total	Explanation
TAFP AFTER VETOES							
	TRF	0.00	1,395,363	0	0	1,395,363	
	Total	0.00	1,395,363	0	0	1,395,363	
DEPARTMENT CORE REQUEST							
	TRF	0.00	1,395,363	0	0	1,395,363	
	Total	0.00	1,395,363	0	0	1,395,363	
GOVERNOR'S RECOMMENDED CORE							
	TRF	0.00	1,395,363	0	0	1,395,363	
	Total	0.00	1,395,363	0	0	1,395,363	

JUDICIARY REPORT 10 FY2012 GOVERNOR RECOMMENDATION**DECISION ITEM DETAIL**

Budget Unit	FY 2010	FY 2010	FY 2011	FY 2011	FY 2012	FY 2012	FY 2012	FY 2012
Decision Item	ACTUAL	ACTUAL	BUDGET	BUDGET	DEPT REQ	DEPT REQ	GOV REC	GOV REC
Budget Object Class	DOLLAR	FTE	DOLLAR	FTE	DOLLAR	FTE	DOLLAR	FTE
JUDICIAL TRNG & ED TRANSFER								
CORE								
TRANSFERS OUT	1,220,101	0.00	1,395,363	0.00	1,395,363	0.00	1,395,363	0.00
TOTAL - TRF	1,220,101	0.00	1,395,363	0.00	1,395,363	0.00	1,395,363	0.00
GRAND TOTAL	\$1,220,101	0.00	\$1,395,363	0.00	\$1,395,363	0.00	\$1,395,363	0.00
GENERAL REVENUE	\$1,122,426	0.00	\$1,395,363	0.00	\$1,395,363	0.00	\$1,395,363	0.00
FEDERAL FUNDS	\$97,675	0.00	\$0	0.00	\$0	0.00	\$0	0.00
OTHER FUNDS	\$0	0.00	\$0	0.00	\$0	0.00	\$0	0.00

JUDICIARY REPORT 9 FY2012 GOVERNOR RECOMMENDATION**DECISION ITEM SUMMARY**

Budget Unit								
Decision Item	FY 2010	FY 2010	FY 2011	FY 2011	FY 2012	FY 2012	FY 2012	FY 2012
Budget Object Summary	ACTUAL	ACTUAL	BUDGET	BUDGET	DEPT REQ	DEPT REQ	GOV REC	GOV REC
Fund	DOLLAR	FTE	DOLLAR	FTE	DOLLAR	FTE	DOLLAR	FTE
JUDICIAL BR TRNG & EDUCATION								
CORE								
PERSONAL SERVICES								
JUDICIARY EDUCATION & TRAINING	384,077	7.80	618,477	13.00	551,675	11.00	551,675	11.00
TOTAL - PS	384,077	7.80	618,477	13.00	551,675	11.00	551,675	11.00
EXPENSE & EQUIPMENT								
JUDICIARY - FEDERAL	0	0.00	225,000	0.00	225,000	0.00	225,000	0.00
JUDICIARY EDUCATION & TRAINING	498,836	0.00	1,033,445	0.00	843,688	0.00	843,688	0.00
TOTAL - EE	498,836	0.00	1,258,445	0.00	1,068,688	0.00	1,068,688	0.00
TOTAL	882,913	7.80	1,876,922	13.00	1,620,363	11.00	1,620,363	11.00
GRAND TOTAL	\$882,913	7.80	\$1,876,922	13.00	\$1,620,363	11.00	\$1,620,363	11.00

CORE DECISION ITEM

Judiciary	Budget Unit <u>11108C</u>
Office of State Courts Administrator	
Core - Judicial Education	

1. CORE FINANCIAL SUMMARY

	FY 2012 Budget Request					FY 2012 Governor's Recommendation			
	GR	Federal	Other	Total		GR	Federal	Other	Total
PS	0	0	551,675	551,675	PS	0	0	551,675	551,675
EE	0	225,000	843,688	1,068,688	EE	0	225,000	843,688	1,068,688
PSD	0	0	0	0	PSD	0	0	0	0
Total	0	225,000	1,395,363	1,620,363	Total	0	225,000	1,395,363	1,620,363
FTE	0.00	0.00	11.00	11.00	FTE	0.00	0.00	11.00	11.00
Est. Fringe	0	0	307,007	307,007	Est. Fringe	0	0	307,007	307,007
<i>Note: Fringes budgeted in House Bill 5 except for certain fringes budgeted directly to MoDOT, Highway Patrol, and Conservation.</i>					<i>Note: Fringes budgeted in House Bill 5 except for certain fringes budgeted directly to MoDOT, Highway Patrol, and Conservation.</i>				

Other Funds: Judicial Education and Training Fund (0847) - \$1,651,922 Other Funds: Judicial Education and Training Fund (0847) - \$1,651,922

2. CORE DESCRIPTION

Judicial Education serves to orient new employees to a complex set of laws and procedures, all of which must be understood and followed if litigants are to have their cases resolved fairly and expeditiously. Judicial Education plays a major role in updating knowledge and skills for almost 4,000 state, county and municipal judicial branch employees—front-line workers such as juvenile officers, detention workers, court clerks—who have no other means to acquire the information to discharge day-to-day job responsibilities. The Judicial Education Program packages courses and programs of study that are tailored to meet the specific needs of new as well as experienced court personnel. These courses and programs are designed to satisfy standards mandated by Federal and State statute and Supreme Court Rules.

3. PROGRAM LISTING (list programs included in this core funding)


Training (page 69)

CORE DECISION ITEM

Judiciary	Budget Unit <u>11108C</u>
Office of State Courts Administrator	
Core - Judicial Education	

4. FINANCIAL HISTORY

	FY 2008 Actual	FY 2009 Actual	FY 2010 Actual	FY 2011 Current Yr.
Appropriation (All Funds)	1,858,910	1,876,922	1,876,922	1,876,922
Less Reverted (All Funds)	0	0	0	N/A
Budget Authority (All Funds)	1,858,910	1,876,922	1,876,922	N/A
Actual Expenditures (All Funds)	1,061,938	949,118	882,913	N/A
Unexpended (All Funds)	796,972	927,804	994,009	N/A
Unexpended, by Fund:				
General Revenue	0	0	0	N/A
Federal	216,420	225,000	225,000	N/A
Other	580,552	702,804	769,009	N/A



Reverted includes Governor's standard 3 percent reserve (when applicable) and any extraordinary withholdings.

NOTES:

CORE RECONCILIATION DETAIL

JUDICIARY**JUDICIAL BR TRNG & EDUCATION**

5. CORE RECONCILIATION DETAIL

	Budget Class	FTE	GR	Federal	Other	Total	Explanation
TAFP AFTER VETOES							
	PS	13.00	0	0	618,477	618,477	
	EE	0.00	0	225,000	1,033,445	1,258,445	
	Total	13.00	0	225,000	1,651,922	1,876,922	
DEPARTMENT CORE ADJUSTMENTS							
Core Reduction	947 4187 EE	0.00	0	0	(189,757)	(189,757)	empty spending authority reduction
Core Reallocation	941 4186 PS	(2.00)	0	0	(66,802)	(66,802)	FTE transfer from Other funds to Federal funds
	NET DEPARTMENT CHANGES	(2.00)	0	0	(256,559)	(256,559)	
DEPARTMENT CORE REQUEST							
	PS	11.00	0	0	551,675	551,675	
	EE	0.00	0	225,000	843,688	1,068,688	
	Total	11.00	0	225,000	1,395,363	1,620,363	
GOVERNOR'S RECOMMENDED CORE							
	PS	11.00	0	0	551,675	551,675	
	EE	0.00	0	225,000	843,688	1,068,688	
	Total	11.00	0	225,000	1,395,363	1,620,363	

JUDICIARY REPORT 10 FY2012 GOVERNOR RECOMMENDATION

DECISION ITEM DETAIL

Budget Unit	FY 2010	FY 2010	FY 2011	FY 2011	FY 2012	FY 2012	FY 2012	FY 2012
Decision Item	ACTUAL	ACTUAL	BUDGET	BUDGET	DEPT REQ	DEPT REQ	GOV REC	GOV REC
Budget Object Class	DOLLAR	FTE	DOLLAR	FTE	DOLLAR	FTE	DOLLAR	FTE
JUDICIAL BR TRNG & EDUCATION								
CORE								
DEP ST CT ADM AND DIVISION DIR	82,801	0.77	86,401	0.80	86,401	0.80	86,401	0.80
PROGRAM MANAGER	61,594	0.96	64,272	1.00	71,544	1.00	71,544	1.00
EDUCATION PROGRAM SPECIALIST	94,173	2.00	155,098	3.00	106,584	2.00	106,584	2.00
PROGRAM COORDINATOR I	10,418	0.21	0	0.00	57,864	1.00	57,864	1.00
PROGRAM COORDINATOR II	4,597	0.08	82,768	1.00	0	0.00	0	0.00
PROGRAM SPECIALIST I	0	0.00	0	0.00	38,700	1.00	38,700	1.00
PROGRAM SPECIALIST IV	45,060	1.00	92,332	2.00	55,548	1.00	55,548	1.00
SUPPORT TECHNICIAN I	27,204	1.00	27,204	1.00	32,256	1.00	32,256	1.00
SECRETARY II	0	0.00	25,526	1.00	0	0.00	0	0.00
SECRETARY TO DIVISION DIRECTOR	38,960	1.07	36,612	1.00	0	0.00	0	0.00
SECRETARY III	19,270	0.71	27,204	1.00	64,512	2.00	64,512	2.00
CLERK I	0	0.00	21,060	1.20	38,266	1.20	38,266	1.20
TOTAL - PS	384,077	7.80	618,477	13.00	551,675	11.00	551,675	11.00
TRAVEL, IN-STATE	305,089	0.00	657,586	0.00	547,829	0.00	547,829	0.00
TRAVEL, OUT-OF-STATE	2,776	0.00	18,200	0.00	18,200	0.00	18,200	0.00
SUPPLIES	12,812	0.00	33,274	0.00	33,274	0.00	33,274	0.00
PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT	2,487	0.00	25,350	0.00	25,350	0.00	25,350	0.00
COMMUNICATION SERV & SUPP	4,499	0.00	21,081	0.00	21,081	0.00	21,081	0.00
PROFESSIONAL SERVICES	49,822	0.00	245,746	0.00	175,746	0.00	175,746	0.00
HOUSEKEEPING & JANITORIAL SERV	0	0.00	376	0.00	376	0.00	376	0.00
M&R SERVICES	1,349	0.00	81,462	0.00	81,462	0.00	81,462	0.00
COMPUTER EQUIPMENT	9,630	0.00	12,000	0.00	12,000	0.00	12,000	0.00
OTHER EQUIPMENT	6,658	0.00	9,500	0.00	9,500	0.00	9,500	0.00
BUILDING LEASE PAYMENTS	225	0.00	2,941	0.00	2,941	0.00	2,941	0.00
EQUIPMENT RENTALS & LEASES	7,748	0.00	26,080	0.00	26,080	0.00	26,080	0.00
MISCELLANEOUS EXPENSES	74,600	0.00	124,849	0.00	94,849	0.00	94,849	0.00

JUDICIARY REPORT 10 FY2012 GOVERNOR RECOMMENDATION

DECISION ITEM DETAIL

Budget Unit	FY 2010	FY 2010	FY 2011	FY 2011	FY 2012	FY 2012	FY 2012	FY 2012
Decision Item	ACTUAL	ACTUAL	BUDGET	BUDGET	DEPT REQ	DEPT REQ	GOV REC	GOV REC
Budget Object Class	DOLLAR	FTE	DOLLAR	FTE	DOLLAR	FTE	DOLLAR	FTE
JUDICIAL BR TRNG & EDUCATION								
CORE								
REBILLABLE EXPENSES	21,141	0.00	0	0.00	20,000	0.00	20,000	0.00
TOTAL - EE	498,836	0.00	1,258,445	0.00	1,068,688	0.00	1,068,688	0.00
GRAND TOTAL	\$882,913	7.80	\$1,876,922	13.00	\$1,620,363	11.00	\$1,620,363	11.00
GENERAL REVENUE	\$0	0.00	\$0	0.00	\$0	0.00	\$0	0.00
FEDERAL FUNDS	\$0	0.00	\$225,000	0.00	\$225,000	0.00	\$225,000	0.00
OTHER FUNDS	\$882,913	7.80	\$1,651,922	13.00	\$1,395,363	11.00	\$1,395,363	11.00

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

Judiciary**Office of State Courts Administrator****Technical Assistance**

	OSCA	Court Improvement	Statewide Court Automation	Total
GR	\$3,309,530	\$0	\$0	\$3,309,530
FEDERAL	\$0	\$1,124,099	\$0	\$1,124,099
OTHER	\$0	\$0	\$413,532	\$413,532
TOTAL	\$3,309,530	\$1,124,099	\$413,532	\$4,847,161

1. What does this program do?

- Assists the Supreme Court in the administration of the courts; promulgates and administers the methods and systems adopted by the Court; and, directs the payment of state monies appropriated for the maintenance and operation of the judicial system.
- Prepares the annual budget for the judicial department; develops fiscal impact estimates for proposed legislation affecting the judiciary; and administers the various funding sources that are needed to maintain and/or complete the many court improvement projects.
- Directs courts on the collection and disbursement of court costs, fees, miscellaneous charges, and surcharges consistent with applicable statutes and Supreme Court rules, which includes: promulgating rules and regulations on the assessment and payment of court costs, and promulgating recommended accounting review procedures to appointing authorities.
- Publishes handbooks and instructional information for 1500 trial court clerks and 1000+ municipal division clerks so the courts are meeting all legally mandated reporting requirements, and coordinates the publication of judicial bench books.
- Operates a help desk that provides technical assistance to staff within the judiciary on a daily basis, ranging from assistance with information systems (IT), financial matters, court procedures, research and evaluation, human resource issues, payroll processing, and other administrative issues.
- Assists courts with implementing case processing time standards, maintaining a uniform court record-keeping system, and maintaining workload statistics. Additionally, provides on-site case processing reviews to improve efficiency.
- Develops juvenile court performance standards and offender assessment forms. Trains juvenile court staff on the use of standards and assessment forms. In addition, assists with the implementation of offender assessment procedures, and sex offender registration.
- Assists courts with determining the current security posture of courts. Conducts on-site security assessments of courts.

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

Judiciary

Office of State Courts Administrator

Technical Assistance

- Administers the fees and expenses of providers of auxiliary aids and services requested by deaf or hard of hearing individuals serving before any civil court or criminal, civil, or juvenile proceeding; and the fees and expenses of foreign language interpreters in criminal cases.
- Designs, implements, and assists courts with program evaluations, compilation of statistical caseload information, estimates for judicial resources, and publishing related reports to meet federal and state laws.
- Provides technical assistance to the courts on human resource matters such as employee recruitment, classification, and discipline.
- Works with the courts to implement more efficient procedures and practices such as video court, new methods for debt collection, elimination of unnecessary tasks, etc.

2. What is the authorization for this program.

§452.340, 476.777, 105.961, 488.5028, 477.650, 488.031, 43.518, 494.455, 488.082, 211.326, 211.322, 211.141, 478.072, RSMo, Supreme Court Operating Rule 17, 21, 4.71, 11.03, 82.03, 4, and 82.04; and Article V, Section 6, Missouri Constitution

3. Are there federal matching requirements? If yes, please explain.

No.


4. Is this a federally mandated program? If yes, please explain.

No.

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

Judiciary
Office of State Courts Administrator
Technical Assistance

5. Provide actual expenditures for the prior three fiscal years.



Note: The FY 2010 Federal column includes \$161,644 for stabilization dollars.

6. What are the sources of the "Other " funds?

N/A

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

Judiciary

Office of State Courts Administrator

Technical Assistance

7a. Provide an effectiveness measure.

Help Desk Calls

	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010	Projected FY 2011	Projected FY 2012
Support Unit	16,045	17,245	18,029	17,500	17,500
Research Unit	237	290	273	200	200
CPA	7,051	7,074	6,897	7,000	7,000
Help Desk	45,094	48,055	47,265	48,000	48,000

7b. Provide an efficiency measure.

Percentage of Help Desk Calls Closed Within Three Days

	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010	Projected FY 2011	Projected FY 2012
Support Unit	94.33%	94.36%	94.07%	94.00%	94.00%
Research Unit	67.51%	67.93%	66.67%	65.00%	65.00%
CPA	78.63%	74.63%	75.35%	80.00%	80.00%
Help Desk	99.47%	99.53%	99.22%	99.00%	99.00%

7c. Provide the number of clients/individuals served (if applicable)

- 412 judges
- 300+ municipalities
- 3,000+ judiciary employees

7d. Provide a customer satisfaction measure, if available.

N/A

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

Judiciary				
Office of State Courts Administrator				
Court Technology				
	OSCA	Court Improvement	Court Automation	Total
GR	\$6,266,960	\$0	\$0	\$6,266,960
FEDERAL	\$0	\$1,480,921	\$0	\$1,480,921
OTHER	\$887,200	\$0	\$4,425,860	\$5,313,060
TOTAL	\$7,154,160	\$1,480,921	\$4,425,860	\$13,060,942

1. What does this program do?

- Maintains the Statewide Justice Information network (SJIN) connecting 341 servers and 536 routers/switches in 224 locations that allow over 4,000 judiciary employees to share information on one network and to share electronic information with other state systems.
- Maintains and updates the integrated case management software, Judicial Information System (JIS), that services 100% of the state's judicial caseload. Also maintains the Jury Management System (JMS) that is used by 113 of Missouri counties.
- Develops, deploys, and maintains automated interfaces to share data with the Highway Patrol, local Prosecuting Attorneys, Department of Social Services, Department of Health and Senior Services, Attorney General's Office, and Department of Revenue. The shared data is used to populate other automated systems and to meet federal and state reporting guidelines such as criminal history and traffic disposition reporting.
- Maintains the Missouri Juvenile Justice Information System (MOJJIS), which in 2009 made confidential court records for approximately 140,000 juveniles available to appropriate staff at the Department of Elementary and Secondary Education, Department of Social Services, Department of Health and Senior Services, Department of Mental Health, and the courts.
- Maintains Case.net, providing web-based public access to more than 13,990,000 open court case records. Last year, an average of 1,489,976 Case.net pages were accessed each weekday, and 619,903 pages each weekend day, for an approximate total of 451,863,594 pages accessed throughout the entire year.
- Evaluates and deploys new technologies such as electronic filing of court documents and video conferencing to expand the functionality and efficiency of the courts.

2. What is the authorization for this program, i.e., federal or state statute, etc.? (Include the federal program number, if applicable.)

§476.055, 483.082, and 488.027, RSMo

3. Are there federal matching requirements? If yes, please explain.

No.


PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

Judiciary
Office of State Courts Administrator
Court Technology

4. Is this a federally mandated program? If yes, please explain.

No, however, data from JIS is used to meet state reporting mandates such as criminal history and traffic disposition reporting and is forwarded to other state agencies to meet their federal reporting mandates such as the National Instant Criminal Background Check System (NICS). Some of the data required for NICS reporting is only available electronically through JIS.

5. Provide actual expenditures for the prior three fiscal years.



Note: The FY 2010 Federal column includes \$496,671 for stabilization dollars.


6. What are the sources of the "Other " funds?

Statewide Court Automation Fund and Crime Victims Compensation Fund.

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

Judiciary
Office of State Courts Administrator
Court Technology

7a. Provide an effectiveness measure.



* December figure represents data received only through December 10, 2010.

7b. Provide an efficiency measure.

CASES TRANSFERRED


To:		CY 2007	CY 2008	CY 2009	CY 2010
	MOVANS	367,535	394,283	403,378	385,691
	Criminal History Reporting	441,925	527,592	718,768	712,505
	Traffic Reporting to DOR	401,176	430,285	452,226	447,320

From:		CY 2007	CY 2008	CY 2009	CY 2010
	MSHP	167,601	196,004	215,457	216,176
	Prosecutor Attorneys	45,282	77,020	121,884	108,823
	FCC	N/A	30,954	36,151	30,818

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

Judiciary
Office of State Courts Administrator
Court Technology
7c. Provide the number of clients/individuals served (if applicable) Serves the Supreme Court, the three districts of the Court of Appeals, 114 Missouri counties, and the City of St. Louis.
7d. Provide a customer satisfaction measure, if available. N/A

Missouri's Courts Video Conferencing (Polycom) Units Purchases by CCBC and Juvenile Grants (as of 11/5/2010)



PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

Judiciary
OSCA - Judicial Education
Training

	OSCA	Statewide Court Automation	Judicial Education	Total
GR	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
FEDERAL	\$0	\$0	\$30,000	\$30,000
OTHER	\$0	\$176,565	\$1,040,216	\$1,216,781
TOTAL	\$0	\$176,565	\$1,070,216	\$1,246,781

1. What does this program do?

- Coordinates education programs for approximately 4,000 state, county and municipal court personnel as follows: Appellate Court Education, Trial Judge Education, Municipal Judge Education, Juvenile Division Education, Clerk Education, Municipal Clerk Education, and Court Reporter Education.
- Provides new and ongoing training to ensure current and newly enacted laws and procedures are correctly followed.
- Orients new employees to a complex set of laws and procedures, all of which must be understood and adhered to if Missouri citizens are to have their cases resolved fairly and expeditiously.
- Assists in expanding the skill set and knowledge base of front-line personnel such as juvenile officers, detention workers, and court clerks . These courses and programs are also designed to satisfy court reporting requirements mandated by statute and meet professional standards set by Supreme Court rule.
- Provides essential educational programs and classes such as new juvenile officer orientation, child abuse and neglect training and assessment, court clerk college, new clerk orientation, case processing, judicial college, new judge orientation, trial skill seminars, annual legislative updates, and web-based training.
- Offers training expertise to support supervisors and their staff during and after JIS implementation.

2. What is the authorization for this program, i.e., federal or state statute, etc.? (Include the federal program number, if applicable.)

§211.326 and 476.057, RSMo; SCR 14.09, 15.05 and 18.05

3. Are there federal matching requirements? If yes, please explain.

No.


4. Is this a federally mandated program? If yes, please explain.

No.

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

Judiciary
OSCA - Judicial Education
Training

5. Provide actual expenditures for the prior three fiscal years.



6. What are the sources of the "Other " funds?

Judicial Education and Training Fund


7a. Provide an effectiveness measure.

Judicial Education provides more knowledgeable front-line court staff and improves case process efficiencies.


PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

Judiciary
OSCA - Judicial Education
Training

7b. Provide an efficiency measure.



7c. Provide the number of clients/individuals served (if applicable).




PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

Judiciary
OSCA - Judicial Education
Training

7d. Provide a customer satisfaction measure, if available.

The graph below is the cumulative of all course survey results for each fiscal year.



“THIS PAGE WAS INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK.”

INTRODUCTION
TO THE
COURT OF APPEALS BUDGET

The Court of Appeals is divided by statute into three districts. The Western District sits in Kansas City, the Eastern District sits in St. Louis, and the Southern District sits in Springfield and Poplar Bluff. The number of judges in each district is also set by statute. The Western District has 11 judges, the Eastern District has 14 judges, and the Southern District has 7 judges.

Amendments to the Missouri Constitution in 1970 expanded the appellate jurisdiction of the Court of Appeals to include cases not within the exclusive jurisdiction of the Supreme Court as specified in Article V, Section 3. All litigants have a right of appeal to the appropriate appellate court from final judgments in all civil and criminal cases. Judges are nominated by the nonpartisan Appellate Judicial Commission and appointed by the governor. If approved by the voters at the first general election after their first 12 months in office, they serve 12-year terms. Judges in each district elect a chief judge to serve for a term fixed by the district.

Last year, there were 15,138 motions, appeals, and writs filed and 14,497 motions, appeals, and writs disposed.

To assist the Court of Appeals in carrying out its constitutional obligations, staff of the three districts share common functions including keeping records and filings; arranging dockets; reviewing briefs and motions to present them to the court in an organized manner; issuing court orders; transporting prisoners; and carrying out financial and personnel management, legal research, and library functions. Staffing patterns for carrying out these duties vary among the three districts depending upon local needs. Case management is facilitated by use of a common computer system used in the statewide court automation effort.


The three districts of the Court of Appeals are increasingly concerned about their ability to hire and retain quality non-judicial personnel. A well trained, competent work force is essential to the effective and efficient operation of the Court of Appeals, as well as all other government agencies.

The total FY 2012 request for the Court of Appeals is \$10,874,350. Funds to operate the Court of Appeals are appropriated separately to each district; the Western District is requesting \$3,741,618, the Eastern District is requesting \$4,818,437, and the Southern district is requesting \$2,314,295.

The three districts of the Court of Appeals recognize the severe financial prospects facing the state and do not seek any common decision items for FY 2012.

In years past, the three districts have requested funds to: 1) maintain a core of experienced law clerks; 2) maintain their appellate law library in the face of substantial increases in the costs of publications and electronic research; 3) replace computers and other electronic equipment on a regular basis; and 4) make security improvements to provide a safe and secure courthouse for citizens, staff and judges. These needs continue to be pressing for the districts but in light of the fiscal condition of the state, no requests will be made.

Missouri's 45 Judicial Circuits and 3 Appellate Districts



- ★ Location of PJ for Circuit
- ★ Court of Appeals
- ★ Correctional Centers

**FISCAL YEAR 2012
COURT OF APPEALS
CORE BY DISTRICT**

PERSONAL SERVICE:

District	Appellate Judges		Judicial Admin. Assistants		Law Clerks		Clerk		Staff Counsel *		Other Staff		Total Personal Service	
Western District	11.00	\$1,410,279	6.00	\$228,828	22.00	\$1,035,243	1.00	\$85,128	1.00	\$69,948	12.50	\$486,807	53.50	\$3,316,233
Eastern District	14.00	\$1,794,901	14.00	\$531,231	28.00	\$1,279,957	1.00	\$76,289	1.00	\$86,988	15.75	\$614,016	73.75	\$4,383,382
Southern District	7.00	\$897,450	7.00	\$266,375	9.00	\$439,498	1.00	\$81,468	1.00	\$65,676	6.60	\$290,479	31.60	\$2,040,946
TOTAL	32.00	\$4,102,630	27.00	\$1,026,434	59.00	\$2,754,698	3.00	\$242,885	3.00	\$222,612	34.85	\$1,391,302	158.85	\$9,740,561

Total Fringes (HB 5) \$6,577,764

* This position is the Court Administrator in the Eastern District.

EXPENSE AND EQUIPMENT:

District	Travel	Utilities, Janitorial, & M&R Services	Library & Research	Equipment	Other	Total Expense & Equipment
Western District	\$26,035	\$123,000	\$171,000	\$10,050	\$95,300	\$425,385
Eastern District	\$29,470	\$5,000	\$160,516	\$33,000	\$207,069	\$435,055
Southern District	\$20,497	\$22,062	\$199,429	\$9,569	\$21,792	\$273,349
TOTAL	\$76,002	\$150,062	\$530,945	\$52,619	\$324,161	\$1,133,789

TOTAL CORE REQUEST:

Western District	\$3,741,618
Eastern District	\$4,818,437
Southern District	<u>\$2,314,295</u>
TOTAL - COURT OF APPEALS	<u>\$10,874,350</u>

“THIS PAGE WAS INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK.”

Court of Appeals Workload Growth

	Actual 1999		Actual 2000		Actual 2001		Actual 2002		Actual 2003		Actual 2004	
	Filed	Disposed										
APPEALS												
Western	1,037	1,285	1,173	1,163	1,192	1,215	1,225	1,228	1,216	1,136	1,112	1,255
Eastern	1,608	1,612	1,510	1,604	1,435	1,549	1,419	1,353	1,499	1,470	1,424	1,492
Southern	576	578	608	588	548	594	602	615	618	606	575	596
Total	3,221	3,475	3,291	3,355	3,175	3,358	3,246	3,196	3,333	3,212	3,111	3,343
WRITS												
Western	169	171	170	166	190	188	187	194	154	152	148	151
Eastern	229	223	197	192	197	195	213	207	222	223	210	207
Southern	59	58	66	68	49	49	68	64	67	73	66	62
Total	457	452	433	426	436	432	468	465	443	448	424	420
MOTIONS												
Western	4,799	4,823	4,072	4,118	3,893	4,014	3,661	3,781	3,558	3,794	3,489	3,666
Eastern	6,417	6,045	6,099	5,908	5,269	5,242	4,899	4,716	5,198	5,458	5,286	4,942
Southern	1,760	1,762	1,972	1,912	1,680	1,722	1,692	1,719	1,789	1,820	1,729	1,778
Total	12,976	12,630	12,143	11,938	10,842	10,978	10,252	10,216	10,545	11,072	10,504	10,386
OPINIONS												
	Actual 1999		Actual 2000		Actual 2001		Actual 2002		Actual 2003		Actual 2004	
Western		770		844		723		739		761		689
Eastern		1,094		1,058		937		844		943		904
Southern		412		371		391		365		399		357
Total		2,276		2,273		2,051		1,948		2,103		1,950

	2009 Population	% of State Population	Correctional Institutions	Inmate Operating Capacity Percentage
Western	2,084,455	35%	12	50.74%
Eastern	2,483,858	41%	6	36.41%
Southern	<u>1,419,267</u>	<u>24%</u>	3	12.85%
Total	5,987,580	100%		

Court of Appeals Workload Growth

	Actual 2005		Actual 2006		Actual 2007		Actual 2008		Actual 2009		Actual 2010	
	Filed	Disposed										
APPEALS												
Western	1,177	1,184	1,260	1,175	1,250	1,273	1,107	1,187	1,175	1,174	1,318	1,204
Eastern	1,481	1,305	1,544	1,563	1,442	1,557	1,348	1,387	1,481	1,395	1,703	1,579
Southern	629	620	640	610	624	641	534	606	623	561	673	615
Total	3,287	3,109	3,444	3,348	3,316	3,471	2,989	3,180	3,279	3,130	3,694	3,398
WRITS												
Western	173	173	203	208	183	172	161	165	165	170	160	159
Eastern	241	245	222	221	201	204	246	246	218	223	186	184
Southern	102	97	104	110	111	108	75	79	87	84	72	78
Total	516	515	529	539	495	484	482	490	470	477	418	421
MOTIONS												
Western	3,449	3,428	4,115	4,185	3,713	3,737	3,593	3,579	3,656	3,662	3,686	3,823
Eastern	5,430	5,134	5,515	5,086	4,904	4,455	5,133	4,497	5,135	4,470	5,129	4,741
Southern	1,897	1,925	1,854	1,914	1,919	1,982	1,903	2,002	1,900	1,978	2,055	2,114
Total	10,776	10,487	11,484	11,185	10,536	10,174	10,629	10,078	10,691	10,110	10,870	10,678
OPINIONS												
Western		729		684		714		685		676		676
Eastern		918		962		901		848		876		868
Southern		350		363		357		361		359		387
Total		1,997		2,009		1,972		1,894		1,911		1,931

“THIS PAGE WAS INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK.”

JUDICIARY REPORT 9 FY2012 GOVERNOR RECOMMENDATION

DECISION ITEM SUMMARY

Budget Unit								
Decision Item	FY 2010	FY 2010	FY 2011	FY 2011	FY 2012	FY 2012	FY 2012	FY 2012
Budget Object Summary	ACTUAL	ACTUAL	BUDGET	BUDGET	DEPT REQ	DEPT REQ	GOV REC	GOV REC
Fund	DOLLAR	FTE	DOLLAR	FTE	DOLLAR	FTE	DOLLAR	FTE
COURT OF APPEALS-WESTERN DIST								
CORE								
PERSONAL SERVICES								
GENERAL REVENUE	2,988,724	48.18	3,316,233	53.50	3,316,233	53.50	3,316,233	53.50
FEDRAL BUDGET STAB-MEDICAID RE	95,297	2.15	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00
TOTAL - PS	3,084,021	50.33	3,316,233	53.50	3,316,233	53.50	3,316,233	53.50
EXPENSE & EQUIPMENT								
GENERAL REVENUE	489,125	0.00	425,385	0.00	425,385	0.00	425,385	0.00
FEDRAL BUDGET STAB-MEDICAID RE	29,777	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00
TOTAL - EE	518,902	0.00	425,385	0.00	425,385	0.00	425,385	0.00
TOTAL	3,602,923	50.33	3,741,618	53.50	3,741,618	53.50	3,741,618	53.50
GRAND TOTAL	\$3,602,923	50.33	\$3,741,618	53.50	\$3,741,618	53.50	\$3,741,618	53.50

CORE DECISION ITEM

Judiciary	Budget Unit <u>14301C</u>
Court of Appeals - Western District	
Core	

1. CORE FINANCIAL SUMMARY

	FY 2012 Budget Request					FY 2012 Governor's Recommendation			
	GR	Federal	Other	Total		GR	Federal	Other	Total
PS	3,316,233	0	0	3,316,233	PS	3,316,233	0	0	3,316,233
EE	425,385	0	0	425,385	EE	425,385	0	0	425,385
PSD	0	0	0	0	PSD	0	0	0	0
Total	3,741,618	0	0	3,741,618	Total	3,741,618	0	0	3,741,618
FTE	53.50	0.00	0.00	53.50	FTE	53.50	0.00	0.00	53.50

Est. Fringe	2,169,425	0	0	2,169,425
--------------------	-----------	---	---	-----------

Note: Fringes budgeted in House Bill 5 except for certain fringes budgeted directly to MoDOT, Highway Patrol, and Conservation.

Est. Fringe	2,169,425	0	0	2,169,425
--------------------	-----------	---	---	-----------

Note: Fringes budgeted in House Bill 5 except for certain fringes budgeted directly to MoDOT, Highway Patrol, and Conservation.

Other Funds: _____

2. CORE DESCRIPTION

The Missouri Constitution charges the Missouri Court of Appeals, Western District with appellate and original jurisdiction over cases that arise in 45 counties of northern, central, and western Missouri. In addition to its headquarters in downtown Kansas City, the Western District regularly holds court in locations throughout its 45 counties including Missouri Western State University; University of Central Missouri; Westminster College; William Woods University; Truman State University; University of Missouri, Kansas City; and the University of Missouri, Columbia. Twelve of the state's twenty-one correctional institutions are located in the Western District, which results in a large percentage of the writs regularly filed by inmates. In addition, Cole County is within the geographical jurisdiction of this court. Hence, appeals include virtually all cases from the Public Service Commission, the Labor and Industrial Relations Commissions, the Administrative Hearing Commission, the Missouri Department of Transportation, and the Missouri Gaming Commission. Many of these appeals involve review of complicated and complex evidentiary and legal issues, requiring a great deal more judicial time than the average appeal. 3,686 motions were filed in the Western District in FY 10. Many of these presented novel and vexing problems uniquely so because the center of state government and most of the state's correctional institutions lie within the Western District. In addition, the caseload in the Western District continues to be disproportionately high in relation to the population. In FY 10, 35% of the state's residents lived in the Western District, but the court handled 36% of all appeals filed in the state.

3. PROGRAM LISTING (list programs included in this core funding)


Court of Appeals (page 103)

CORE DECISION ITEM

Judiciary	Budget Unit <u>14301C</u>
Court of Appeals - Western District	
Core	

4. FINANCIAL HISTORY

	FY 2008 Actual	FY 2009 Actual	FY 2010 Actual	FY 2011 Current Yr
Appropriation (All Funds)	3,645,030	3,741,618	3,741,618	3,741,618
Less Reverted (All Funds)	0	(158,660)	(137,321)	N/A
Budget Authority (All Funds)	3,645,030	3,582,958	3,604,297	N/A
Actual Expenditures (All Funds)	3,629,636	3,532,271	3,602,923	N/A
Unexpended (All Funds)	15,394	50,687	1,374	N/A
Unexpended, by Fund:				
General Revenue	15,394	50,687	1,374	N/A
Federal	0	0	0	N/A
Other	0	0	0	N/A



NOTES:

CORE RECONCILIATION DETAIL

JUDICIARY
COURT OF APPEALS-WESTERN DIST

5. CORE RECONCILIATION DETAIL

	Budget Class	FTE	GR	Federal	Other	Total	Explanation
TAFP AFTER VETOES							
	PS	53.50	3,316,233	0	0	3,316,233	
	EE	0.00	425,385	0	0	425,385	
	Total	53.50	3,741,618	0	0	3,741,618	
DEPARTMENT CORE REQUEST							
	PS	53.50	3,316,233	0	0	3,316,233	
	EE	0.00	425,385	0	0	425,385	
	Total	53.50	3,741,618	0	0	3,741,618	
GOVERNOR'S RECOMMENDED CORE							
	PS	53.50	3,316,233	0	0	3,316,233	
	EE	0.00	425,385	0	0	425,385	
	Total	53.50	3,741,618	0	0	3,741,618	

FLEXIBILITY REQUEST FORM

BUDGET UNIT NUMBER: 14301C	DEPARTMENT: Judiciary
BUDGET UNIT NAME: Court of Appeals Western District	DIVISION: Court of Appeals - Western District

1. Provide the amount by fund of personal service flexibility and the amount by fund of expense and equipment flexibility you are requesting in dollar and percentage terms and explain why the flexibility is needed. If flexibility is being requested among divisions, provide the amount by fund of flexibility you are requesting in dollar and percentage terms and explain why the flexibility is needed.

DEPARTMENT REQUEST

General Revenue			
PS	\$	331,623	10%
E&E	\$	42,539	10%

2. Estimate how much flexibility will be used for the budget year. How much flexibility was used in the Prior Year Budget and the Current Year Budget? Please specify the amount.

PRIOR YEAR ACTUAL AMOUNT OF FLEXIBILITY USED	CURRENT YEAR ESTIMATED AMOUNT OF FLEXIBILITY THAT WILL BE USED	BUDGET REQUEST ESTIMATED AMOUNT OF FLEXIBILITY THAT WILL BE USED
General Revenue PS \$ (93,518) -2.90% E&E \$ 93,518 23.63%	HB 12.330 language allows for up to 25% flexibility between personal services and expense and equipment. The Western District does not have an estimate of the amount of that flexibility that might be used in FY 11.	10% flexibility is being requested for FY 12. The Western District does not have an estimate of the amount of flexibility that might be used if approved.

3. Please explain how flexibility was used in the prior and/or current years.

PRIOR YEAR EXPLAIN ACTUAL USE	CURRENT YEAR EXPLAIN PLANNED USE
The Western District used funds to purchase an x-ray machine for security, repair restrooms, purchase an HVAC computer, seal and repaint the parking lot, repair caulk in the entry of the building, replace telephones, replace computers, replace printers, and add scanning feature to network copier.	The Western District does not have an estimate at this time of how much flex will be used in managing the \$5 million Governor's withhold.

JUDICIARY REPORT 10 FY2012 GOVERNOR RECOMMENDATION

DECISION ITEM DETAIL

Budget Unit	FY 2010	FY 2010	FY 2011	FY 2011	FY 2012	FY 2012	FY 2012	FY 2012
Decision Item	ACTUAL	ACTUAL	BUDGET	BUDGET	DEPT REQ	DEPT REQ	GOV REC	GOV REC
Budget Object Class	DOLLAR	FTE	DOLLAR	FTE	DOLLAR	FTE	DOLLAR	FTE
COURT OF APPEALS-WESTERN DIST								
CORE								
APPELLATE JUDGE	1,280,024	9.98	1,410,279	11.00	1,410,279	11.00	1,410,279	11.00
JUDICIAL ADMINISTRATIVE AST	209,592	5.50	228,828	6.00	228,828	6.00	228,828	6.00
LAW CLERKS	926,654	19.77	1,035,243	22.00	1,035,243	22.00	1,035,243	22.00
CLERK	85,128	1.00	85,128	1.00	85,128	1.00	85,128	1.00
DEPUTY CLERK	207,864	6.00	207,864	6.00	207,864	6.00	207,864	6.00
MARSHAL	40,212	1.00	40,212	1.00	40,212	1.00	40,212	1.00
LIBRARIAN II	54,360	1.00	54,360	1.00	54,360	1.00	54,360	1.00
DEPUTY MARSHAL II	37,296	1.00	37,296	1.00	37,296	1.00	37,296	1.00
STAFF COUNSEL	69,948	1.00	69,948	1.00	69,948	1.00	69,948	1.00
TEMPORARY CLERK	0	0.00	802	0.30	802	0.30	802	0.30
BUILDING MANAGER	42,504	1.00	42,504	1.00	42,504	1.00	42,504	1.00
SETTLEMENT ASSISTANT	0	0.00	2	0.00	2	0.00	2	0.00
FISCAL OFFICER II	47,184	1.00	47,184	1.00	47,184	1.00	47,184	1.00
COMPUTER INFO TECH SPEC	52,200	1.00	52,200	1.00	52,200	1.00	52,200	1.00
RECORDS CLERK	25,380	1.00	4,383	0.20	4,383	0.20	4,383	0.20
SENIOR JUDGE	5,675	0.08	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00
TOTAL - PS	3,084,021	50.33	3,316,233	53.50	3,316,233	53.50	3,316,233	53.50
TRAVEL, IN-STATE	29,242	0.00	20,000	0.00	20,000	0.00	20,000	0.00
TRAVEL, OUT-OF-STATE	2,458	0.00	6,035	0.00	6,035	0.00	6,035	0.00
FUEL & UTILITIES	78,821	0.00	75,000	0.00	75,000	0.00	75,000	0.00
SUPPLIES	174,668	0.00	171,000	0.00	171,000	0.00	171,000	0.00
PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT	16,990	0.00	19,000	0.00	19,000	0.00	19,000	0.00
COMMUNICATION SERV & SUPP	35,030	0.00	35,000	0.00	35,000	0.00	35,000	0.00
PROFESSIONAL SERVICES	23,227	0.00	22,000	0.00	22,000	0.00	22,000	0.00
HOUSEKEEPING & JANITORIAL SERV	29,323	0.00	31,000	0.00	31,000	0.00	31,000	0.00
M&R SERVICES	11,186	0.00	17,000	0.00	17,000	0.00	17,000	0.00
COMPUTER EQUIPMENT	26,115	0.00	3,000	0.00	3,000	0.00	3,000	0.00
MOTORIZED EQUIPMENT	0	0.00	150	0.00	150	0.00	150	0.00
OFFICE EQUIPMENT	16,312	0.00	3,500	0.00	3,500	0.00	3,500	0.00
OTHER EQUIPMENT	30,703	0.00	3,400	0.00	3,400	0.00	3,400	0.00
PROPERTY & IMPROVEMENTS	30,297	0.00	3,500	0.00	3,500	0.00	3,500	0.00
EQUIPMENT RENTALS & LEASES	8,485	0.00	8,800	0.00	8,800	0.00	8,800	0.00

JUDICIARY REPORT 10 FY2012 GOVERNOR RECOMMENDATION

DECISION ITEM DETAIL

Budget Unit	FY 2010	FY 2010	FY 2011	FY 2011	FY 2012	FY 2012	FY 2012	FY 2012
Decision Item	ACTUAL	ACTUAL	BUDGET	BUDGET	DEPT REQ	DEPT REQ	GOV REC	GOV REC
Budget Object Class	DOLLAR	FTE	DOLLAR	FTE	DOLLAR	FTE	DOLLAR	FTE
COURT OF APPEALS-WESTERN DIST								
CORE								
MISCELLANEOUS EXPENSES	6,045	0.00	7,000	0.00	7,000	0.00	7,000	0.00
TOTAL - EE	518,902	0.00	425,385	0.00	425,385	0.00	425,385	0.00
GRAND TOTAL	\$3,602,923	50.33	\$3,741,618	53.50	\$3,741,618	53.50	\$3,741,618	53.50
GENERAL REVENUE	\$3,477,849	48.18	\$3,741,618	53.50	\$3,741,618	53.50	\$3,741,618	53.50
FEDERAL FUNDS	\$125,074	2.15	\$0	0.00	\$0	0.00	\$0	0.00
OTHER FUNDS	\$0	0.00	\$0	0.00	\$0	0.00	\$0	0.00

JUDICIARY REPORT 9 FY2012 GOVERNOR RECOMMENDATION

DECISION ITEM SUMMARY

Budget Unit								
Decision Item	FY 2010	FY 2010	FY 2011	FY 2011	FY 2012	FY 2012	FY 2012	FY 2012
Budget Object Summary	ACTUAL	ACTUAL	BUDGET	BUDGET	DEPT REQ	DEPT REQ	GOV REC	GOV REC
Fund	DOLLAR	FTE	DOLLAR	FTE	DOLLAR	FTE	DOLLAR	FTE
COURT OF APPEALS-EASTERN DIST								
CORE								
PERSONAL SERVICES								
GENERAL REVENUE	4,177,423	67.42	4,383,382	73.75	4,383,382	73.75	4,383,382	73.75
FEDRAL BUDGET STAB-MEDICAID RE	129,424	2.72	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00
TOTAL - PS	4,306,847	70.14	4,383,382	73.75	4,383,382	73.75	4,383,382	73.75
EXPENSE & EQUIPMENT								
GENERAL REVENUE	404,596	0.00	435,055	0.00	435,055	0.00	435,055	0.00
FEDRAL BUDGET STAB-MEDICAID RE	30,442	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00
TOTAL - EE	435,038	0.00	435,055	0.00	435,055	0.00	435,055	0.00
TOTAL	4,741,885	70.14	4,818,437	73.75	4,818,437	73.75	4,818,437	73.75
GRAND TOTAL	\$4,741,885	70.14	\$4,818,437	73.75	\$4,818,437	73.75	\$4,818,437	73.75

CORE DECISION ITEM


Judiciary									
Court of Appeals - Eastern District									
Core									
1. CORE FINANCIAL SUMMARY									
FY 2012 Budget Request					FY 2012 Governor's Recommendation				
	GR	Federal	Other	Total		GR	Federal	Other	Total
PS	4,383,382	0	0	4,383,382	PS	4,383,382	0	0	4,383,382
EE	435,055	0	0	435,055	EE	435,055	0	0	435,055
PSD	0	0	0	0	PSD	0	0	0	0
Total	4,818,437	0	0	4,818,437	Total	4,818,437	0	0	4,818,437
FTE	73.75	0.00	0.00	73.75	FTE	73.75	0.00	0.00	73.75
Est. Fringe	2,851,641	0	0	2,851,641	Est. Fringe	2,851,641	0	0	2,851,641
<i>Note: Fringes budgeted in House Bill 5 except for certain fringes budgeted directly to MoDOT, Highway Patrol, and Conservation.</i>					<i>Note: Fringes budgeted in House Bill 5 except for certain fringes budgeted directly to MoDOT, Highway Patrol, and Conservation.</i>				
Other Funds:					Other Funds:				
2. CORE DESCRIPTION									
<p>The Missouri Constitution and Missouri Statutes confer upon the Missouri Court of Appeals, Eastern District jurisdiction over 25 counties and the City of St. Louis containing 41% of the state's population. All citizens within this area have an automatic right of appeal from all final judgments in civil and criminal cases to the Eastern District, except those within the exclusive jurisdiction of the Supreme Court. The court hears 45% of all appeals filed in the state. The Eastern District includes six correctional facilities containing more than one-third of the state's inmate population and five centers run by the Department of Mental Health creating a continuing source of petitions for writs and appeals. In order to carry out its mandate to hear and decide cases, the court also operates the Clerk's Office, the library, and provides security. The court endeavors to make the appellate process visible to all geographic areas of the Eastern District by holding sessions of court at more than 20 different court houses and schools throughout the Eastern District.</p>									
3. PROGRAM LISTING (list programs included in this core funding)									
Court of Appeals (page 103)									

CORE DECISION ITEM

Judiciary
Court of Appeals - Eastern District
Core

4. FINANCIAL HISTORY

	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011
	Actual	Actual	Actual	Current Yr
Appropriation (All Funds)	4,690,765	4,818,437	4,818,437	4,818,437
Less Reverted (All Funds)	0	(49,025)	(63,060)	N/A
Budget Authority (All Funds)	4,690,765	4,769,412	4,755,377	N/A
Actual Expenditures (All Funds)	4,690,355	4,763,620	4,741,885	N/A
Unexpended (All Funds)	410	5,792	13,492	N/A
Unexpended, by Fund:				
General Revenue	410	5,792	13,480	N/A
Federal	0	0	12	N/A
Other	0	0	0	N/A



Reverted includes Governor's standard 3 percent reserve (when applicable) and any extraordinary withholdings.

NOTES:

CORE RECONCILIATION DETAIL

JUDICIARY
COURT OF APPEALS-EASTERN DIST

5. CORE RECONCILIATION DETAIL

	Budget Class	FTE	GR	Federal	Other	Total	Explanation
TAFP AFTER VETOES							
	PS	73.75	4,383,382	0	0	4,383,382	
	EE	0.00	435,055	0	0	435,055	
	Total	73.75	4,818,437	0	0	4,818,437	
DEPARTMENT CORE REQUEST							
	PS	73.75	4,383,382	0	0	4,383,382	
	EE	0.00	435,055	0	0	435,055	
	Total	73.75	4,818,437	0	0	4,818,437	
GOVERNOR'S RECOMMENDED CORE							
	PS	73.75	4,383,382	0	0	4,383,382	
	EE	0.00	435,055	0	0	435,055	
	Total	73.75	4,818,437	0	0	4,818,437	

FLEXIBILITY REQUEST FORM

BUDGET UNIT NUMBER 14401C	DEPARTMENT: Judiciary
BUDGET UNIT NAME: Court of Appeals - Eastern District	DIVISION: Court of Appeals - Eastern District

1. Provide the amount by fund of personal service flexibility and the amount by fund of expense and equipment flexibility you are requesting in dollar and percentage terms and explain why the flexibility is needed. If flexibility is being requested among divisions, provide the amount by fund of flexibility you are requesting in dollar and percentage terms and explain why the flexibility is needed.

DEPARTMENT REQUEST

	General Revenue				
PS	\$	438,338		10%	
E&E	\$	43,506		10%	

2. Estimate how much flexibility will be used for the budget year. How much flexibility was used in the Prior Year Budget and the Current Year Budget? Please specify the amount.

PRIOR YEAR ACTUAL AMOUNT OF FLEXIBILITY USED	CURRENT YEAR ESTIMATED AMOUNT OF FLEXIBILITY THAT WILL BE USED	BUDGET REQUEST ESTIMATED AMOUNT OF FLEXIBILITY THAT WILL BE USED
No flexibility was used in FY 10.	HB 12.335 language allows for up to 25% flexibility between personal service and expense and equipment. The Eastern District does not have an estimate of the amount of that flexibility that might be used in FY 11.	10% flexibility is being requested for FY 12. The Eastern District does not have an estimate on the amount of flexibility that might be used if approved.

3. Please explain how flexibility was used in the prior and/or current years.

PRIOR YEAR EXPLAIN ACTUAL USE	CURRENT YEAR EXPLAIN PLANNED USE
No flexibility was used in FY 10.	The Eastern District does not have an estimate at this time of how much flex will be used in managing the \$5 million Governor's withhold.

JUDICIARY REPORT 10 FY2012 GOVERNOR RECOMMENDATION

DECISION ITEM DETAIL

Budget Unit	FY 2010	FY 2010	FY 2011	FY 2011	FY 2012	FY 2012	FY 2012	FY 2012
Decision Item	ACTUAL	ACTUAL	BUDGET	BUDGET	DEPT REQ	DEPT REQ	GOV REC	GOV REC
Budget Object Class	DOLLAR	FTE	DOLLAR	FTE	DOLLAR	FTE	DOLLAR	FTE
COURT OF APPEALS-EASTERN DIST								
CORE								
APPELLATE JUDGE	1,740,763	13.58	1,794,901	14.00	1,794,901	14.00	1,794,901	14.00
JUDICIAL ADMINISTRATIVE AST	522,957	13.75	531,231	14.00	531,231	14.00	531,231	14.00
COURT ADMINISTRATOR - AP	90,900	1.00	86,988	1.00	86,988	1.00	86,988	1.00
LAW CLERKS	1,272,239	26.05	1,279,957	28.00	1,279,957	28.00	1,279,957	28.00
CLERK	71,544	1.00	76,289	1.00	76,289	1.00	76,289	1.00
RESEARCH ATTORNEY	52,200	1.00	52,192	1.00	52,192	1.00	52,192	1.00
DEPUTY CLERK	192,830	5.63	206,554	6.50	206,554	6.50	206,554	6.50
MARSHAL	38,700	1.00	38,700	1.00	38,700	1.00	38,700	1.00
SETTLEMENT SECRETARY	34,098	0.98	35,905	1.00	35,905	1.00	35,905	1.00
SENIOR SETTLEMENT JUDGE	10,332	0.15	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00
LIBRARIAN ASSISTANT	0	0.00	4,649	0.25	4,649	0.25	4,649	0.25
CHIEF DEPUTY CLERK II	45,060	1.00	45,069	1.00	45,069	1.00	45,069	1.00
FISCAL OFFICER II	47,184	1.00	47,174	1.00	47,174	1.00	47,174	1.00
ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT	37,968	1.00	37,973	1.00	37,973	1.00	37,973	1.00
LIBRARIAN III	61,620	1.00	56,681	1.00	56,681	1.00	56,681	1.00
DATA PROCESSING COORD	37,296	1.00	37,973	1.00	37,973	1.00	37,973	1.00
COMPUTER INFO TECH SPEC	51,156	1.00	51,146	1.00	51,146	1.00	51,146	1.00
TOTAL - PS	4,306,847	70.14	4,383,382	73.75	4,383,382	73.75	4,383,382	73.75
TRAVEL, IN-STATE	15,224	0.00	21,250	0.00	21,250	0.00	21,250	0.00
TRAVEL, OUT-OF-STATE	4,105	0.00	8,220	0.00	8,220	0.00	8,220	0.00
SUPPLIES	155,511	0.00	160,516	0.00	160,516	0.00	160,516	0.00
PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT	22,463	0.00	7,000	0.00	7,000	0.00	7,000	0.00
COMMUNICATION SERV & SUPP	72,927	0.00	63,206	0.00	68,206	0.00	68,206	0.00
PROFESSIONAL SERVICES	32,695	0.00	26,308	0.00	30,308	0.00	30,308	0.00
M&R SERVICES	4,880	0.00	10,000	0.00	5,000	0.00	5,000	0.00
COMPUTER EQUIPMENT	22,060	0.00	20,000	0.00	20,000	0.00	20,000	0.00
OFFICE EQUIPMENT	7,589	0.00	15,000	0.00	10,000	0.00	10,000	0.00
OTHER EQUIPMENT	0	0.00	3,000	0.00	3,000	0.00	3,000	0.00
PROPERTY & IMPROVEMENTS	0	0.00	4,500	0.00	4,500	0.00	4,500	0.00
BUILDING LEASE PAYMENTS	79,492	0.00	71,954	0.00	76,954	0.00	76,954	0.00
EQUIPMENT RENTALS & LEASES	9,960	0.00	14,100	0.00	10,100	0.00	10,100	0.00
MISCELLANEOUS EXPENSES	8,132	0.00	10,000	0.00	10,000	0.00	10,000	0.00

JUDICIARY REPORT 10 FY2012 GOVERNOR RECOMMENDATION

DECISION ITEM DETAIL

Budget Unit	FY 2010	FY 2010	FY 2011	FY 2011	FY 2012	FY 2012	FY 2012	FY 2012
Decision Item	ACTUAL	ACTUAL	BUDGET	BUDGET	DEPT REQ	DEPT REQ	GOV REC	GOV REC
Budget Object Class	DOLLAR	FTE	DOLLAR	FTE	DOLLAR	FTE	DOLLAR	FTE
COURT OF APPEALS-EASTERN DIST								
CORE								
REBILLABLE EXPENSES	0	0.00	1	0.00	1	0.00	1	0.00
TOTAL - EE	435,038	0.00	435,055	0.00	435,055	0.00	435,055	0.00
GRAND TOTAL	\$4,741,885	70.14	\$4,818,437	73.75	\$4,818,437	73.75	\$4,818,437	73.75
GENERAL REVENUE	\$4,582,019	67.42	\$4,818,437	73.75	\$4,818,437	73.75	\$4,818,437	73.75
FEDERAL FUNDS	\$159,866	2.72	\$0	0.00	\$0	0.00	\$0	0.00
OTHER FUNDS	\$0	0.00	\$0	0.00	\$0	0.00	\$0	0.00

JUDICIARY REPORT 9 FY2012 GOVERNOR RECOMMENDATION
DECISION ITEM SUMMARY

Budget Unit								
Decision Item	FY 2010	FY 2010	FY 2011	FY 2011	FY 2012	FY 2012	FY 2012	FY 2012
Budget Object Summary	ACTUAL	ACTUAL	BUDGET	BUDGET	DEPT REQ	DEPT REQ	GOV REC	GOV REC
Fund	DOLLAR	FTE	DOLLAR	FTE	DOLLAR	FTE	DOLLAR	FTE
COURT OF APPEALS-SOUTHERN DIS								
CORE								
PERSONAL SERVICES								
GENERAL REVENUE	1,856,405	28.25	2,040,946	31.60	2,040,946	31.60	2,040,946	31.60
FEDRAL BUDGET STAB-MEDICAID RE	57,175	1.22	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00
TOTAL - PS	1,913,580	29.47	2,040,946	31.60	2,040,946	31.60	2,040,946	31.60
EXPENSE & EQUIPMENT								
GENERAL REVENUE	272,716	0.00	273,349	0.00	273,349	0.00	273,349	0.00
FEDRAL BUDGET STAB-MEDICAID RE	19,134	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00
TOTAL - EE	291,850	0.00	273,349	0.00	273,349	0.00	273,349	0.00
TOTAL	2,205,430	29.47	2,314,295	31.60	2,314,295	31.60	2,314,295	31.60
GRAND TOTAL	\$2,205,430	29.47	\$2,314,295	31.60	\$2,314,295	31.60	\$2,314,295	31.60

CORE DECISION ITEM


Judiciary					Budget Unit: 14501C				
Court of Appeals - Southern District									
Core									
1. CORE FINANCIAL SUMMARY									
FY 2012 Budget Request					FY 2012 Governor's Recommendations				
	GR	Federal	Other	Total		GR	Federal	Other	Total
PS	2,040,946	0	0	2,040,946	PS	2,040,946	0	0	2,040,946
EE	273,349	0	0	273,349	EE	273,349	0	0	273,349
PSD	0	0	0	0	PSD	0	0	0	0
Total	2,314,295	0	0	2,314,295	Total	2,314,295	0	0	2,314,295
FTE	31.60	0.00	0.00	31.60	FTE	31.60	0.00	0.00	31.60
Est. Fringe	1,341,931	0	0	1,341,931	Est. Fringe	1,341,931	0	0	1,341,931
<i>Note: Fringes budgeted in House Bill 5 except for certain fringes budgeted directly to MoDOT, Highway Patrol, and Conservation.</i>					<i>Note: Fringes budgeted in House Bill 5 except for certain fringes budgeted directly to MoDOT, Highway Patrol, and Conservation.</i>				
Other Funds:					Other Funds:				
2. CORE DESCRIPTION									
<p>The constitutional provisions establishing the parameters and responsibilities of the Missouri judicial system reflect the basic recognition of the need for a fair and timely system of justice for Missouri citizens. The Missouri Constitution charges the Missouri Court of Appeals, Southern District with appellate jurisdiction over cases which arise in the 44 counties of southern Missouri. These counties include 24% of the state's population. The appeals generated by this population through the circuit court filings are reviewed and decided by the seven judges of the Southern District, which is 22% of the state's court of appeals judges. With the assistance of nine law clerks, 15% of the state's court of appeal law clerks, cases are heard and decided by the Southern District. The principal location of the court is in Springfield. However, in accordance with §477.200, RSMo, the court is mandated to annually hold two sessions of court in Poplar Bluff. The court attempts to broaden its exposure, educate the public, and save time and expense for litigants and counsel by holding oral argument sessions in different county courthouses and schools throughout the district's jurisdiction. This past fiscal year, the court held argument at Missouri State University, Bolivar High School, and West Plains High School.</p>									
3. PROGRAM LISTING (list programs included in this core funding)									
Court of Appeals (page 103)									

CORE DECISION ITEM

Judiciary	Budget Unit: 14501C
Court of Appeals - Southern District	
Core	

4. FINANCIAL HISTORY

	FY 2008 Actual	FY 2009 Actual	FY 2010 Actual	FY 2011 Current Yr.
Appropriation (All Funds)	2,249,351	2,314,295	2,314,295	2,314,295
Less Reverted (All Funds)	0	(18,091)	(54,357)	N/A
Budget Authority (All Funds)	2,249,351	2,296,204	2,259,938	N/A
Actual Expenditures (All Funds)	2,249,351	2,282,037	2,205,430	N/A
Unexpended (All Funds)	0	14,167	54,508	N/A
Unexpended, by Fund:				
General Revenue	0	14,167	54,508	N/A
Federal	0	0	0	N/A
Other	0	0	0	N/A



NOTES:

CORE RECONCILIATION DETAIL

JUDICIARY
COURT OF APPEALS-SOUTHERN DIS

5. CORE RECONCILIATION DETAIL

	Budget Class	FTE	GR	Federal	Other	Total	Explanation
TAFP AFTER VETOES							
	PS	31.60	2,040,946	0	0	2,040,946	
	EE	0.00	273,349	0	0	273,349	
	Total	31.60	2,314,295	0	0	2,314,295	
DEPARTMENT CORE REQUEST							
	PS	31.60	2,040,946	0	0	2,040,946	
	EE	0.00	273,349	0	0	273,349	
	Total	31.60	2,314,295	0	0	2,314,295	
GOVERNOR'S RECOMMENDED CORE							
	PS	31.60	2,040,946	0	0	2,040,946	
	EE	0.00	273,349	0	0	273,349	
	Total	31.60	2,314,295	0	0	2,314,295	

FLEXIBILITY REQUEST FORM

BUDGET UNIT NUMBER 14401C	DEPARTMENT: Judiciary
BUDGET UNIT NAME: Court of Appeals - Southern District	DIVISION: Court of Appeals - Southern District

1. Provide the amount by fund of personal service flexibility and the amount by fund of expense and equipment flexibility you are requesting in dollar and percentage terms and explain why the flexibility is needed. If flexibility is being requested among divisions, provide the amount by fund of flexibility you are requesting in dollar and percentage terms and explain why the flexibility is needed.

DEPARTMENT REQUEST

	General Revenue				
PS	\$	204,095		10%	
E&E	\$	27,335		10%	

2. Estimate how much flexibility will be used for the budget year. How much flexibility was used in the Prior Year Budget and the Current Year Budget? Please specify the amount.

PRIOR YEAR ACTUAL AMOUNT OF FLEXIBILITY USED	CURRENT YEAR ESTIMATED AMOUNT OF FLEXIBILITY THAT WILL BE USED	BUDGET REQUEST ESTIMATED AMOUNT OF FLEXIBILITY THAT WILL BE USED
General Revenue PS \$ (18,500) -0.9% E&E \$ 18,500 7.2%	HB 12.335 language allows for up to 25% flexibility between personal service and expense and equipment. The Southern District does not have an estimate of the amount of that flexibility that might be used in FY 11.	10% flexibility is being requested for FY 12. The Southern District does not have an estimate on the amount of flexibility that might be used if approved.

3. Please explain how flexibility was used in the prior and/or current years.

PRIOR YEAR EXPLAIN ACTUAL USE	CURRENT YEAR EXPLAIN PLANNED USE
We purchased 11 computers, 32 monitors, 1 laserjet printer, 3 laptops, 21 floppy disk drives, and 1 scanning work station.	The Southern District does not have an estimate at this time of how much flex will be used in managing the \$5 million Governor's withhold.

JUDICIARY REPORT 10 FY2012 GOVERNOR RECOMMENDATION

DECISION ITEM DETAIL

Budget Unit	FY 2010	FY 2010	FY 2011	FY 2011	FY 2012	FY 2012	FY 2012	FY 2012
Decision Item	ACTUAL	ACTUAL	BUDGET	BUDGET	DEPT REQ	DEPT REQ	GOV REC	GOV REC
Budget Object Class	DOLLAR	FTE	DOLLAR	FTE	DOLLAR	FTE	DOLLAR	FTE
COURT OF APPEALS-SOUTHERN DIS								
CORE								
APPELLATE JUDGE	807,703	5.54	897,450	7.00	897,450	7.00	897,450	7.00
JUDICIAL ADMINISTRATIVE AST	258,127	6.78	266,375	7.00	266,375	7.00	266,375	7.00
LAW CLERKS	394,343	8.24	439,498	9.00	439,498	9.00	439,498	9.00
CLERK	81,468	1.00	81,468	1.00	81,468	1.00	81,468	1.00
RESEARCH ATTORNEY	52,200	1.00	52,200	1.00	52,200	1.00	52,200	1.00
DEPUTY CLERK	34,644	1.00	34,644	1.00	34,644	1.00	34,644	1.00
MARSHAL	21,571	0.60	21,571	0.60	21,571	0.60	21,571	0.60
STAFF COUNSEL	65,676	1.00	65,676	1.00	65,676	1.00	65,676	1.00
CHIEF DEPUTY CLERK I	41,712	1.00	41,712	1.00	41,712	1.00	41,712	1.00
FISCAL OFFICER II	54,806	1.16	47,184	1.00	47,184	1.00	47,184	1.00
LIBRARIAN I	42,596	1.04	40,968	1.00	40,968	1.00	40,968	1.00
COMPUTER INFO TECH SPEC	52,200	1.00	52,200	1.00	52,200	1.00	52,200	1.00
SENIOR JUDGE	6,534	0.11	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00
TOTAL - PS	1,913,580	29.47	2,040,946	31.60	2,040,946	31.60	2,040,946	31.60
TRAVEL, IN-STATE	22,743	0.00	16,194	0.00	16,194	0.00	16,194	0.00
TRAVEL, OUT-OF-STATE	628	0.00	4,303	0.00	4,303	0.00	4,303	0.00
SUPPLIES	154,869	0.00	199,429	0.00	199,429	0.00	199,429	0.00
PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT	10,150	0.00	50	0.00	50	0.00	50	0.00
COMMUNICATION SERV & SUPP	59,358	0.00	13,000	0.00	13,000	0.00	13,000	0.00
PROFESSIONAL SERVICES	1,451	0.00	6,150	0.00	6,150	0.00	6,150	0.00
HOUSEKEEPING & JANITORIAL SERV	0	0.00	80	0.00	80	0.00	80	0.00
M&R SERVICES	4,311	0.00	21,982	0.00	21,982	0.00	21,982	0.00
COMPUTER EQUIPMENT	11,901	0.00	7,234	0.00	7,234	0.00	7,234	0.00
OFFICE EQUIPMENT	17,673	0.00	2,235	0.00	2,235	0.00	2,235	0.00
OTHER EQUIPMENT	0	0.00	100	0.00	100	0.00	100	0.00
BUILDING LEASE PAYMENTS	8,458	0.00	2,300	0.00	2,300	0.00	2,300	0.00
EQUIPMENT RENTALS & LEASES	0	0.00	100	0.00	100	0.00	100	0.00

JUDICIARY REPORT 10 FY2012 GOVERNOR RECOMMENDATION

DECISION ITEM DETAIL

Budget Unit	FY 2010	FY 2010	FY 2011	FY 2011	FY 2012	FY 2012	FY 2012	FY 2012
Decision Item	ACTUAL	ACTUAL	BUDGET	BUDGET	DEPT REQ	DEPT REQ	GOV REC	GOV REC
Budget Object Class	DOLLAR	FTE	DOLLAR	FTE	DOLLAR	FTE	DOLLAR	FTE
COURT OF APPEALS-SOUTHERN DIS								
CORE								
MISCELLANEOUS EXPENSES	308	0.00	192	0.00	192	0.00	192	0.00
TOTAL - EE	291,850	0.00	273,349	0.00	273,349	0.00	273,349	0.00
GRAND TOTAL	\$2,205,430	29.47	\$2,314,295	31.60	\$2,314,295	31.60	\$2,314,295	31.60
GENERAL REVENUE	\$2,129,121	28.25	\$2,314,295	31.60	\$2,314,295	31.60	\$2,314,295	31.60
FEDERAL FUNDS	\$76,309	1.22	\$0	0.00	\$0	0.00	\$0	0.00
OTHER FUNDS	\$0	0.00	\$0	0.00	\$0	0.00	\$0	0.00

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

Judiciary

Court of Appeals

Court of Appeals

1. What does this program do?

- The Constitution organizes the Court of Appeals into separate districts and allows the court to sit en banc or in division of not less than three judges.
- The Court of Appeals has general appellate jurisdiction in all cases except those within the exclusive jurisdiction of the supreme court.
- The Court considers the briefs, oral arguments, and the transcripts, pleadings and exhibits from a trial in researching, deciding, and writing its opinions.
- To increase accessibility to the judicial process, court is held not only in their own courthouse, but also in county courthouses, schools, and at other locations throughout the state.
- The Court en banc sets administrative policies and internal and external rules.
- The Chief Judge of the Western District chairs the 6th, 7th, and 16th Judicial Circuit Commissions. The Chief Judge of the Eastern District chairs the 21st and 22nd Judicial Circuit Commissions. The Chief Judge of the Southern District chairs the 31st Judicial Circuit Commission. These Commissions submit panels to the Governor for appointment of Associate and Circuit Court judges for the respective circuits.
- Law Clerks and Research Attorneys perform legal research and write memoranda to aid the judges.
- Clerk's Office carries out the day-to-day staff functions necessary to keep cases moving through the Appellate Court; performs essential filing and record keeping; notifies the parties of the Court's rulings and decisions; distributes the Court's opinions; and provides fiscal support to the Court.
- Section 477.150, RSMo authorizes a state funded law library for each district to assist the judges and staff in the legal research necessary to promptly decide cases.
- Marshals provide security at the courthouse for citizens, staff and judges and arrange for the arrest of criminal appellants on bonds.

2. What is the authorization for this program, i.e., federal or state statute, etc.? (Include the federal program number, if applicable.)

Article V, Section 13, Missouri Constitution, Chapter 476 and 477, RSMo

3. Are there federal matching requirements? If yes, please explain.

No.

4. Is this a federally mandated program? If yes, please explain.

No.



PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

Judiciary

Court of Appeals


Court of Appeals

5. Provide actual expenditures for the prior three fiscal years.




PROGRAM DESCRIPTION


Judiciary
Court of Appeals
Court of Appeals




Western District FY11 Planned Expenditures



Eastern District FY11 Planned Expenditures



Southern District FY11 Planned Expenditures



PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

Judiciary

Court of Appeals

Court of Appeals

6. What are the sources of the "Other " funds?

N/A

7a. Provide an effectiveness measure.

See pages 79-80.

7b. Provide an efficiency measure.

See pages 79-80.

7c. Provide the number of clients/individuals served (if applicable)

See page 79.

7d. Provide a customer satisfaction measure, if available.

N/A

“THIS PAGE WAS INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK.”

INTRODUCTION
TO THE
CIRCUIT COURT BUDGET

The Circuit Courts, organized under the Missouri Constitution and statutes, are the trial courts of general jurisdiction. There are 45 circuits, each having at least one circuit judge and one associate circuit judge for each county in the circuit. Each circuit has a presiding judge and is organized into divisions: circuit, associate, family/juvenile, municipal, and probate.

In each county, a circuit clerk office supports the clerical aspect of the cases before circuit and associate circuit judges. In larger counties, there may be several divisions of the court, each with separate support staff. In the 35 multi-county circuits, the juvenile court staff are state paid.

Core funding for the circuit courts for FY 11 includes 2,928.20 FTE. There are 641 FTE which are provided by statute with statutory salaries and 2,287.20 other personnel. While the majority are deputy and division clerks, included in that total are 513.3875 FTE to support juvenile operations.

The fiscal year 2012 budget request includes \$595,740 for access to justice interpreter services; \$429,498 for a new associate circuit judge position in Clay, Polk, and Warren Counties; and \$76,445 for a Federal FTE authority increase.

“THIS PAGE WAS INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK.”

FY 2011 CORE (As of 9-1-10)
CIRCUIT COURT PERSONAL SERVICES BUDGET BY CIRCUIT

CIR	CIRCUIT JUDGES		ASSOCIATE CIRCUIT JUDGES		COURT REPORTERS		CIRCUIT CLERKS		JUVENILE STAFF		CIRCUIT COURT PERSONNEL FY11 CORE		TOTAL ALL FTE, ALL FUNDS		CIR
1	1.00	120,484	3.00	328,098	1.00	55,012	3.00	160,536	3.0000	118,596	9.6250	295,711	20.6250	1,078,437	1
2	1.00	120,484	3.00	328,098	1.00	55,012	3.00	160,536	42.0000	1,223,730	11.6125	340,110	61.6125	2,227,970	2
3	1.00	120,484	4.00	437,464	1.00	55,012	4.00	214,048	5.0000	178,956	12.8625	362,585	27.8625	1,368,549	3
4	1.00	120,484	5.00	546,830	1.00	55,012	5.00	267,560	7.0000	265,044	12.8750	373,128	31.8750	1,628,058	4
5	4.00	481,936	3.00	328,098	4.00	220,048	2.00	121,400	47.0500	1,447,354	35.2500	960,162	95.3000	3,558,998	5
6	2.00	240,968	3.00	328,098	2.00	110,024	1.00	67,888	1.0000	46,204	23.0000	616,632	32.0000	1,409,814	6
7	4.00	481,936	4.00	437,464	4.00	220,048	1.00	67,888	1.0000	46,204	49.3250	1,405,944	63.3250	2,659,484	7
8	1.00	120,484	2.00	218,732	1.00	55,012	2.00	107,024	5.0000	176,316	9.8750	276,848	20.8750	954,416	8
9	1.00	120,484	3.00	328,098	1.00	55,012	3.00	160,536	5.0000	197,412	10.0625	290,375	23.0625	1,151,917	9
10	1.00	120,484	3.00	328,098	1.00	55,012	4.00	227,460	9.2750	358,752	16.0250	450,919	34.3000	1,540,725	10
11	6.00	722,904	6.00	656,196	6.00	330,072	1.00	67,888	1.0000	46,204	66.6875	1,880,858	86.6875	3,704,122	11
12	1.00	120,484	4.00	437,464	1.00	55,012	3.00	160,536	12.0000	405,084	23.0000	651,132	44.0000	1,829,712	12
13	4.00	481,936	7.00	765,562	4.00	220,048	2.00	135,776	44.7500	1,526,622	54.5000	1,568,219	116.2500	4,698,163	13
14	1.00	120,484	2.00	218,732	1.00	55,012	2.00	112,001	6.7500	231,933	13.3750	367,306	26.1250	1,105,468	14
15	1.00	120,484	4.00	437,464	1.00	55,012	2.00	122,358	8.0000	274,308	21.5000	580,392	37.5000	1,590,018	15
16	20.00	2,409,680	16.00	1,749,856	19.00	1,045,228	1.00	73,413	1.0000	46,204	210.0000	6,216,574	267.0000	11,540,955	16
17	2.00	240,968	5.00	546,830	2.00	110,024	2.00	129,067	25.0000	807,336	30.5625	821,976	66.5625	2,656,201	17
18	1.00	120,484	3.00	328,098	1.00	55,012	2.00	114,691	13.5000	407,138	20.5000	554,009	41.0000	1,579,432	18
19	3.00	361,452	1.00	109,366	3.00	165,036	1.00	67,888	1.0000	46,204	26.5750	752,520	35.5750	1,502,466	19
20	2.00	240,968	5.00	546,830	2.00	110,024	3.00	174,912	22.8125	772,398	34.7500	1,032,075	69.5625	2,877,207	20
21	21.00	2,530,164	18.00	1,968,588	20.00	1,100,240	1.00	67,888	1.0000	46,204	227.0000	7,060,108	288.0000	12,773,192	21
22	25.00	3,012,100	13.00	1,421,758	24.00	1,320,288	1.00	111,953	1.0000	46,204	161.0000	5,011,468	225.0000	10,923,771	22
23	6.00	722,904	6.00	656,196	6.00	330,072	1.00	67,888	3.0000	85,836	53.5000	1,577,560	75.5000	3,440,456	23
24	2.00	240,968	6.00	656,196	2.00	110,024	4.00	221,715	20.0000	608,784	39.7750	1,121,726	73.7750	2,959,413	24
25	2.00	240,968	6.00	656,196	2.00	110,024	4.00	214,048	9.0000	323,796	35.9750	1,118,918	58.9750	2,663,950	25
26	2.00	240,968	7.00	765,562	2.00	110,024	5.00	281,936	39.7500	1,257,441	39.6875	1,111,259	95.4375	3,767,190	26
27	1.00	120,484	3.00	328,098	1.00	55,012	3.00	160,536	7.8000	279,374	17.6000	497,280	33.4000	1,440,784	27
28	1.00	120,484	4.00	437,464	1.00	55,012	4.00	214,048	6.0000	218,460	17.6125	501,014	33.6125	1,546,482	28
29	3.00	361,452	4.00	437,464	3.00	165,036	1.00	73,413	1.0000	46,204	39.1250	1,116,556	51.1250	2,200,125	29
30	1.00	120,484	6.00	656,196	1.00	55,012	5.00	267,560	24.5250	720,458	29.7000	784,827	67.2250	2,604,537	30

CIR	CIRCUIT JUDGES		ASSOCIATE CIRCUIT JUDGES		COURT REPORTERS		CIRCUIT CLERKS		JUVENILE STAFF		CIRCUIT COURT PERSONNEL FY 11 CORE		TOTAL ALL FTE, ALL FUNDS		CIR
31	5.00	602,420	10.00	1,093,660	5.00	275,060	1.00	67,888	1.0000	46,204	74.0000	2,369,008	96.0000	4,454,240	31
32	2.00	240,968	4.00	437,464	2.00	110,024	3.00	180,437	24.7500	793,038	28.6500	826,455	64.4000	2,588,386	32
33	1.00	120,484	4.00	437,464	1.00	55,012	2.00	107,024	22.5000	697,836	24.5000	703,482	55.0000	2,121,302	33
34	1.00	120,484	3.00	328,098	1.00	55,012	2.00	114,691	4.0000	155,796	18.7000	515,517	29.7000	1,289,598	34
35	1.00	120,484	5.00	546,830	1.00	55,012	2.00	107,024	16.9250	557,506	26.0000	727,212	51.9250	2,114,068	35
36	1.00	120,484	3.00	328,098	1.00	55,012	2.00	107,024	14.8750	432,338	20.8000	588,080	42.6750	1,631,036	36
37	1.00	120,484	5.00	546,830	1.00	55,012	4.00	214,048	8.0000	313,428	22.7750	604,936	41.7750	1,854,738	37
38	1.00	120,484	4.00	437,464	1.00	55,012	2.00	129,067	9.0000	325,548	28.3750	779,018	45.3750	1,846,593	38
39	1.00	120,484	6.00	656,196	1.00	55,012	3.00	160,536	8.0000	291,348	31.4375	848,144	50.4375	2,131,720	39
40	1.00	120,484	3.00	328,098	1.00	55,012	2.00	114,691	5.8750	207,735	27.6000	773,752	40.4750	1,599,772	40
41	1.00	120,484	2.00	218,732	1.00	55,012	2.00	107,024	6.0000	262,824	8.5000	211,206	20.5000	975,282	41
42	2.00	240,968	6.00	656,196	2.00	110,024	5.00	267,560	7.0000	242,124	25.8000	751,621	47.8000	2,268,493	42
43	2.00	240,968	5.00	546,830	2.00	110,024	5.00	267,560	4.5000	178,476	19.5000	542,638	38.0000	1,886,496	43
44	1.00	120,484	3.00	328,098	1.00	55,012	3.00	160,536	10.7500	339,438	12.5000	345,876	31.2500	1,349,444	44
45	1.00	120,484	3.00	328,098	1.00	55,012	2.00	107,024	6.0000	214,368	21.5000	602,364	34.5000	1,427,350	45
Senior Judges CPAs/Other Statewide Unallocated											5.0000	246,332	5.0000	246,332	
											5.0000	227,904	5.0000	227,904	
											25.2375	786,804	25.2375	786,804	
TOTAL	144.00	17,349,696	225.00	24,607,350	141.00	7,756,692	116.00	6,606,525	523.3875	17,312,767	1778.8125	52,148,540	2928.2000	125,781,570	

Statutory salaries total \$57,028,635 and 641 FTE, or 45% and 22%, respectively. Non-statutory salaries total \$68,752,935 and 2287.2 FTE, or 55% and 78%, respectively.

7th Circuit: 1 family court commissioner @ \$109,366 is included with associate circuit judges.

12th Circuit: 1 drug court commissioner @ \$109,366 is included with associate circuit judges.

13th Circuit: 1 family court commissioner @ \$109,366 is included with associate circuit judges.

16th Circuit: 1 probate commissioner @ \$120,484 is included with the circuit judges; 5 family court commissioners, 1 drug court commissioner and 1 deputy probate commissioner totaling \$765,562 are included with associate circuit judges.

21st Circuit: 1 probate commissioner @ \$120,484 is included with the circuit judges; 4 family court commissioners and 1 deputy probate commissioner totaling \$546,830 are included with associate circuit judges.

22nd Circuit: 1 probate commissioner @ \$120,484 is included with the circuit judges; 3 family court commissioners, 2 drug court commissioners and 1 deputy probate commissioner are included with associate circuit judges totaling \$656,196.

24th Circuit: 1 drug court commissioner @ \$109,366 is included with associate circuit judges.

29th Circuit: 1 family court commissioner @ \$109,366 is included with associate circuit judges.

31st Circuit: 4 family court commissioners, 1 drug court commissioner and 1 probate commissioner are included with associate circuit judges totaling \$546,830.

33rd Circuit: 1 drug court commissioner @ \$109,366 is included with associate circuit judges.

35th Circuit: 1 drug court commissioner @ \$109,366 is included with associate circuit judges.

42nd Circuit: 1 drug court commissioner @ \$109,366 is included with associate circuit judges.

JUDICIARY REPORT 9 FY2012 GOVERNOR RECOMMENDATION

DECISION ITEM SUMMARY

Budget Unit								
Decision Item	FY 2010	FY 2010	FY 2011	FY 2011	FY 2012	FY 2012	FY 2012	FY 2012
Budget Object Summary	ACTUAL	ACTUAL	BUDGET	BUDGET	DEPT REQ	DEPT REQ	GOV REC	GOV REC
Fund	DOLLAR	FTE	DOLLAR	FTE	DOLLAR	FTE	DOLLAR	FTE
CIRCUIT PERSONNEL								
CORE								
PERSONAL SERVICES								
GENERAL REVENUE	117,870,224	2,718.32	123,987,773	2,871.70	123,987,773	2,871.70	123,987,773	2,871.70
JUDICIARY - FEDERAL	461,512	17.94	1,541,273	49.00	1,541,273	49.00	1,541,273	49.00
FEDRAL BUDGET STAB-MEDICAID RE	3,733,855	124.55	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00
THIRD PARTY LIABILITY COLLECT	172,464	6.00	252,524	7.50	252,524	7.50	252,524	7.50
TOTAL - PS	122,238,055	2,866.81	125,781,570	2,928.20	125,781,570	2,928.20	125,781,570	2,928.20
EXPENSE & EQUIPMENT								
GENERAL REVENUE	2,341,798	0.00	2,819,885	0.00	2,802,885	0.00	2,802,885	0.00
JUDICIARY - FEDERAL	0	0.00	298,661	0.00	298,661	0.00	298,661	0.00
FEDRAL BUDGET STAB-MEDICAID RE	455,882	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00
THIRD PARTY LIABILITY COLLECT	99,693	0.00	128,039	0.00	100,000	0.00	100,000	0.00
STATE COURT ADMIN REVOLVING	121,044	0.00	195,000	0.00	195,000	0.00	195,000	0.00
TOTAL - EE	3,018,417	0.00	3,441,585	0.00	3,396,546	0.00	3,396,546	0.00
PROGRAM-SPECIFIC								
GENERAL REVENUE	257,837	0.00	278,000	0.00	295,000	0.00	295,000	0.00
JUDICIARY - FEDERAL	9,080	0.00	31,000	0.00	31,000	0.00	31,000	0.00
THIRD PARTY LIABILITY COLLECT	28,000	0.00	0	0.00	28,039	0.00	28,039	0.00
STATE COURT ADMIN REVOLVING	0	0.00	5,000	0.00	5,000	0.00	5,000	0.00
TOTAL - PD	294,917	0.00	314,000	0.00	359,039	0.00	359,039	0.00
TOTAL	125,551,389	2,866.81	129,537,155	2,928.20	129,537,155	2,928.20	129,537,155	2,928.20
CC-Access to Justice Inter Ser - 1100002								
EXPENSE & EQUIPMENT								
GENERAL REVENUE	0	0.00	0	0.00	595,740	0.00	0	0.00
TOTAL - EE	0	0.00	0	0.00	595,740	0.00	0	0.00
TOTAL	0	0.00	0	0.00	595,740	0.00	0	0.00
CC-Judgeship Determined by Pop - 1100001								
PERSONAL SERVICES								
GENERAL REVENUE	0	0.00	0	0.00	421,626	6.00	0	0.00
TOTAL - PS	0	0.00	0	0.00	421,626	6.00	0	0.00

JUDICIARY REPORT 9 FY2012 GOVERNOR RECOMMENDATION

DECISION ITEM SUMMARY

Budget Unit								
Decision Item	FY 2010	FY 2010	FY 2011	FY 2011	FY 2012	FY 2012	FY 2012	FY 2012
Budget Object Summary	ACTUAL	ACTUAL	BUDGET	BUDGET	DEPT REQ	DEPT REQ	GOV REC	GOV REC
Fund	DOLLAR	FTE	DOLLAR	FTE	DOLLAR	FTE	DOLLAR	FTE
CIRCUIT PERSONNEL								
CC-Judgeship Determined by Pop - 1100001								
EXPENSE & EQUIPMENT								
GENERAL REVENUE	0	0.00	0	0.00	7,872	0.00	0	0.00
TOTAL - EE	0	0.00	0	0.00	7,872	0.00	0	0.00
TOTAL	0	0.00	0	0.00	429,498	6.00	0	0.00
CC-Federal FTE Authority Inc - 1100005								
PERSONAL SERVICES								
JUDICIARY - FEDERAL	0	0.00	0	0.00	76,445	11.00	0	0.00
TOTAL - PS	0	0.00	0	0.00	76,445	11.00	0	0.00
TOTAL	0	0.00	0	0.00	76,445	11.00	0	0.00
GRAND TOTAL	\$125,551,389	2,866.81	\$129,537,155	2,928.20	\$130,638,838	2,945.20	\$129,537,155	2,928.20

JUDICIARY REPORT 9 FY2012 GOVERNOR RECOMMENDATION

DECISION ITEM SUMMARY

Budget Unit								
Decision Item	FY 2010	FY 2010	FY 2011	FY 2011	FY 2012	FY 2012	FY 2012	FY 2012
Budget Object Summary	ACTUAL	ACTUAL	BUDGET	BUDGET	DEPT REQ	DEPT REQ	GOV REC	GOV REC
Fund	DOLLAR	FTE	DOLLAR	FTE	DOLLAR	FTE	DOLLAR	FTE
CIRCUIT COURT ADMINISTRATION								
CORE								
EXPENSE & EQUIPMENT								
CIRCUIT COURTS ESCROW FUND	2,500	0.00	5,500	0.00	5,500	0.00	5,500	0.00
DOM RELATIONS RESOLUTION-JUD	2,527	0.00	100	0.00	100	0.00	100	0.00
TOTAL - EE	5,027	0.00	5,600	0.00	5,600	0.00	5,600	0.00
PROGRAM-SPECIFIC								
GENERAL REVENUE	7,133,960	0.00	7,879,900	0.00	7,879,900	0.00	7,879,900	0.00
FEDRAL BUDGET STAB-MEDICAID RE	745,940	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00
MISSOURI CASA	81,149	0.00	100,000	0.00	100,000	0.00	100,000	0.00
CIRCUIT COURTS ESCROW FUND	1,511,604	0.00	500,000	0.00	500,000	0.00	500,000	0.00
DOM RELATIONS RESOLUTION-JUD	270,674	0.00	299,900	0.00	299,900	0.00	299,900	0.00
CRIMINAL NONSUPPORT COURT RESO	0	0.00	1	0.00	1	0.00	1	0.00
TOTAL - PD	9,743,327	0.00	8,779,801	0.00	8,779,801	0.00	8,779,801	0.00
TOTAL	9,748,354	0.00	8,785,401	0.00	8,785,401	0.00	8,785,401	0.00
GRAND TOTAL	\$9,748,354	0.00	\$8,785,401	0.00	\$8,785,401	0.00	\$8,785,401	0.00

CORE DECISION ITEM

Judiciary
Circuit Courts
Core

1. CORE FINANCIAL SUMMARY

	FY 2012 Budget Request					FY 2012 Governor's Recommendation			
	GR	Federal	Other	Total		GR	Federal	Other	Total
PS	123,987,773	1,541,273	252,524	125,781,570	PS	123,987,773	1,541,273	252,524	125,781,570
EE	2,802,885	298,661	300,600 E	3,402,146 E	EE	2,802,885	298,661	300,600 E	3,402,146 E
PSD	8,174,900	31,000	932,940 E	9,138,840 E	PSD	8,174,900	31,000	932,940 E	9,138,840 E
Total	134,965,558	1,870,934	1,486,064 E	138,322,556 E	Total	134,965,558	1,870,934	1,486,064 E	138,322,556 E
FTE	2,871.70	49.00	7.50	2,928.20	FTE	2,871.70	49.00	7.50	2,928.20

Est. Fringe	79,270,577	857,718	140,530	80,268,825
--------------------	------------	---------	---------	------------

Note: Fringes budgeted in House Bill 5 except for certain fringes budgeted directly to MoDOT, Highway Patrol, and Conservation.

Est. Fringe	79,270,577	857,718	140,530	80,268,825
--------------------	------------	---------	---------	------------

Note: Fringes budgeted in House Bill 5 except for certain fringes budgeted directly to MoDOT, Highway Patrol, and Conservation.

Other Funds: Third Party Liability Fund (0120) - \$380,563
 State Courts Administration Revolving Fund (0831) - \$200,000
 Domestic Relations Resolution Fund (0852) - \$300,000 (E)
 Missouri CASA Fund (0590) - \$100,000 (E)
 Circuit Court Escrow Fund (0718) - \$505,500 (E)
 Criminal Nonsupport Court Resources Fund (0936) - \$1 (E)

Other Funds: Third Party Liability Fund (0120) - \$380,563
 State Courts Administration Revolving Fund (0831) - \$200,000
 Domestic Relations Resolution Fund (0852) - \$300,000 (E)
 Missouri CASA Fund (0590) - \$100,000 (E)
 Circuit Court Escrow Fund (0718) - \$505,500 (E)
 Criminal Nonsupport Court Resources Fund (0936) - \$1 (E)

2. CORE DESCRIPTION

Article V, Section 1 of the Missouri Constitution establishes the Circuit Court as the trial court system of the state. At present, there are 45 circuits, each composed of one to five counties. Circuit boundaries are established by statute. The Circuit Court is organized into divisions: circuit, associate, family/juvenile, and probate. The state is required to pay the salaries of most circuit court personnel. A large part of these salaries is required and set by statute. The state is also required to pay case-related travel expenses for judges and court reporters under §478.017, RSMo and §485.090, RSMo, and is responsible for some legal or necessary expenses for the state's portion of the operation of the circuit courts, including interpreters for the hearing impaired and those who speak a foreign language.

3. PROGRAM LISTING (list programs included in this core funding)


- Trial Courts (page 125)
- Juvenile Justice (page 142)
- Drug Courts Adjudication and Treatment (page 207)
- Permanency Planning (page 147)
- CASA (page 158)
- DRR (page 163)
- Single County Circuit Juvenile Court Personnel Reimbursement (page 167)

CORE DECISION ITEM

Judiciary
Circuit Courts
Core

4. FINANCIAL HISTORY

	FY 2008 Actual	FY 2009 Actual	FY 2010 Actual	FY 2011 Current Yr.
Appropriation (All Funds)	135,431,913	139,213,189	139,422,555	138,322,556
Less Reverted (All Funds)	0	(1,041,952)	(2,324,996)	N/A
Budget Authority (All Funds)	135,431,913	138,171,237	137,097,559	N/A
Actual Expenditures (All Funds)	134,066,628	136,796,518	135,299,739	N/A
Unexpended (All Funds)	1,365,285	1,374,719	1,797,820	N/A
Unexpended, by Fund:				
General Revenue	110,450	7,468	88,527	N/A
Federal	803,629	915,366	1,412,885	N/A
Other	451,206	451,885	296,408	N/A



Reverted includes Governor's standard 3 percent reserve (when applicable) and any extraordinary withholdings.

NOTES:

CORE RECONCILIATION DETAIL

JUDICIARY
CIRCUIT PERSONNEL

5. CORE RECONCILIATION DETAIL

	Budget Class	FTE	GR	Federal	Other	Total	Explanation
TAFP AFTER VETOES							
	PS	2,928.20	123,987,773	1,541,273	252,524	125,781,570	
	EE	0.00	2,819,885	298,661	323,039	3,441,585	
	PD	0.00	278,000	31,000	5,000	314,000	
	Total	2,928.20	127,085,658	1,870,934	580,563	129,537,155	
DEPARTMENT CORE ADJUSTMENTS							
Core Reallocation	929 5274 EE	0.00	(17,000)	0	0	(17,000)	Unified Family Court
Core Reallocation	929 5274 PD	0.00	17,000	0	0	17,000	Unified Family Court
Core Reallocation	931 3805 EE	0.00	0	0	(28,039)	(28,039)	Family Court Improvement Project Grant match
Core Reallocation	931 3805 PD	0.00	0	0	28,039	28,039	Family Court Improvement Project Grant match
NET DEPARTMENT CHANGES		0.00	0	0	0	0	
DEPARTMENT CORE REQUEST							
	PS	2,928.20	123,987,773	1,541,273	252,524	125,781,570	
	EE	0.00	2,802,885	298,661	295,000	3,396,546	
	PD	0.00	295,000	31,000	33,039	359,039	
	Total	2,928.20	127,085,658	1,870,934	580,563	129,537,155	
GOVERNOR'S RECOMMENDED CORE							
	PS	2,928.20	123,987,773	1,541,273	252,524	125,781,570	
	EE	0.00	2,802,885	298,661	295,000	3,396,546	
	PD	0.00	295,000	31,000	33,039	359,039	
	Total	2,928.20	127,085,658	1,870,934	580,563	129,537,155	

CORE RECONCILIATION DETAIL

JUDICIARY
CIRCUIT COURT ADMINISTRATION

5. CORE RECONCILIATION DETAIL

	Budget Class	FTE	GR	Federal	Other	Total	Explanation
TAFP AFTER VETOES							
	EE	0.00	0	0	5,600	5,600	
	PD	0.00	7,879,900	0	899,901	8,779,801	
	Total	0.00	7,879,900	0	905,501	8,785,401	
DEPARTMENT CORE REQUEST							
	EE	0.00	0	0	5,600	5,600	
	PD	0.00	7,879,900	0	899,901	8,779,801	
	Total	0.00	7,879,900	0	905,501	8,785,401	
GOVERNOR'S RECOMMENDED CORE							
	EE	0.00	0	0	5,600	5,600	
	PD	0.00	7,879,900	0	899,901	8,779,801	
	Total	0.00	7,879,900	0	905,501	8,785,401	

FLEXIBILITY REQUEST FORM

BUDGET UNIT NUMBER 15001C	DEPARTMENT: Judiciary
BUDGET UNIT NAME: Circuit Courts	DIVISION: Circuit Courts

1. Provide the amount by fund of personal service flexibility and the amount by fund of expense and equipment flexibility you are requesting in dollar and percentage terms and explain why the flexibility is needed. If flexibility is being requested among divisions, provide the amount by fund of flexibility you are requesting in dollar and percentage terms and explain why the flexibility is needed.

DEPARTMENT REQUEST

	General Revenue								
PS	\$	12,398,777	10%						
E&E	\$	280,289	10%						

2. Estimate how much flexibility will be used for the budget year. How much flexibility was used in the Prior Year Budget and the Current Year Budget? Please specify the amount.

PRIOR YEAR ACTUAL AMOUNT OF FLEXIBILITY USED	CURRENT YEAR ESTIMATED AMOUNT OF FLEXIBILITY THAT WILL BE USED	BUDGET REQUEST ESTIMATED AMOUNT OF FLEXIBILITY THAT WILL BE USED
Flex was not used in FY10.	HB 12.345 language allows for up to 25% flexibility between personal service and expense and equipment. The Circuit Courts plan to use this flexibility to manage the \$5 million Governor's withhold.	10% flexibility is being requested for FY12. The Circuit Courts will use these funds to assist in managing any budget restrictions that are placed on the Judiciary.

3. Please explain how flexibility was used in the prior and/or current years.

PRIOR YEAR EXPLAIN ACTUAL USE	CURRENT YEAR EXPLAIN PLANNED USE
N/A	The Circuit Courts does not have an estimate at this time of how much flex will be used in managing the \$5 million Governor's withhold.

JUDICIARY REPORT 10 FY2012 GOVERNOR RECOMMENDATION

DECISION ITEM DETAIL

Budget Unit	FY 2010	FY 2010	FY 2011	FY 2011	FY 2012	FY 2012	FY 2012	FY 2012
Decision Item	ACTUAL	ACTUAL	BUDGET	BUDGET	DEPT REQ	DEPT REQ	GOV REC	GOV REC
Budget Object Class	DOLLAR	FTE	DOLLAR	FTE	DOLLAR	FTE	DOLLAR	FTE
CIRCUIT PERSONNEL								
CORE								
CIRCUIT JUDGE	16,841,373	139.78	16,988,244	141.00	16,988,244	141.00	16,988,244	141.00
PROBATE COMMISSIONER	470,818	4.00	470,818	4.00	470,818	4.00	470,818	4.00
ASSOCIATE CIRCUIT JUDGE	20,978,256	191.82	21,107,638	193.00	21,107,638	193.00	21,107,638	193.00
DEPUTY PROBATE COMMISSIONER	328,098	3.00	328,098	3.00	328,098	3.00	328,098	3.00
COURT REPORTER	7,724,308	140.41	7,756,703	141.00	7,756,703	141.00	7,756,703	141.00
JUVENILE OFFICER	463,837	4.82	462,040	10.00	462,040	10.00	462,040	10.00
FAMILY COURT COMMISSIONER	1,938,818	17.73	2,077,954	19.00	2,077,954	19.00	2,077,954	19.00
DRUG COURT COMMISSIONER	984,295	9.00	984,294	9.00	984,294	9.00	984,294	9.00
FAMILY COURT ADMINISTRATOR	83,766	1.00	120,494	2.00	120,494	2.00	120,494	2.00
MARSHAL	151,306	3.00	151,306	3.00	151,306	3.00	151,306	3.00
CIRCUIT CLERK	6,602,659	111.85	6,606,551	116.00	6,606,534	116.00	6,606,534	116.00
PROGRAM MANAGER	63,618	0.99	0	0.00	64,272	1.00	64,272	1.00
PROGRAM COORDINATOR II	2,514	0.04	109,171	2.00	0	0.00	0	0.00
PROGRAM SPECIALIST II	1,444	0.04	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00
SUPPORT SPECIALIST III	100,152	2.00	153,439	3.00	153,439	3.00	153,439	3.00
SUPPORT TECHNICIAN I	63,473	2.00	63,486	2.00	63,486	2.00	63,486	2.00
CLERK III	0	0.00	150,627	5.00	150,627	5.00	150,627	5.00
SENIOR JUDGE	220,094	3.49	246,332	5.00	246,332	5.00	246,332	5.00
TEMPORARY REP	45,413	1.47	345,682	9.00	345,682	9.00	345,682	9.00
TEMPORARY HELP	66,989	3.19	494,370	15.00	451,906	15.00	451,906	15.00
COURT ADMINISTRATOR	95,136	2.00	95,136	2.00	95,136	2.00	95,136	2.00
DRUG COURT ADMINISTRATOR	753,203	16.69	767,868	17.00	767,868	17.00	767,868	17.00
ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT I	123,013	4.00	123,216	4.00	123,216	4.00	123,216	4.00
ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT II	37,968	1.00	37,968	1.00	37,968	1.00	37,968	1.00
UNIT MANAGER I	579,396	13.00	579,396	13.00	579,396	13.00	579,396	13.00
UNIT MANAGER II	652,116	13.04	652,380	13.00	652,380	13.00	652,380	13.00
UNIT MANAGER III	172,236	3.00	172,236	3.00	172,236	3.00	172,236	3.00
COURT PROGRAM SPECIALIST I	160,188	5.00	160,188	5.00	160,188	5.00	160,188	5.00
COURT PROGRAM SPECIALIST II	168,874	4.98	199,896	6.00	199,896	6.00	199,896	6.00
COURT PROGRAM SPECIALIST III	34,644	1.00	34,644	1.00	34,644	1.00	34,644	1.00
COURT PROGRAM SPECIALIST IV	86,772	2.00	86,881	2.00	86,881	2.00	86,881	2.00
DIRECTOR OF FINE COLLECTION CT	86,405	1.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00

JUDICIARY REPORT 10 FY2012 GOVERNOR RECOMMENDATION

DECISION ITEM DETAIL

Budget Unit	FY 2010	FY 2010	FY 2011	FY 2011	FY 2012	FY 2012	FY 2012	FY 2012
Decision Item	ACTUAL	ACTUAL	BUDGET	BUDGET	DEPT REQ	DEPT REQ	GOV REC	GOV REC
Budget Object Class	DOLLAR	FTE	DOLLAR	FTE	DOLLAR	FTE	DOLLAR	FTE
CIRCUIT PERSONNEL								
CORE								
PERSONNEL OFFICER	91,608	2.00	91,608	2.00	102,396	2.00	102,396	2.00
PERSONNEL ASSISTANT	53,556	2.00	53,556	2.00	53,556	2.00	53,556	2.00
TRAINING COORDINATOR	80,436	2.00	80,436	2.00	80,436	2.00	80,436	2.00
COMPUTER INFO TECH SUPV II	54,360	1.00	54,360	1.00	54,360	1.00	54,360	1.00
COMPUTER INFO TECH SUPV I	132,304	2.72	146,568	3.00	146,632	3.00	146,632	3.00
COMPUTER INFO TECH SPEC I	46,248	1.00	46,248	1.00	46,248	1.00	46,248	1.00
COMPUTER INFO TECH III	90,588	2.00	90,588	2.00	90,588	2.00	90,588	2.00
COMPUTER INFO TECH II	119,280	3.00	119,280	3.00	119,280	3.00	119,280	3.00
COMPUTER INFO TECH I	34,032	1.00	69,790	2.00	69,790	2.00	69,790	2.00
COMPUTER INFO TECH TRNE	32,256	1.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00
COMPUTER OPERATOR	90,864	3.00	90,864	3.00	90,864	3.00	90,864	3.00
LEGAL COUNSEL	320,772	6.00	320,772	6.00	320,772	6.00	320,772	6.00
COURT CLERK I	50,591	2.36	0	0.00	85,747	4.00	85,747	4.00
COURT CLERK II	21,310,799	847.25	22,566,164	878.00	21,685,422	842.50	21,685,422	842.50
COURT CLERK III	11,288,398	386.86	11,255,820	357.00	11,909,232	382.00	11,909,232	382.00
COURT CLERK IV	2,430,344	77.20	2,502,012	79.00	2,487,010	79.00	2,487,010	79.00
COURT CLERK V	2,013,838	57.28	1,961,625	54.00	2,144,626	61.00	2,144,626	61.00
CALENDAR CONTROL CLERK	36,612	1.00	83,437	2.00	36,612	1.00	36,612	1.00
PROBATE ISSUE CLERK	399,680	14.70	190,692	7.00	408,048	15.00	408,048	15.00
CHIEF PROBATE ISSUE CLERK	58,567	1.79	32,858	1.00	65,712	2.00	65,712	2.00
ACCOUNTING MANAGER	114,684	2.00	110,402	2.00	114,684	2.00	114,684	2.00
ACCOUNTING SPECIALIST	94,671	2.00	48,081	1.00	48,081	1.00	48,081	1.00
ACCOUNT CLERK I	63,813	2.97	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00
ACCOUNT CLERK II	2,324,674	91.39	2,542,059	100.00	2,502,933	98.50	2,502,933	98.50
ACCOUNT CLERK III	396,494	14.01	442,560	16.00	452,813	16.00	452,813	16.00
ACCOUNTING SUPERVISOR I	274,698	8.84	282,264	9.00	282,264	9.00	282,264	9.00
ACCOUNTING SUPERVISOR II	209,224	5.99	217,799	6.00	217,799	6.00	217,799	6.00
PROBATE AUDITOR	484,874	14.88	491,931	15.00	491,931	15.00	491,931	15.00
CHIEF PROBATE AUDITOR	77,664	2.00	76,156	2.00	77,664	2.00	77,664	2.00
ASSISTANT PROBATE MANAGER	38,700	1.00	38,700	1.00	38,700	1.00	38,700	1.00
ASSISTANT ACCOUNTING MANAGER	74,580	2.00	75,316	2.00	75,316	2.00	75,316	2.00
SECRETARY I	24,576	1.00	49,536	2.00	24,576	1.00	24,576	1.00

JUDICIARY REPORT 10 FY2012 GOVERNOR RECOMMENDATION

DECISION ITEM DETAIL

Budget Unit	FY 2010	FY 2010	FY 2011	FY 2011	FY 2012	FY 2012	FY 2012	FY 2012
Decision Item	ACTUAL	ACTUAL	BUDGET	BUDGET	DEPT REQ	DEPT REQ	GOV REC	GOV REC
Budget Object Class	DOLLAR	FTE	DOLLAR	FTE	DOLLAR	FTE	DOLLAR	FTE
CIRCUIT PERSONNEL								
CORE								
SECRETARY II	135,977	5.04	133,044	5.00	134,856	5.00	134,856	5.00
SECRETARY III	199,291	6.63	216,806	7.00	216,806	7.00	216,806	7.00
SECRETARY TO PRESIDING JUDGE	1,506,050	43.37	1,741,500	45.00	1,741,500	45.00	1,741,500	45.00
CLERK TYPIST II	94,531	3.75	124,704	5.00	100,560	4.00	100,560	4.00
RECEPTIONIST	0	0.00	21,701	1.00	0	0.00	0	0.00
RECORDS CLERK I	105,454	4.53	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00
RECORDS CLERK II	670,297	26.78	950,981	38.00	875,157	35.00	875,157	35.00
RECORDS CLERK III	84,876	3.00	56,296	2.00	84,876	3.00	84,876	3.00
MICROFILM OPERATOR	0	0.00	21,051	1.00	0	0.00	0	0.00
RECORDS MANAGER	40,968	1.00	40,967	1.00	40,967	1.00	40,967	1.00
PRINTER	35,316	1.00	34,641	1.00	35,316	1.00	35,316	1.00
JUVENILE OFFICER I	918,245	29.00	380,592	12.20	380,592	12.20	380,592	12.20
JUVENILE OFFICER II	5,304,515	146.47	6,027,353	167.00	6,053,237	167.00	6,053,237	167.00
JUVENILE OFFICER III	1,607,232	39.01	1,534,908	37.00	1,448,688	35.00	1,448,688	35.00
JUVENILE OFFICER IV	1,299,413	27.12	1,339,980	28.00	1,371,192	29.00	1,371,192	29.00
JUVENILE OFFICER V	726,180	14.00	726,180	14.00	726,180	14.00	726,180	14.00
JUVENILE OFFICER VI	119,484	2.00	119,484	2.00	119,484	2.00	119,484	2.00
LEGAL STAFF ASSISTANT	50,076	1.00	50,076	1.00	50,076	1.00	50,076	1.00
LEGAL COUNSEL	243,294	4.67	261,000	5.00	261,000	5.00	261,000	5.00
PSYCHOLOGIST	0	0.00	89,280	2.00	89,280	2.00	89,280	2.00
SECRETARY I	1,075,480	42.99	1,100,535	44.00	1,100,747	44.00	1,100,747	44.00
SECRETARY II	855,079	30.66	855,896	31.00	856,376	31.00	856,376	31.00
COURT PROGRAM SPECIALIST I	29,040	1.00	29,040	1.00	29,040	1.00	29,040	1.00
COURT PROGRAM SPECIALIST II	91,872	3.00	61,248	2.00	91,872	3.00	91,872	3.00
FOOD SERVICE WORKER I	100,611	4.41	103,504	4.00	103,504	4.00	103,504	4.00
FOOD SERVICE WORKER II	102,918	4.16	123,276	5.00	123,276	5.00	123,276	5.00
DETENTION AIDE I	2,447,026	100.80	2,531,803	104.00	2,431,514	100.50	2,431,514	100.50
DETENTION AIDE II	1,122,391	42.37	1,108,510	42.00	1,213,030	45.50	1,213,030	45.50
MAINTENANCE WORKER	154,136	5.47	155,666	6.00	155,666	6.00	155,666	6.00
JUV/FAMILY COURT SUPPORT WKR	70,632	2.00	106,715	2.50	106,715	2.50	106,715	2.50
JUVENILE/FAMILY COURT AIDE	52,704	2.00	76,295	2.50	76,295	2.50	76,295	2.50
TOTAL - PS	122,238,055	2,866.81	125,781,570	2,928.20	125,781,570	2,928.20	125,781,570	2,928.20

JUDICIARY REPORT 10 FY2012 GOVERNOR RECOMMENDATION

DECISION ITEM DETAIL

Budget Unit	FY 2010	FY 2010	FY 2011	FY 2011	FY 2012	FY 2012	FY 2012	FY 2012
Decision Item	ACTUAL	ACTUAL	BUDGET	BUDGET	DEPT REQ	DEPT REQ	GOV REC	GOV REC
Budget Object Class	DOLLAR	FTE	DOLLAR	FTE	DOLLAR	FTE	DOLLAR	FTE
CIRCUIT PERSONNEL								
CORE								
TRAVEL, IN-STATE	648,609	0.00	498,818	0.00	662,818	0.00	662,818	0.00
TRAVEL, OUT-OF-STATE	0	0.00	836	0.00	1,836	0.00	1,836	0.00
SUPPLIES	1,546	0.00	86,460	0.00	63,960	0.00	63,960	0.00
PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT	69,321	0.00	10,509	0.00	10,509	0.00	10,509	0.00
COMMUNICATION SERV & SUPP	67,026	0.00	147,100	0.00	89,100	0.00	89,100	0.00
PROFESSIONAL SERVICES	2,101,954	0.00	2,674,691	0.00	2,529,652	0.00	2,529,652	0.00
HOUSEKEEPING & JANITORIAL SERV	0	0.00	100	0.00	100	0.00	100	0.00
M&R SERVICES	100,000	0.00	9,623	0.00	9,623	0.00	9,623	0.00
COMPUTER EQUIPMENT	10,209	0.00	2,679	0.00	2,679	0.00	2,679	0.00
OFFICE EQUIPMENT	0	0.00	3,000	0.00	3,000	0.00	3,000	0.00
PROPERTY & IMPROVEMENTS	0	0.00	418	0.00	418	0.00	418	0.00
BUILDING LEASE PAYMENTS	0	0.00	4,084	0.00	4,084	0.00	4,084	0.00
EQUIPMENT RENTALS & LEASES	2,037	0.00	1	0.00	1	0.00	1	0.00
MISCELLANEOUS EXPENSES	7,145	0.00	2,444	0.00	10,444	0.00	10,444	0.00
REBILLABLE EXPENSES	10,570	0.00	822	0.00	8,322	0.00	8,322	0.00
TOTAL - EE	3,018,417	0.00	3,441,585	0.00	3,396,546	0.00	3,396,546	0.00
PROGRAM DISTRIBUTIONS	294,917	0.00	309,000	0.00	354,039	0.00	354,039	0.00
REFUNDS	0	0.00	5,000	0.00	5,000	0.00	5,000	0.00
TOTAL - PD	294,917	0.00	314,000	0.00	359,039	0.00	359,039	0.00
GRAND TOTAL	\$125,551,389	2,866.81	\$129,537,155	2,928.20	\$129,537,155	2,928.20	\$129,537,155	2,928.20
GENERAL REVENUE	\$120,469,859	2,718.32	\$127,085,658	2,871.70	\$127,085,658	2,871.70	\$127,085,658	2,871.70
FEDERAL FUNDS	\$4,660,329	142.49	\$1,870,934	49.00	\$1,870,934	49.00	\$1,870,934	49.00
OTHER FUNDS	\$421,201	6.00	\$580,563	7.50	\$580,563	7.50	\$580,563	7.50

JUDICIARY REPORT 10 FY2012 GOVERNOR RECOMMENDATION
DECISION ITEM DETAIL

Budget Unit	FY 2010	FY 2010	FY 2011	FY 2011	FY 2012	FY 2012	FY 2012	FY 2012
Decision Item	ACTUAL	ACTUAL	BUDGET	BUDGET	DEPT REQ	DEPT REQ	GOV REC	GOV REC
Budget Object Class	DOLLAR	FTE	DOLLAR	FTE	DOLLAR	FTE	DOLLAR	FTE
CIRCUIT COURT ADMINISTRATION								
CORE								
SUPPLIES	5,027	0.00	600	0.00	2,600	0.00	2,600	0.00
COMMUNICATION SERV & SUPP	0	0.00	5,000	0.00	3,000	0.00	3,000	0.00
TOTAL - EE	5,027	0.00	5,600	0.00	5,600	0.00	5,600	0.00
PROGRAM DISTRIBUTIONS	8,231,723	0.00	8,279,801	0.00	8,279,801	0.00	8,279,801	0.00
REFUNDS	1,511,604	0.00	500,000	0.00	500,000	0.00	500,000	0.00
TOTAL - PD	9,743,327	0.00	8,779,801	0.00	8,779,801	0.00	8,779,801	0.00
GRAND TOTAL	\$9,748,354	0.00	\$8,785,401	0.00	\$8,785,401	0.00	\$8,785,401	0.00
GENERAL REVENUE	\$7,133,960	0.00	\$7,879,900	0.00	\$7,879,900	0.00	\$7,879,900	0.00
FEDERAL FUNDS	\$745,940	0.00	\$0	0.00	\$0	0.00	\$0	0.00
OTHER FUNDS	\$1,868,454	0.00	\$905,501	0.00	\$905,501	0.00	\$905,501	0.00

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

Judiciary		
Circuit Courts		
Trial Courts		
	Circuit Courts	Total
GR	\$103,195,504	\$103,195,504
FEDERAL	\$960,000	\$960,000
OTHER	\$1,700,000	\$1,700,000
TOTAL	\$105,855,504	\$105,855,504

1. What does this program do?

The trial courts are responsible for adjudicating cases involving:

- Domestic Relations
- Felonies, Misdemeanors, and Infractions
- Guardianships
- Civil Actions
- Small Claims
- Traffic
- Ordinance violations (when heard on trial de novo or by an associate judge)
- Conservatorships
- Adult Abuse/Child Protection
- Child Support
- Decedents' estates
- Mental Health proceedings
- Adoptions
- Paternity
- Juveniles (including Child Abuse and Neglect)

Adjudication of cases involves the judges and commissioners scheduling the cases, managing the cases to meet the time standards guidelines, hearing and ruling on motions, hearing testimony, presiding over bench trials and jury trials, ruling on the case, and hearing post-disposition activities such as probation violations. In addition, judges and commissioners now preside over treatment court dockets. Adjudication of cases for the clerks involves filing all pleadings, preparing orders, collecting and disbursing almost \$300 million, sound recording associate court proceedings, assisting pro se parties where allowed by law, issuing garnishments, maintaining indexes for the use of the public to locate cases, and reporting criminal and traffic dispositions to central repositories for the information.

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

Judiciary

Circuit Courts

Trial Courts

In addition:

- Section 488.2250, RSMo, obligates the state to pay transcription fees for: transcripts of testimony required by the judge; transcripts of criminal trials in which an indigent defendant appeals; pleas and sentences for class A & B felonies where a motion is filed under Supreme Court Rule 24.035; and, transcripts of preliminary hearings in homicide cases.
- Section 494.455, RSMo, provides that, if a county increases juror compensation from \$6 to \$12 a day from local funds, the state will add another \$6. This results in \$18 per juror per day served. Currently, there are 76 counties that qualify for the reimbursement.

Personnel expenses include salaries of judges, commissioners, clerks, court reporters, and other support personnel.

Expense and Equipment (E&E) funding for state expenses under the Constitution and statutes supports:

- operation of the circuit courts (e.g., jury costs, language interpreters, judge transfer),
- case-related judicial travel,
- temporary court reporters,
- the Circuit Court Budget Committee,
- the deductible for the state blanket bond, and
- the Fine Collection Center.

2. What is the authorization for this program, i.e., federal or state statute, etc.? (Include the federal program number, if applicable.)

Federal: Title II of the Americans with Disabilities Act, Federal Executive Order 13166, Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, Title VI regulations

State: Missouri Constitution Article I, Section 14 and Article V; Chapters 211, 476, 478, 483, 485, 487, 488, 491, 494, RSMo.; §494.555 and 488.2250, RSMo; Family Preservation Support Act (1993); Adoption and Safe Families Act (1997).

3. Are there federal matching requirements? If yes, please explain.

No.


PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

Judiciary
Circuit Courts
Trial Courts

4. Is this a federally mandated program? If yes, please explain.

Title II of the Americans with Disabilities ACT (ADA) mandates that state and local governments ensure persons with disabilities are not precluded from services, programs, or activities. The ADA requires the entity to furnish appropriate services or auxiliary aids at no expense to the person with a disability. The U.S. Supreme Court's decision in Tennessee v. Lane, 541 US 509 (U.S. 2004) upheld the constitutional provisions of Title II of the ADA that allows private citizens to bring suits for money damages against the state for failing to provide reasonable access to the courts, costing the state and counties more than \$970,000. Recipients of federal assistance must comply with Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 that prohibits discrimination, including discrimination on the basis of national origin.

5. Provide actual expenditures for the prior three fiscal years.




The FY 2010 Federal column includes \$4,244,276.18 for stabilization dollars.


PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

Judiciary
Circuit Courts
Trial Courts

FY 2011 Planned Expenditures



FY 2011 FTE Breakdown



6. What are the sources of the "Other " funds?

- Third Party Liability Fund
- Domestic Relations Resolution Fund
- State Courts Administration Revolving Fund
- Circuit Court Escrow Fund

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

Judiciary

Circuit Courts

Trial Courts

7a. Provide an effectiveness measure.

Clearance rates equal cases disposed divided by cases filed in a year.

Clearance Rates: FY 05 - FY 10						
	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010
Civil	1.00	0.98	0.96	0.95	1.02	1.02
Criminal	0.96	0.96	0.99	1.00	1.03	1.02
Probate	0.92	0.84	0.91	0.88	0.91	0.91
TOTAL	0.98	0.96	0.96	0.97	1.02	1.01

Annual Disbursements: FY 09 - FY 10		
Paid To	FY 2009	FY 2010
State	\$32,334,437	\$31,934,077
Counties	\$56,148,145	\$54,980,076
Municipalities	\$3,676,492	\$2,913,749
Other	\$204,192,000	\$220,114,060
Refunds	(\$63,057,670)	(\$57,373,383)
Grand Total	\$233,293,405	\$252,568,580

Note: FY 2009 was the first year that all counties were on the case management system for a full year.

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

Judiciary**Circuit Courts****Trial Courts****7b. Provide an efficiency measure.**

Time Standard Category	Standard for Age of Case at Disposition in the State	Actual Performance Standards			
		FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010
Circuit Civil					
In 24 months	90%	88%	82%	86%	88%
In 30 months	95%	93%	91%	90%	92%
Domestic Relations					
In 10 months	90%	88%	87%	84%	86%
In 14 months	95%	93%	92%	89%	91%
Circuit Felony					
In 10 months	90%	86%	84%	83%	83%
In 14 months	95%	92%	91%	91%	91%
Associate Civil					
In 6 months	90%	87%	85%	84%	84%
In 12 months	95%	97%	97%	96%	97%
Associate Criminal					
In 6 months	90%	84%	84%	83%	84%
In 8 months	95%	91%	91%	90%	91%

7c. Provide the number of clients/individuals served (if applicable)

All 5,987,580 citizens of Missouri (2009 figures).

7d. Provide a customer satisfaction measure, if available.

N/A

CIRCUIT COURT WORKLOAD GROWTH

CASE TYPE	ACTUAL FY 1983		ACTUAL FY 1984		ACTUAL FY 1985		ACTUAL FY 1986		ACTUAL FY 1987		ACTUAL FY 1988	
	FILED	DISPOSED										
CIRCUIT												
Civil	31,019	33,999	32,406	30,728	36,138	31,763	37,162	35,331	37,074	36,330	35,180	35,364
Domestic Relations	54,919	55,150	56,042	53,933	56,751	54,086	58,297	54,475	58,533	54,687	62,679	55,375
Felony	16,597	16,580	15,957	16,112	15,898	5,679	17,501	15,847	18,206	17,491	19,629	18,667
Misdemeanor	3,020	3,077	3,017	2,990	3,120	2,613	3,368	2,826	3,856	3,186	2,944	2,874
Municipal	3,491	3,614	3,370	3,414	3,418	4,026	3,361	3,395	3,382	3,284	4,303	3,873
Total	109,046	112,420	110,792	107,177	115,325	108,167	119,689	111,874	121,051	114,978	124,735	116,153
JUVENILE	20,451	20,520	19,720	19,301	17,787	18,174	19,130	18,752	19,906	19,037	21,120	20,710
ASSOCIATE												
Civil	89,870	82,124	92,939	91,646	98,790	90,744	107,858	104,958	114,254	112,113	121,703	108,383
Small Claims	18,663	17,231	19,106	17,572	19,717	18,316	20,801	18,955	20,982	23,320	20,702	19,600
Felony	26,080	25,978	25,578	25,072	26,053	23,745	27,586	25,914	30,811	27,865	32,248	29,064
Misdemeanor	56,207	49,969	60,231	56,100	65,739	58,772	69,187	63,679	74,716	68,973	84,139	74,911
Traffic	371,719	368,043	346,043	341,918	386,039	376,965	384,500	370,224	409,694	387,131	391,845	379,815
Ordinance	36,098	31,874	33,732	31,336	38,514	34,005	41,425	39,672	46,848	45,330	53,718	48,929
Total	598,637	575,219	577,629	563,644	634,852	602,547	651,357	623,402	697,305	664,732	704,355	660,702
PROBATE												
Decedents/Supv.	7,144	7,851	6,757	7,133	6,374	6,693	6,073	6,465	5,799	6,331	5,630	5,866
Decedents/Indep.	1,301	805	1,734	1,249	2,063	1,550	2,270	2,008	2,717	2,182	2,923	2,472
Minors - est.	1,102	1,003	1,144	1,142	968	1,090	1,237	922	1,307	1,053	1,324	1,151
Incap/Disabled est.	2,342	1,494	2,348	1,575	2,606	1,640	2,797	1,864	2,856	2,023	2,768	2,001
Mental Health Proc.	2,194	2,182	1,293	1,384	1,251	1,289	1,568	1,578	1,529	1,842	1,638	1,315
@ Prob Cause Pet.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	14,083	13,335	13,276	12,483	13,262	12,262	13,945	12,837	14,207	13,431	14,283	12,805
GRAND TOTAL	742,217	721,494	721,417	702,605	781,226	741,150	804,121	766,865	852,469	812,178	864,493	810,370
CHILD SUPPORT												
Open Accounts	75,061		85,111		103,137		119,761		138,580		160,012	
Payments	495,850		583,149		684,236		799,745		951,662		1,071,660	

@ Began collecting probable cause petitions for sexually violent predators January 1, 1999.

CIRCUIT COURT WORKLOAD GROWTH

CASE TYPE	ACTUAL FY 1989		ACTUAL FY 1990		ACTUAL FY 1991		ACTUAL FY 1992		ACTUAL FY 1993		ACTUAL FY 1994	
	FILED	DISPOSED										
CIRCUIT												
Civil	35,841	36,774	38,352	35,191	35,838	33,389	35,233	34,718	32,190	34,382	31,654	35,487
Domestic Relations	63,629	57,462	69,298	63,662	75,526	67,797	82,197	76,119	83,764	81,124	86,002	89,510
Felony	21,009	19,710	22,793	20,039	23,056	21,909	26,043	24,682	25,559	24,825	26,405	24,374
Misdemeanor	1,940	2,246	1,876	1,566	1,782	1,571	2,312	2,017	2,636	2,319	2,941	2,987
Municipal	4,897	4,958	4,364	4,364	4,551	4,001	4,597	4,314	5,625	5,178	5,257	6,098
Total	127,316	121,150	136,683	124,822	140,753	128,667	150,382	141,850	149,774	147,828	152,259	158,456
JUVENILE	21,303	20,222	21,969	21,253	21,814	21,179	22,634	21,854	24,408	23,562	25,737	25,561
ASSOCIATE												
Civil	124,240	115,886	117,415	108,506	122,031	110,585	116,524	122,864	106,741	125,732	104,117	113,410
Small Claims	23,460	21,250	22,581	20,574	23,186	20,934	22,334	22,051	20,337	22,205	20,154	20,627
Felony	35,077	31,726	38,359	34,761	37,983	33,511	40,308	37,956	37,928	38,704	41,166	37,701
Misdemeanor	85,771	77,530	96,048	84,075	87,918	77,103	97,715	90,829	86,011	87,351	86,872	83,446
Traffic	376,001	369,558	357,577	353,533	362,667	349,193	389,290	370,290	335,942	346,876 *	350,903	347,217
Ordinance	47,397	51,952	53,088	52,518	46,810	47,511	41,860	43,606	27,856	39,171 *	15,092	16,055
Total	691,946	667,902	685,068	653,967	680,595	638,837	708,031	687,596	614,815	660,039	618,304	618,456
PROBATE												
Decedents/Supv.	5,312	5,589	5,242	5,517	4,620	5,172	7,956	7,909	4,314	4,717	3,778	4,583
Decedents/Indep.	2,961	2,742	3,166	2,762	3,027	2,987	----	----	3,210	3,090	2,987	3,210
Minors - est.	1,201	1,083	1,228	1,095	1,335	1,018	1,374	1,060	1,463	1,156	1,404	1,142
Incap/Disabled est.	2,775	1,824	2,841	2,024	2,798	2,069	2,820	2,070	2,828	2,322	2,486	2,387
Mental Health Proc.	2,049	2,120	2,167	2,267	2,323	2,355	1,944	1,841	1,932	1,895	1,906	1,918
@ Prob Cause Pet.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	14,298	13,358	14,644	13,665	14,103	13,601	14,094	12,880	13,747	13,180	12,561	13,240
GRAND TOTAL	854,863	822,632	858,364	813,707	857,265	802,284	895,141	864,180	802,744	844,609	808,861	815,713
CHILD SUPPORT												
Open Accounts	186,375		214,182		242,579		252,774		280,008		308,309	
Payments	1,212,110		1,349,621		1,455,520		1,666,839		1,811,975		1,894,932	

For FY 92, supervised and independent estates are shown combined.

* About 55,000 traffic and ordinance cases were transferred to the new St. Louis County traffic court beginning in 1993.

@ Began collecting probable cause petitions for sexually violent predators January 1, 1999.

CIRCUIT COURT WORKLOAD GROWTH

CASE TYPE	ACTUAL FY 1995		ACTUAL FY 1996		ACTUAL FY 1997		ACTUAL FY 1998		ACTUAL FY 1999		ACTUAL FY 2000***	
	FILED	DISPOSED	FILED	DISPOSED								
CIRCUIT												
Civil	32,813	35,885	33,849	32,561	33,379	32,887	33,377	32,366	32,046	30,741	31,828	29,091
Domestic Relations	92,264	87,857	96,199	89,705	99,623	94,996	100,400	97,132	94,573	91,450	100,468	93,878
Felony	31,126	28,871	31,255	29,803	32,719	31,745	33,814	32,727	32,904	31,616	31,944	30,352
Misdemeanor	3,132	2,841	3,320	2,920	3,780	3,555	3,700	3,567	2,698	2,734	2,523	2,366
Municipal	4,230	4,710	3,717	3,645	3,924	4,014	3,627	3,541	3,552	3,375	3,850	3,419
Total	163,565	160,164	168,340	158,634	173,425	167,197	174,918	169,333	165,773	159,916	170,613	159,106
JUVENILE	27,052	25,610	26,822	26,231	28,656	27,507	29,185	28,244	33,261	31,918	36,820	34,387
ASSOCIATE												
Civil	109,353	111,580	117,286	109,967	127,698	122,292	126,219	126,569	128,138	123,455	128,695	127,012
Small Claims	20,203	20,794	21,028	19,491	22,255	21,741	19,822	20,160	19,388	18,619	19,854	19,134
Felony	45,783	38,078	49,943	45,850	51,412	48,354	53,989	49,686	47,985	48,015	49,567	46,200
Misdemeanor	94,821	82,720	104,994	96,361	111,199	102,364	120,236	107,856	120,689	114,819	123,014	114,739
Traffic	365,633	362,708	366,539	357,340	360,016	353,473	385,513	372,969	414,574	405,564	379,848	368,683
Ordinance	17,771	17,014	19,358	18,820	21,258	20,312	18,808	18,484	20,180	19,284	17,811	17,677
Total	653,564	632,894	679,148	647,829	693,838	668,536	724,587	695,724	750,954	729,756	718,789	693,445
PROBATE												
Decedents/Supv.	3,354	3,867	3,192	3,534	3,241	3,114	3,039	3,053	2,862	3,025	2,808	2,978
Decedents/Indep.	2,686	2,876	2,716	2,768	2,746	2,687	2,810	2,581	2,939	2,686	2,817	2,813
Minors - est.	1,528	1,339	1,533	1,133	1,695	1,365	1,926	1,341	2,098	1,337	2,343	1,501
Incap/Disabled est.	2,566	2,087	2,554	2,266	2,409	2,105	2,510	2,169	2,709	2,182	2,658	2,273
Mental Health Proc.	1,822	1,985	1,877	1,902	2,050	2,047	2,233	2,197	2,377	2,360	2,330	2,216
@ Prob Cause Pet.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	3	38	21
Total	11,956	12,154	11,872	11,603	12,141	11,318	12,518	11,341	12,998	11,593	12,994	11,802
GRAND TOTAL	856,137	830,822	886,182	844,297	908,060	874,558	941,208	904,642	962,986	933,183	939,216	898,740
CHILD SUPPORT												
Open Accounts	327,243		363,324		390,991		**		**		**	
Payments	2,023,793		2,234,979		2,432,909		2,544,850		2,613,304		1,581,921	

** With the transition to the Missouri Automated Child Support System, comparable data is not readily available.

*** Traffic Caseload does not include cases processed by the Fine Collection Center (FCC).

@ Began collecting probable cause petitions for sexually violent predators January 1, 1999.

CIRCUIT COURT WORKLOAD GROWTH

CASE TYPE	ACTUAL FY 2001***		ACTUAL FY 2002***		ACTUAL FY 2003***		ACTUAL FY 2004***		ACTUAL FY 2005***		ACTUAL FY 2006***	
	FILED	DISPOSED										
CIRCUIT												
Civil	31,792	31,189	33,087	29,873	35,124	31,237	35,275	33,702	36,197	35,729	41,619	36,710
Domestic Relations	99,808	100,465	102,956	101,297	106,358	105,917	109,753	106,552	109,646	109,349	109,987	107,743
Felony	32,228	30,405	36,519	33,521	38,298	36,604	39,231	37,885	38,619	37,645	41,361	39,767
Misdemeanor	2,688	2,492	2,418	2,480	2,644	2,591	1,601	1,621	1,394	1,431	1,494	1,516
Municipal	4,308	3,484	3,856	3,699	4,106	3,576	3,321	3,255	2,765	2,451	2,909	2,753
Total	170,824	168,035	178,836	170,870	186,530	179,925	189,181	183,015	188,621	186,605	197,370	188,489
JUVENILE	37,411	35,530	36,920	36,609	37,198	25,325	32,650	26,874	31,471	27,783	27,484	25,936
ASSOCIATE												
Civil	132,435	130,294	146,648	140,446	162,388	155,532	177,442	175,898	175,443	177,960	177,919	177,190
Small Claims	18,966	19,070	18,356	18,403	17,466	17,457	16,122	16,415	16,057	15,895	15,704	15,597
Felony	52,240	46,582	57,762	52,555	55,216	54,217	54,617	54,009	54,607	53,390	58,775	57,574
Misdemeanor	122,617	113,332	125,227	121,820	128,506	124,134	133,882	125,848	132,302	125,787	137,690	129,309
Traffic	303,711	296,313	255,469	260,240	257,189	252,769	239,645	232,557	231,890	230,576	214,153	216,962
Ordinance	19,820	18,398	18,652	18,202	21,105	20,601	18,888	17,771	18,138	18,189	18,518	18,316
Total	649,789	623,989	622,114	611,666	641,870	624,710	640,596	622,498	628,437	621,797	622,759	614,948
PROBATE												
Decedents/Supv.	2,670	2,770	2,555	2,619	2,602	2,688	2,358	2,711	2,349	2,928	2,314	2,350
Decedents/Indep.	2,791	2,586	2,829	2,641	2,827	2,756	2,847	3,140	2,758	2,797	2,609	2,716
Minors - est.	2,952	1,735	2,721	1,852	3,052	2,168	3,274	2,472	3,518	2,226	4,743	3,069
Incap/Disabled est.	2,893	2,332	2,931	2,335	2,800	2,457	3,102	2,655	2,986	2,790	3,068	2,525
Mental Health Proc.	2,669	2,577	2,388	2,697	2,431	2,386	2,103	2,180	2,195	1,986	2,264	1,962
@ Prob Cause Pet.	46	24	18	12	26	16	20	12	36	12	26	5
Total	14,021	12,024	13,442	12,156	13,738	12,471	13,704	13,170	13,842	12,739	15,024	12,627
GRAND TOTAL	872,045	839,578	851,312	831,301	879,336	842,431	876,131	845,557	862,371	848,924	862,637	842,000
CHILD SUPPORT												
Open Accounts	**		**		**		**		**		**	
Payments	287,301		**		**		**		**		**	

** With the transition to the Missouri Automated Child Support System, comparable data is not readily available.

*** Traffic Caseload does not include cases processed by the Fine Collection Center (FCC).

@ Began collecting probable cause petitions for sexually violent predators January 1, 1999.

CIRCUIT COURT WORKLOAD GROWTH

CASE TYPE	ACTUAL FY 2007***		ACTUAL FY 2008***		ACTUAL FY 2009***		ACTUAL FY 2010***		PROJECTED FY 2011**		PROJECTED FY 2012***	
	FILED	DISPOSED	FILED	DISPOSED	FILED	DISPOSED	FILED	DISPOSED	FILED	DISPOSED	FILED	DISPOSED
CIRCUIT												
Civil	33,394	35,670	34,870	34,425	35,722	35,559	34,788	35,767	36,651	37,447	36,917	38,076
Domestic Relations	103,472	101,390	106,021	103,113	108,638	112,274	110,286	112,120	110,489	111,043	111,179	111,956
Felony	42,177	39,852	42,043	41,984	41,302	43,705	41,273	41,511	44,145	45,160	45,025	46,410
Misdemeanor	1,855	1,682	2,092	2,122	2,102	2,313	2,158	2,315	1,749	1,895	1,695	1,866
Municipal	2,432	2,599	2,215	2,078	2,036	2,106	2,378	2,119	3,404	1,726	2,952	1,528
Total	183,330	181,193	187,241	183,722	189,800	195,957	190,883	193,832	196,438	197,271	197,768	199,836
JUVENILE	23,230	21,289	18,006	15,660	17,588	14,757	17,358	14,868	13,131	10,935	10,440	8,475
ASSOCIATE												
Civil	199,855	185,116	233,444	218,221	243,192	248,341	228,188	230,117	253,115	250,378	265,009	262,463
Small Claims	15,493	15,027	14,332	14,501	13,697	13,968	12,301	12,326	12,166	12,166	11,496	11,494
Felony	57,721	58,185	56,537	56,817	53,267	55,641	54,126	54,254	55,673	58,334	55,707	59,064
Misdemeanor	133,017	131,957	129,012	129,007	122,254	125,252	113,691	119,121	124,626	128,635	124,045	129,376
Traffic	178,646	183,105	157,628	157,831	158,506	156,716	150,977	157,815	123,052	127,561	106,374	111,756
Ordinance	18,375	18,389	20,481	20,291	18,575	18,560	17,219	18,042	18,036	18,667	17,865	18,665
Total	603,107	591,779	611,434	596,668	609,491	618,478	576,502	591,675	586,668	595,741	580,496	592,818
PROBATE												
Decedents/Supv.	2,041	2,174	2,038	2,109	1,917	2,022	1,810	1,909	1,732	1,861	1,635	1,758
Decedents/Indep.	2,805	2,563	2,761	2,582	2,556	2,650	2,622	2,529	2,606	2,592	2,581	2,573
Minors - est.	3,751	3,252	3,547	2,794	3,307	2,944	3,391	2,995	3,865	3,394	3,945	3,547
Incap/Disabled est.	3,169	2,361	3,006	2,420	3,038	2,378	3,104	2,351	3,142	2,432	3,166	2,427
Mental Health Proc.	2,297	2,425	2,151	1,997	2,082	1,731	2,044	2,032	1,979	1,767	1,927	1,689
@ Prob Cause Pet.	21	7	23	15	23	21	20	19	19	14	17	14
Total	14,084	12,782	13,526	11,917	12,923	11,746	12,991	11,835	13,343	12,060	13,271	12,008
GRAND TOTAL	823,751	807,043	830,207	807,967	829,802	840,938	797,734	812,210	809,580	816,007	801,975	813,137
CHILD SUPPORT												
Open Accounts	**											
Payments	**											

** With the transition to the Missouri Automated Child Support System, comparable data is not readily available.

*** Traffic Caseload does not include cases processed by the Fine Collection Center (FCC).

@ Began collecting probable cause petitions for sexually violent predators January 1, 1999.

FINE COLLECTION CENTER

	<u>FY 2000</u>	<u>FY 2001</u>	<u>FY 2002</u>	<u>FY 2003</u>	<u>FY 2004</u>	<u>FY 2005</u>	<u>FY 2006</u>	<u>FY 2007</u>
Cases Filed	53,052	99,776	104,963	115,305	133,659	147,234	175,694	184,406
Cases Disposed by Guilty Plea	31,222	59,187	64,683	74,111	86,119	96,726	116,155	123,077
Cases Returned to County Due to Not Guilty Plea	9,710	16,288	20,663	25,064	30,042	34,373	39,351	38,890
Cases Returned to County Due to No Response	2,995	25,515	19,637	16,714	15,985	15,359	17,828	21,749
Total Cases Disposed	43,927	100,990	104,983	115,889	132,146	146,458	173,334	183,716
Cases Pending as of end of Fiscal Year	9,591	7,762	7,753	7,573	9,637	10,334	12,366	13,499
Clearance Rate	82.80%	101.22%	100.02%	100.51%	98.87%	99.47%	98.66%	99.63%
	<u>FY 2008</u>	<u>FY 2009</u>	<u>FY 2010</u>					
Cases Filed	196,862	219,900	216,832					
Cases Disposed by Guilty Plea	133,783	145,848	144,138					
Cases Returned to County Due to Not Guilty Plea	39,742	43,691	44,831					
Cases Returned to County Due to No Response	25,231	27,522	28,960					
Total Cases Disposed	198,756	217,061	217,929					
Cases Pending as of end of Fiscal Year	10,810	13,775	12,319					
Clearance Rate	100.96%	98.71%	100.51%					

Countries Participating in Debt

Collection


(as of 11-30-10)



■ Circuit Court

★ Municipal Court Participant


Spanish Interpreter Usage in Missouri's 45 Judicial Circuits Criminal Proceedings FY10 (As of 06/25/2010)



- Jackson County**
\$34,009
- Buchanan County**
\$13,517
- Newton**
\$12,738
- Taney County**
\$11,374
- Boone County**
\$9,240

● County Seat

Office of State Courts Administrator,
 P.O. Box 104480,
 2112 Industrial Drive,
 Jefferson City, MO
 65110




**FY10 Interpreter Usage in Court
(Foreign Languages Other Than Spanish)
Compared with Foreign Born Population
(as of 06/25/2010)**

Map Source: Missouri Economic Research & Information Center, MO Dept. of Economic Development
Interpreter Information added by OSCA

Payments for Services for the Deaf and Hard of Hearing FY10

As of 06/25/2010



Legend

- CART or Real-Time Captioning \$1,271
- Sign Language Interpreter \$70,223

Office of State Courts
Administrator, P.O. Box
104480, 2112 Industrial
Drive, Jefferson City, MO
65110

● County Seat

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

Judiciary**Circuit Courts****Juvenile Justice**

	Circuit Courts	Total
GR	\$16,186,395	\$16,186,395
FEDERAL	\$0	\$0
OTHER	\$0	\$0
TOTAL	\$16,186,395	\$16,186,395

1. What does this program do?

- Missouri is composed of 45 circuits comprised of 114 counties and the City of St. Louis. Each circuit has a juvenile officer with deputy juvenile officers in many counties throughout the state. These 45 juvenile officers and their staff are the front-line staff for Missouri's juvenile courts, and act as intake and processing specialist, prosecutor, treatment provider, detention center supervisor, and education programs specialist. The types of cases they deal with range from child abuse/neglect to violent juvenile delinquency.
- There are 24 juvenile secure detention centers in the State that are open 24 hours, 7 days per week. Fifteen centers are located in the 35 multi-county circuits, and require juvenile officers and detention aides to provide intake and supervision services at the youth/staff ratio established by Supreme Court Rule. Food service, maintenance, and clerical staff are also necessary for the daily operation of these facilities.
- Juvenile Courts report workload, assessment, and outcome data for youth receiving informal and formal services. In addition, the courts report information on delinquency and the effectiveness of delinquency programming.
- Standards for the Administration of Juvenile Justice require juvenile officers and clerical support staff to screen and process juvenile court referrals and supervise youth.

2. What is the authorization for this program, i.e., federal or state statute, etc.? (Include the federal program number, if applicable.)

Article V, MO Constitution, Chapters 211 and 487, RSMo, Family Preservation Support Act, 1993, Adoption and Safe Families Act,

3. Are there federal matching requirements? If yes, please explain.

No.


4. Is this a federally mandated program? If yes, please explain.

No.

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

Judiciary
Circuit Courts
Juvenile Justice

5. Provide actual expenditures for the prior three fiscal years.



6. What are the sources of the "Other " funds?

N/A

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

Judiciary**Circuit Courts****Juvenile Justice****7a. Provide an effectiveness measure.****FORMAL CASE FILINGS FOR ALL 45 CIRCUITS**

(data combined by OSCA from the Justice Information System)

Cases Filed	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008*	FY 2009	FY 2010
Abuse and Neglect	10,809	9,271	5,586	5,712	6,256
Adoption	3,469	2,826	2,733	2,578	2,661
Termination of Parental Rights	1,810	1,469	1,169	1,011	929
Status Offenses	1,712	1,092	573	651	652
Delinquency	9,684	8,565	5,240	4,901	4,424
Jurisdiction Extended		7	2	7	0
**Motion to Modify			2,703	2,679	2,435
TOTALS	27,484	23,230	18,006	17,539	17,357

* FY 2008 is the first year that data was pulled from all 45 judicial circuits using the Justice Information System.

**Missouri procedures do not allow a change to the case type within JIS when filing a Motion to Modify Previous Order of Disposition.

INFORMAL CASE PROCESS FOR ALL 45 CIRCUITS

(data compiled by MDYS from the Justice Information System)

Referral Received	CY 2005	CY 2006	CY 2007	CY 2008	CY 2009*
Abuse and Neglect	13,598	11,890	12,713	12,916	14,486
Status Offenses	16,223	16,086	16,185	15,431	14,479
Law Violations	38,937	39,496	37,249	38,391	37,783
Court Ordered Violations	1,043	1,376	1,239	2,123	1,343
TOTALS	69,801	68,848	67,386	68,861	68,091

In CY 2009, approximately 80% of referrals were informally supervised, transferred, or rejected.

*Data compiled from the Justice Information System

Detention Program

There are 15 multi-county secure detention centers in Missouri:


228 beds available for secure detention

Average daily population is **4.2** youth per facility.

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

Judiciary
Circuit Courts
Juvenile Justice
 7b. Provide an efficiency measure. N/A
 7c. Provide the number of clients/individuals served (if applicable) See 7a, Detention Program.
 7d. Provide a customer satisfaction measure, if available. N/A

JUVENILE SECURE DETENTION SITES



PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

Judiciary**Circuit Courts****Permanency Planning**

	Court Improvement	Circuit Courts	Total
GR	\$0	\$11,862	\$11,862
FEDERAL	\$675,000	\$0	\$675,000
OTHER	\$0	\$265,000	\$265,000
TOTAL	\$675,000	\$276,862	\$951,862

1. What does this program do?

The Missouri Permanency Planning Program started in 1997 in the 2nd and 23rd circuits. The program's mission is to:

- Develop and implement a statewide plan for improvement which will result in timely, full and fair proceedings for children and their families and expediting placement of all abused and neglected children in permanent homes;
- Shorten the average length of stay for children in out-of-home care; and,
- Reduce the amount of state and federal funds that would otherwise be necessary to support those children in out-of-home care.

Congress created three different grant programs to support juvenile court improvements for at-risk children and families to promote permanency. Each state's highest court is guaranteed a portion of these federal funds. Each grant program focuses in one area of permanency planning. The three grant programs are:

- The Basic Court Improvement Grant - Develops and implements statewide plans to improve the process for child welfare cases.
- Data Collection and Analysis Grant - Promotes a working partnership among the courts, child welfare agencies, legal community, and other key stakeholders to ensure that foster children's needs for safety, permanency, and well-being are met in a timely and complete manner. Fostering Court Improvement (FCI) is the primary initiative funded through this grant. FCI was initially implemented in the 13th, 22nd, 31st, and 35th circuits in January 2007. The program expanded to include the 2nd, 5th, 23rd, 25th, 26th, and 45th circuits by January 2009 (see map on page 157). The 19th and 42nd circuits will join the program in January 2011.
- Training Grant - Provides training for judges, attorneys, Children's Division, and other legal personnel in child welfare cases and conducts cross-training with child welfare agency staff.

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

Judiciary
Circuit Courts
Permanency Planning

2. What is the authorization for this program, i.e., federal or state statute, etc.? (Include the federal program number, if applicable.)

Adoption and Safe Families Act (1997) P.L. 105-89; Family Preservation and Support Act (1993); Promoting Safe and Stable Families Act (2001) P.L. 107-133; Chapter 211, RSMo. The Deficit Reduction Act of 2005 (P.L. 109-171) amends Section 438 to authorize the two new court improvement program grants for Federal FYs 2006 through 2010: Data Collection and Analysis Grant and Training Grant.


3. Are there federal matching requirements? If yes, please explain.

The grants require the State to provide a 25% match of the project budget.

4. Is this a federally mandated program? If yes, please explain.

No.

5. Provide actual expenditures for the prior three fiscal years and planned expenditures for the current fiscal year.



6. What are the sources of the "Other " funds?





Third Party Liability

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

Judiciary
Circuit Courts
Permanency Planning

7a. Provide an effectiveness measure. This measure is provided for the Permanency Planning Program.



The percentage of children who had been in care two years or more is down significantly in the two original court improvement sites.



PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

Judiciary
Circuit Courts
Permanency Planning

The same trend can be seen statewide which is likely due, in part, to mandatory timeframes for court hearings in child abuse/neglect cases and other court and agency reform efforts. Many reforms were initiated as the result of HB 1453, which was passed in May 2004.




PROGRAM DESCRIPTION


Judiciary
Circuit Courts
Permanency Planning

7a. Effectiveness Measure for the 35th, 31st, and 13th circuits. All are Fostering Court Improvement (FCI) sites.

In the 35th circuit, the number of children in care dramatically decreased from 2006-2009. FCI was implemented in this circuit in January 2007.




In the 31st circuit, the number of finalized adoptions increased. FCI was implemented in this circuit in January 2007.



PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

Judiciary
Circuit Courts
Permanency Planning

The 13th circuit saw a reduction in the number of children re-entering foster care. FCI was implemented in this circuit in January 2007.



PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

Judiciary
Circuit Courts
Permanency Planning


7b. Provide an efficiency measure.

The 2nd and 23rd circuits are permanency planning program sites.

AVERAGE LENGTH OF STAY FOR CHILDREN IN CARE ON LAST DAY OF FISCAL YEAR

	FY 1997	FY 2009	% Change
2nd Circuit*	41.5 months	26.0 months	-37.35%
23rd Circuit	38.2 months	16.5 months	-56.81%
Statewide	32.4 months	25.1 months	-22.53%

* Adair County only, the largest county in the circuit



* Largest county in 2nd Circuit

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION


Judiciary

Circuit Courts

Permanency Planning

7b. Efficiency Measures for the 35th Circuit, Fostering Court Improvement (FCI) site.

The percentage of children who have been reunified with their families within 12 months has increased in the 35th circuit from 2006 to 2009. FCI was implemented in this circuit in January 2007.




Strategies which have been implemented in the FCI sites to reduce lengths of stay in care, achieve timely reunifications and permanency include, but are not limited to, parent education programs, older youth initiatives and quarterly staffing of all cases for accountability of professionals. As a result, the 35th circuit was able to reduce their caseload by 25%.

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

Judiciary
Circuit Courts

Permanency Planning

The number of timely hearings in Missouri continues to increase each year. Time standards for hearings and other court and agency reforms result in improved outcomes for children.



PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

Judiciary

Circuit Courts

Permanency Planning

7c. Provide the number of clients/individuals served, if applicable.

This measure is provided for the Permanency Planning Program, 2nd and 23rd circuits.

Total Number of Children in the Custody of the Children's Division and in Out of Home Care Anytime During Fiscal Year

	FY 1997	FY 2002	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2009
2nd Circuit	181	169	158	115	124
23rd Circuit	587	917	617	586	629
State	15,226	18,959	15,226	14,528	14,256

7c. Number of clients/individuals served in the initial and second-tier FCI sites.

FCI was not operational in the initial sites until January 2007.

Initial Sites (January 2007)

Second-Tier Sites (January 2008)

	FY 2007	FY 2009		FY 2009		FY 2009
13th Circuit	431	376	23rd Circuit	629	2nd Circuit	124
22nd Circuit	1,659	1,447	25th Circuit	418	5th Circuit	90
31st Circuit	1,085	1,015	26th Circuit	447	45th Circuit	202
35th Circuit	512	362				

Children Who Entered Care or Re-Entered Care Anytime During Fiscal Year (permanency planning project sites).

	FY 1997	FY 2002	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2009
2nd Circuit	69	111	63	62	57
23rd Circuit	243	408	250	267	308
State	6,548	7,568	5,656	5,190	5,447

Children Who Entered Care or Re-Entered Care Anytime During Fiscal Year (FCI sites).

Initial Sites (January 2007)


Second-Tier Sites (January 2008)

	FY 2007	FY 2009		FY 2008	FY 2009		JAN 2009
13th Circuit	109	97	23rd Circuit	267	308	2nd Circuit	57
22nd Circuit	423	283	25th Circuit	168	172	5th Circuit	37
31st Circuit	328	308	26th Circuit	205	188	45th Circuit	85
35th Circuit	251	190					

7d. Provide a customer satisfaction measure, if available.

N/A

FOSTERING COURT IMPROVEMENT PROJECT



09/02/10

Office of State Courts Administrator, P.O. Box 104480, 2112 Industrial Drive, Jefferson City, MO 65110

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

Judiciary
Circuit Court
Court Appointed Special Advocate (CASA)

	Circuit Court	Total
GR	\$200,000	\$200,000
STABILIZATION	\$0	\$0
OTHER	\$82,674	\$82,674
TOTAL	\$282,674	\$282,674

1. What does this program do?

Court Appointed Special Advocate (CASA) programs recruit, train, supervise, and evaluate volunteer advocates for abused and neglected children. CASA volunteers, assigned to abuse or neglect cases by a judge, conduct thorough research on the background of the case, review documents, interview involved parties, report to the court with recommendations based on the best interest of the child, and provide the judge with information that will help him or her make an informed decision. Funds are used to increase the number of children that can be served in the circuit court and community, thereby expediting the placement of children in safe and permanent homes and improving the quality of services offered directly to those children.

Each fiscal year, funding is distributed to approved CASA programs with 15% of collections going to new programs and 85% going to existing programs. The average distributions vary each year depending on the number of new and existing CASA programs as well as the total fund balance as of July of each year. For FY 11, the amount awarded each of the 21 existing programs was \$3,346.31. There was one new CASA program in FY 11.

2. What is the authorization for this program, i.e., federal or state statute, etc.? (Include the federal program number, if applicable.)

The Missouri CASA Program is funded through a \$2.00 surcharge (deposited into the "Missouri CASA Fund") for domestic relations petitions filed in the circuit or associate circuit court as provided in §476.777, RSMo (2001).

3. Are there federal matching requirements? If yes, please explain.

No.

4. Is this a federally mandated program? If yes, please explain.

No.


PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

Judiciary

Circuit Court

Court Appointed Special Advocate (CASA)

5. Provide actual expenditures for the prior three fiscal years.



Note: The GR and Federal Budget Stabilization funds represents a pass thru to the Statewide CASA office.

6. What are the sources of the "Other " funds?

Missouri CASA funds



7a. Provide an effectiveness measure.

Fiscal Year	Number of Children Served by CASA	Number of Children in DSS Custody	Percentage of Children served by CASA in DSS custody
2008	2,593	15,226	17.03%
2009	2,216	14,445	15.34%
2010	2,231	14,630	15.25%

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

Judiciary
 Circuit Court
 Court Appointed Special Advocate (CASA)

7b. Provide an efficiency measure.



* The cost savings of using CASA volunteers instead of attorney guardians ad litem using the \$70.00 per hour reported rate of compensation for attorneys in child abuse/neglect cases.

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

Judiciary
Circuit Court
Court Appointed Special Advocate (CASA)

7c. Provide the number of clients/individuals served (if applicable).

Program Name (Counties Served)	FY 2008		FY 2009		FY 2010	
	Children Served	Active Volunteers	Children Served	Active Volunteers	Children Served	Active Volunteers
3rd Circuit (Harrison, Mercer, Putnam, Grundy)	14	11	20	10	30	11
5th Circuit (Andrew, Buchanan)	60	24	53	23	44	16
11th Circuit (St. Charles)	40	42	38	53	42	43
14th Circuit CASA (Randolph, Howard)	2	5	2	2	38	15
15th Circuit (Lafayette, Saline)	65	36	63	34	59	40
Adair County CASA	59	51	59	34	36	33
CASA of S. Central MO (Phelps, Maries, Pulaski, Texas)	50	28	43	23	40	33
CASA of 36th Circuit (Ripley, Butler)	35	6	46	8	33	8
37th Circuit (Shannon, Howell, Oregon, Carter)	36	22	62	33	63	33
CASA of SEMO (Perry, Cape Girardeau, Bollinger)	50	42	58	33	54	36
CASA of SWMO (Greene)	181	111	180	137	148	137
Clay County	137	54	119	60	96	57
Douglas County CASA (Marion, Monroe, Ralls)	19	10	26	14	26	13
Heart of MO CASA (Boone)	50	32	31	17	30	17
Jackson County	385	156	499	219	572	229
Mid-Ozark CASA Program (Dent, Iron, Crawford, Reynolds, Wayne)	21	9	6	13	16	15
Voices for Children (St. Louis City)	1,078	194	578	179	517	154
CASA of St. Louis County	240	272	270	354	316	274
CASA of Dunklin County	40	15	23	6	17	7
Franklin County CASA	31	18	40	27	54	31
Capitol City CASA	n/a	n/a	0*	0*	0	0
TOTAL	2,593	1,138	2,216	1,279	2,231	1,202

* New or reorganized program

Source: Missouri CASA Association

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

Judiciary
Circuit Court
Court Appointed Special Advocate (CASA)
<p>7d. Provide a customer satisfaction measure, if applicable.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● At least 80 percent of judges/commissioners, juvenile officers, and CASA volunteers reported the CASA volunteer remains on the case until permanency is achieved.* ● Nearly 80 percent of the CASA volunteers reported they usually interview foster parents, compared to 12 percent of guardians ad litem (gal). Approximately 60 percent interview treatment providers, double the percentage reported by gals. Close to 60 percent investigate alternative services, three times the percentage of gals. About 70 percent find out how the child is doing in school, double the percentage of gals.* ● CASA [volunteers] reported they met with each child at least once a month. Close to 30 percent reported they met with the child weekly and a comparable number met with him/her twice a month.* ● Nearly two-thirds of foster parents whose foster child(ren) had been assigned a CASA volunteer indicated CASA knew enough about the situation to make good recommendations.* <p style="margin-top: 10px;">* <i>Reassessment of Court Proceedings in Foster Care and Adoption Cases</i>, Office of State Courts Administrator, June 2004</p>

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

Judiciary**Circuit Court****Domestic Relations Resolution****1. What does this program do?**

	Circuit Court	Total
GR	\$0	\$0
FEDERAL	\$0	\$0
OTHER	\$200,000	\$200,000
TOTAL	\$200,000	\$200,000

The “Domestic Relations Resolution Fund” is established through a \$3.00 surcharge assessed on civil cases as provided in §452.554 and §488.635, RSMo. Moneys in this fund are used to pay costs for the following:

- The parenting handbook, created by §452.556, RSMo, helps to assure that parents receive basic, easy to read information regarding court processes and the court system. It is available in English, Spanish, Braille, large print and electronic format upon request. They are provided to each party of a dissolution or legal separation action, motion to modify, motion for family access order, and motion for contempt.
- The creation and implementation of local circuit programs applicable to domestic relations cases. Examples of these programs include supervised visitation, exchange programs, and alternative dispute resolution programs. The Missouri Family Court Committee oversees the Request for Proposals (RFP) process and allows circuits to apply for funds for more than one program.
- Funds partially support implementation and evaluation of the 3-year Unified Family Court pilot projects in the 11th and 25th circuits. The programs are designed to provide unified case management to ensure that cases involving children and families are handled in a fair, timely, effective and cost-efficient manner.
- Funds partially support continuation of the Mid-Missouri Access to Justice Project in the 13th circuit. The program is designed to provide various levels of assistance to low-income individuals attempting to access the courts in domestic relations cases.
- Funds partially support implementation of a Domestic Violence Court in the 45th circuit. This specialized court is necessary to assure that victims are safe and offenders are held accountable.
- Funds Family Court Judge Bench Book, which includes recent juvenile law changes.

2. What is the authorization for this program, i.e., federal or state statute, etc.? (Include the federal program number, if applicable.)

§452.554, §452.556, and §488.635, RSMo

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

Judiciary
Circuit Court
Domestic Relations Resolution


3. Are there federal matching requirements? If yes, please explain.

No.

4. Is this a federally mandated program? If yes, please explain.

No.

5. Provide actual expenditures for the prior three fiscal years.



6. What are the sources of the "Other " funds?

Domestic Relations Resolution Fund

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

Judiciary**Circuit Court****Domestic Relations Resolution****7a. Provide an effectiveness measure.**

PROGRAMS AWARDED	FY 09		FY 10	
	Projected to Serve	Actual	Projected to Serve	Actual
6th Circuit - Visitation & Exchange Program*	65	9	17	11
6th Circuit - Co-Parenting is Forever Program	N/A	N/A	9	0
7th Circuit - Coordinated Education for Parents and Children of Separated Families	50	30	140	175
7th Circuit - Visitation and Exchange Expansion Program*	100	27	N/A	N/A
11th Circuit - Therapeutic Supervised Visitation Program*	N/A	N/A	10	17
13th Circuit - Thirteenth Judicial Circuit Court Domestic Violence Program	N/A	N/A	250	420
13th Circuit - Supervised Access and Exchange Program	N/A	N/A	29	40
16th Circuit - "Connections"-Supervised Therapeutic Visitation Program*	45	5	N/A	N/A
19th Circuit - Supervised Access and Exchange Program	N/A	N/A	37	19
20th Circuit - Children's Waiting Room	0	0	N/A	N/A
21st Circuit - Special Process Servers/Increasing Access to Full Orders of Protection*	400	59	200	40
21st Circuit - Specialized Civil Domestic Violence Court Enhancement Program*	N/A	N/A	416	374
22nd Circuit - Pro Se Clinic*	N/A	N/A	108	45
23rd Circuit - Jefferson County Mediation Project	266	61	N/A	N/A
23rd Circuit - Jefferson County Safe Access and Exchange Program*	N/A	N/A	19	36
25th Circuit - Supervised Visitation & Monitored Exchange Program (Pulaski)*	50	24	N/A	N/A
25th Circuit - Supervised Visitation & Monitored Exchange Program (Phelps)*	50	20	N/A	N/A
25th Circuit - Supervised Access and Exchange for Texas County	50	1	N/A	N/A
25th Circuit - Supervised Access and Exchange Program*	N/A	N/A	64	62
31st Circuit - Family Court Services Educational Program*	140	118	N/A	N/A
37th Circuit - Online Parenting Education Program	679	41	N/A	N/A
45th Circuit - Women and Children First Program	400	447	N/A	N/A
45th Circuit - Supervised Visitation and Exchange Program	N/A	N/A	60	27

N/A - Not Applicable (not funded) for that year.

* Not fully funded (received less than amount requested for projected numbers to serve)

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

Judiciary
 Circuit Court
 Domestic Relations Resolution

FY 11 CIRCUITS AWARDED (DRRF)

Circuit	Program/Project Name	Projected to Serve
6	Visitation/Exchange Program	17
13	Supervised Access and Exchange Program	14
16	Parenting Class	1,250
19	Supervised Visitation and Exchange Program	42
21	Special Process Servers	200
21	Domestic Violence Victim Impact Panel	32
21	Domestic Violence Court-Based Victim Advocacy	833
22	Pro Se Clinic	108
25	Supervised Access and Exchange Program	66
31	Supervised Access Exchange and Visitation Program	73
32	Supervised Exchange Program for Cape Girardeau County	50
45	Supervised Visitation and Exchange Program	50
45	Batterer Intervention Program/Domestic Violence Victim Impact Panel	46

7b. Provide an efficiency measure.

N/A

7c. Provide the number of clients/individuals served (if applicable).

See 7a.

7d. Provide a customer satisfaction measure, if available.

N/A

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

Judiciary**Circuit Court****Single County Circuit Juvenile Court Personnel Reimbursement**

	Circuit Court	Total
GR	\$7,355,741	\$7,355,741
FEDERAL	\$0	\$0
OTHER	\$0	\$0
TOTAL	\$7,355,741	\$7,355,741

1. What does this program do?

Juvenile and family court employees of judicial circuits composed of a single county of the first class are paid by the county. Employees of all other judicial circuits are paid by the state. Prior to this function being transferred to the Judiciary, the Office of Administration reimbursed the ten judicial circuits composed of a single county of the first class 25% of the expended 1997 personnel budgets. In accordance to §211.393, RSMo, the state may reimburse, subject to appropriation, the following percentages of such circuits' total juvenile court personnel budget expended for CY 1997, excluding the salary for the juvenile officer, and excluding all costs of retirement, health, and other fringe benefits: thirty (30)% beginning July 1, 2000 until June 30, 2001; forty (40)% beginning July 1, 2001 until June 30, 2002; fifty (50)% beginning July 1, 2002; however, no county shall receive any reimbursement from the state in an amount less than the greater of twenty-five (25)% of their total juvenile court personnel budget expended for CY 1997. All reimbursements are pursuant to §211.393, RSMo. In FY 07, this program was transferred in SB 870 from the Office of Administration to the Judiciary.

	County	2010 Budget	1997 Expended Budget	2011 Reimburse- ment		County	2010 Budget	1997 Expended Budget	2011 Reimburse- ment
Circuit 6 -	Platte	\$470,577	\$198,813	\$66,800	Circuit 21 -	St. Louis Co	\$10,764,214	\$8,198,134	\$1,988,887
Circuit 7 -	Clay	\$1,995,236	\$1,381,736	\$335,212	Circuit 22 -	St. Louis City	\$11,369,472	\$7,370,946	\$1,788,209
Circuit 11 -	St. Charles	\$1,756,781	\$966,497	\$234,474	Circuit 23 -	Jefferson	\$867,568	\$530,183	\$128,624
Circuit 16 -	Jackson	\$13,743,642	\$9,952,482	\$2,414,496	Circuit 29 -	Jasper	\$750,692	\$390,811	\$94,812
Circuit 19 -	Cole	\$588,534	\$238,256	\$66,800	Circuit 31 -	Greene	\$1,973,532	\$960,277	\$232,965

2. What is the authorization for this program, i.e., federal or state statute, etc.? (Include the federal program number, if applicable.)

§211.393 and 211.394, RSMo

3. Are there federal matching requirements? If yes, please explain.

No


4. Is this a federally mandated program? If yes, please explain.

No

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

Judiciary
Circuit Court
Single County Circuit Juvenile Court Personnel Reimbursement

5. Provide actual expenditures for the prior three fiscal years and planned expenditures for the current fiscal year.



6. What are the sources of the "Other " funds?

N/A

7a. Provide an effectiveness measure.

Compliance with statutes ensures counties receive authorized reimbursements.

7b. Provide an efficiency measure.

County reimbursement has been completed by the statutory deadline for 16 years. This program is administered with less than .1 FTE. Coordination is required with the circuits to request, record, and calculate the appropriate reimbursement amount, and to ensure reimbursements are processed by the statutory deadline.

7c. Provide the number of clients/individuals served, if applicable.

The ten judicial circuits are: 6, 7, 11, 16, 19, 21, 22, 23, 29, and 31.

7d. Provide a customer satisfaction measure, if available.

N/A

**NEW DECISION ITEM
RANK: 5 OF 7**

Judiciary	Budget Unit <u>15001C</u>
Circuit Courts	
Access to Justice Interpreter Services (#1100002)	

1. AMOUNT OF REQUEST

FY 2012 Budget Request					FY 2012 Governor's Recommendation				
	GR	Federal	Other	Total		GR	Federal	Other	Total
PS	0	0	0	0	PS	0	0	0	0
EE	595,740	0	0	595,740	EE	0	0	0	0
PSD	0	0	0	0	PSD	0	0	0	0
Total	595,740	0	0	595,740	Total	0	0	0	0
FTE	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	FTE	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00

Est. Fringe	0	0	0	0
--------------------	---	---	---	---

Note: Fringes budgeted in House Bill 5 except for certain fringes budgeted directly to MoDOT, Highway Patrol, and Conservation.

Est. Fringe	0	0	0	0
--------------------	---	---	---	---

Note: Fringes budgeted in House Bill 5 except for certain fringes budgeted directly to MoDOT, Highway Patrol, and Conservation.

Other Funds:

Other Funds:

2. THIS REQUEST CAN BE CATEGORIZED AS:

<input type="checkbox"/> New Legislation	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> New Program	<input type="checkbox"/> Fund Switch
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Federal Mandate		<input type="checkbox"/> Program Expansion	<input type="checkbox"/> Cost to Continue
<input type="checkbox"/> GR Pick-Up		<input type="checkbox"/> Space Request	<input type="checkbox"/> Equipment Replacement
<input type="checkbox"/> Pay Plan		<input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____	

3. WHY IS THIS FUNDING NEEDED? PROVIDE AN EXPLANATION FOR ITEMS CHECKED IN #2. INCLUDE THE FEDERAL OR STATE STATUTORY OR CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORIZATION FOR THIS PROGRAM.

Providing judicial services for those that are hearing impaired or have lingual challenges is required by state and federal law. Per §476.760(5) and §476.806(2), RSMo, the courts shall appoint a state-paid interpreter in criminal proceedings. In addition, state law requires courts to appoint a qualified foreign language interpreter in all legal proceedings in which a non-English speaking person is a party or a witness (§476.803.1, RSMo). Federal Executive Order 13166 and the U.S. Department of Justice policy guidelines mandate that courts provide interpreting and translating services to all non-English speaking individuals who use the court system in order to have meaningful access to the courts. Furthermore, failure to provide such services is a violation of the Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, which prohibits discrimination based upon national origin.

According to 2000 census data, 5.1% of the Missouri population speaks little or no English. Qualified foreign language interpreters are essential to a functional and fair justice system. An insufficient number of foreign language interpreters and funding could result in language barriers and a lack of awareness of one's rights in domestic and child abuse cases, which could lead to a victim not pursuing needed protection or being placed in danger.

**NEW DECISION ITEM
RANK: 5 OF 7**

Judiciary	Budget Unit <u>15001C</u>				
Circuit Courts					
Access to Justice Interpreter Services (#1100002)					
4. DESCRIBE THE DETAILED ASSUMPTIONS USED TO DERIVE THE SPECIFIC REQUESTED AMOUNT. (How did you determine that the requested number of FTE were appropriate? From what source or standard did you derive the requested levels of funding? Were alternatives such as outsourcing or automation considered? If based on new legislation, does request tie to TAFP fiscal note? If not, explain why. Detail which portions of the request are one-times and how those amounts were calculated.)					
<p>The legislature has appropriated \$120,000 annually for interpreters used in criminal proceedings since FY 2000. The cost of interpreters has grown from \$126,701 in FY 2002 to \$325,226 in FY 2010. This represents a growth of 194.37% since FY 2002 or an annualized growth of 16.24%. Based on the annualized growth rate, we project interpreters' cost for FY 2012 to be \$433,534, an increase of \$313,534.</p> <p>Missouri's total population is 5,987,580. In 2009, 418,837 civil and juvenile cases were filed. Approximately 7% of the total population filed civil and juvenile cases. The percentage of the Missouri population that speaks little or no English is 5.1%. With those assumptions ($5,987,580 \times 7\% \times 5.1\% / 5,987,580$), it is anticipated that 0.35% of the cases filed would have an individual who speaks little or no English, who would need an interpreter to participate in the court proceeding. The average hourly rate of interpreters is \$70.00/hour, and it is estimated that each case would require an average of 2.5 hours of interpreter services. Currently, other expenses (mileage, hotel, meals) for interpreters in criminal cases are approximately 10% of what is spent on interpreter services.</p>					
<u>Case Type</u>	<u># of Cases Filed</u>	<u># of Cases Interpreter Services Are Needed</u>	<u>Interpreters' Cost</u>	<u>Other Expenses</u>	<u>Total Cost</u>
Circuit Civil	35,722	125	\$ 21,875	\$ 2,188	\$ 24,063
Associate Civil	243,192	851	\$ 148,925	\$ 14,893	\$ 163,818
Small Claims	13,697	48	\$ 8,400	\$ 840	\$ 9,240
Domestic Relations	108,638	380	\$ 66,500	\$ 6,650	\$ 73,150
Juvenile Cases	17,588	62	\$ 10,850	\$ 1,085	\$ 11,935
Total	418,837	1,466	\$ 256,550	\$ 25,656	\$ 282,206
Civil/Juvenile Total Criminal					\$ 313,534
TOTAL					\$ 595,740

NEW DECISION ITEM
RANK: 5 OF 7

Judiciary		Budget Unit 15001C							
Circuit Courts									
Access to Justice Interpreter Services (#1100002)									
5. BREAK DOWN THE REQUEST BY BUDGET OBJECT CLASS, JOB CLASS, AND FUND SOURCE. IDENTIFY ONE-TIME COSTS.									
Budget Object Class/Job Class	Dept Req GR DOLLARS	Dept Req GR FTE	Dept Req FED DOLLARS	Dept Req FED FTE	Dept Req OTHER DOLLARS	Dept Req OTHER FTE	Dept Req TOTAL DOLLARS	Dept Req TOTAL FTE	Dept Req One-Time DOLLARS
							0	0.0	
							0	0.0	
Total PS	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0
Professional Services	595,740						595,740		
							0		
Total EE	595,740		0		0		595,740		0
Program Distributions							0		
Total PSD	0		0		0		0		0
Grand Total	595,740	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	595,740	0.0	0
Budget Object Class/Job Class	Gov Rec GR DOLLARS	Gov Rec GR FTE	Gov Rec FED DOLLARS	Gov Rec FED FTE	Gov Rec OTHER DOLLARS	Gov Rec OTHER FTE	Gov Rec TOTAL DOLLARS	Gov Rec TOTAL FTE	Gov Rec One-Time DOLLARS
							0	0.0	
							0	0.0	
Total PS	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0
							0		
Total EE	0		0		0		0		0
Program Distributions							0		
Total PSD	0		0		0		0		0
Grand Total	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0

**NEW DECISION ITEM
RANK: 5 OF 7**

Judiciary	Budget Unit <u>15001C</u>
Circuit Courts	
Access to Justice Interpreter Services (#1100002)	

6. PERFORMANCE MEASURES (If new decision item has an associated core, separately identify projected performance with & without additional funding.)

6a. Provide an effectiveness measure.
N/A

6b. Provide an efficiency measure.
Average Cost for Interpreters

<u>Fiscal Year</u>	<u>Avg. Number</u>
2011 Target	\$70
2012 Target	\$70

6c. Provide the number of clients/individuals served, if applicable.
Limited English Proficient (LEP) Individuals Served

6d. Provide a customer satisfaction measure, if available.
N/A

<u>Fiscal Year</u>	<u>Number</u>
2011 Target	1,423
2012 Target	1,466

7. STRATEGIES TO ACHIEVE THE PERFORMANCE MEASUREMENT TARGETS:

N/A



U. S. Department of Justice
Civil Rights Division

Assistant Attorney General

Washington, D.C. 20530

August 16, 2010

Dear Chief Justice/State Court Administrator:

In the past decade, increasing numbers of state court systems have sought to improve their capacity to handle cases and other matters involving parties or witnesses who are limited English proficient (LEP). In some instances the progress has been laudable and reflects increased recognition that language access costs must be treated as essential to sound court management. However, the Department of Justice (DOJ) continues to encounter state court language access policies or practices that are inconsistent with federal civil rights requirements. Through this letter, DOJ intends to provide greater clarity regarding the requirement that courts receiving federal financial assistance provide meaningful access for LEP individuals.

Dispensing justice fairly, efficiently, and accurately is a cornerstone of the judiciary. Policies and practices that deny LEP persons meaningful access to the courts undermine that cornerstone. They may also place state courts in violation of long-standing civil rights requirements. Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, as amended, 42 U.S.C. § 2000d *et seq.* (Title VI), and the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968, as amended, 42 U.S.C. § 3789d(c) (Safe Streets Act), both prohibit national origin discrimination by recipients of federal financial assistance. Title VI and Safe Streets Act regulations further prohibit recipients from administering programs in a manner that has the effect of subjecting individuals to discrimination based on their national origin. *See* 28 C.F.R. §§ 42.104(b)(2), 42.203(e).

The Supreme Court has held that failing to take reasonable steps to ensure meaningful access for LEP persons is a form of national origin discrimination prohibited by Title VI regulations. *See Lau v. Nichols*, 414 U.S. 563 (1974). Executive Order 13166, which was issued in 2000, further emphasized the point by directing federal agencies to publish LEP guidance for their financial assistance recipients, consistent with initial general guidance from DOJ. *See* 65 Fed. Reg. 50,121 (Aug. 16, 2000). In 2002, DOJ issued final Guidance to Federal Financial Assistance Recipients Regarding Title VI Prohibition Against National Origin Discrimination Affecting Limited English Proficient Persons. 67 Fed. Reg. 41,455 (June 18, 2002) (DOJ Guidance). The DOJ Guidance and subsequent technical assistance letters from the Civil Rights Division explained that court systems receiving federal financial assistance, either directly or indirectly, must provide meaningful access to LEP persons in order to comply with Title VI, the Safe Streets Act, and their implementing regulations. The federal requirement to provide language assistance to LEP individuals applies notwithstanding conflicting state or local laws or court rules.

Despite efforts to bring courts into compliance, some state court system policies and practices significantly and unreasonably impede, hinder, or restrict participation in court proceedings and access to court operations based upon a person's English language ability. Examples of particular concern include the following:

1. Limiting the types of proceedings for which qualified interpreter services are provided by the court. Some courts only provide competent interpreter assistance in limited categories of cases, such as in criminal, termination of parental rights, or domestic violence proceedings. DOJ, however, views access to *all* court proceedings as critical. The DOJ Guidance refers to the importance of meaningful access to courts and courtrooms, without distinguishing among civil, criminal, or administrative matters. See DOJ Guidance, 67 Fed. Reg. at 41,462. It states that “every effort should be taken to ensure competent interpretation for LEP individuals during *all* hearings, trials, and motions,” *id.* at 41,471 (emphasis added), including administrative court proceedings. *Id.* at 41,459, n.5.

Courts should also provide language assistance to non-party LEP individuals whose presence or participation in a court matter is necessary or appropriate, including parents and guardians of minor victims of crime or of juveniles and family members involved in delinquency proceedings. Proceedings handled by officials such as magistrates, masters, commissioners, hearing officers, arbitrators, mediators, and other decision-makers should also include professional interpreter coverage. DOJ expects that meaningful access will be provided to LEP persons in all court and court-annexed proceedings, whether civil, criminal, or administrative including those presided over by non-judges.

2. Charging interpreter costs to one or more parties. Many courts that ostensibly provide qualified interpreters for covered court proceedings require or authorize one or more of the persons involved in the case to be charged with the cost of the interpreter. Although the rules or practices vary, and may exempt indigent parties, their common impact is either to subject some individuals to a surcharge based upon a party's or witness' English language proficiency, or to discourage parties from requesting or using a competent interpreter. Title VI and its regulations prohibit practices that have the effect of charging parties, impairing their participation in proceedings, or limiting presentation of witnesses based upon national origin. As such, the DOJ Guidance makes clear that court proceedings are among the most important activities conducted by recipients of federal funds, and emphasizes the need to provide interpretation free of cost. Courts that charge interpreter costs to the parties may be arranging for an interpreter's presence, but they are not “providing” the interpreter. DOJ expects that, when meaningful access requires interpretation, courts will provide interpreters at no cost to the persons involved.

- 3 -

3. Restricting language services to courtrooms. Some states provide language assistance only for courtroom proceedings, but the meaningful access requirement extends to court functions that are conducted outside the courtroom as well. Examples of such court-managed offices, operations, and programs can include information counters; intake or filing offices; cashiers; records rooms; sheriff's offices; probation and parole offices; alternative dispute resolution programs; *pro se* clinics; criminal diversion programs; anger management classes; detention facilities; and other similar offices, operations, and programs. Access to these points of public contact is essential to the fair administration of justice, especially for unrepresented LEP persons. DOJ expects courts to provide meaningful access for LEP persons to such court operated or managed points of public contact in the judicial process, whether the contact at issue occurs inside or outside the courtroom.

4. Failing to ensure effective communication with court-appointed or supervised personnel. Some recipient court systems have failed to ensure that LEP persons are able to communicate effectively with a variety of individuals involved in a case under a court appointment or order. Criminal defense counsel, child advocates or guardians *ad litem*, court psychologists, probation officers, doctors, trustees, and other such individuals who are employed, paid, or supervised by the courts, and who are required to communicate with LEP parties or other individuals as part of their case-related functions, must possess demonstrated bilingual skills or have support from professional interpreters. In order for a court to provide meaningful access to LEP persons, it must ensure language access in all such operations and encounters with professionals.

DOJ continues to interpret Title VI and the Title VI regulations to prohibit, in most circumstances, the practices described above. Nevertheless, DOJ has observed that some court systems continue to operate in apparent violation of federal law. Most court systems have long accepted their legal duty under the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) to provide auxiliary aids and services to persons with disabilities, and would not consciously engage in the practices highlighted in this letter in providing an accommodation to a person with a disability. While ADA and Title VI requirements are not the same, existing ADA plans and policy for sign language interpreting may provide an effective template for managing interpreting and translating needs for some state courts.

Language services expenses should be treated as a basic and essential operating expense, not as an ancillary cost. Court systems have many operating expenses – judges and staff, buildings, utilities, security, filing, data and records systems, insurance, research, and printing costs, to name a few. Court systems in every part of the country serve populations of LEP individuals and most jurisdictions, if not all, have encountered substantial increases in the number of LEP parties and witnesses and the diversity of languages they speak. Budgeting adequate funds to ensure language access is fundamental to the business of the courts.

- 4 -

We recognize that most state and local courts are struggling with unusual budgetary constraints that have slowed the pace of progress in this area. The DOJ Guidance acknowledges that recipients can consider the costs of the services and the resources available to the court as part of the determination of what language assistance is reasonably required in order to provide meaningful LEP access. *See id.* at 41,460. Fiscal pressures, however, do not provide an exemption from civil rights requirements. In considering a system's compliance with language access standards in light of limited resources, DOJ will consider all of the facts and circumstances of a particular court system. Factors to review may include, but are not limited to, the following:

- The extent to which current language access deficiencies reflect the impact of the fiscal crisis as demonstrated by previous success in providing meaningful access;
- The extent to which other essential court operations are being restricted or defunded;
- The extent to which the court system has secured additional revenues from fees, fines, grants, or other sources, and has increased efficiency through collaboration, technology, or other means;
- Whether the court system has adopted an implementation plan to move promptly towards full compliance; and
- The nature and significance of the adverse impact on LEP persons affected by the existing language access deficiencies.

DOJ acknowledges that it takes time to create systems that ensure competent interpretation in all court proceedings and to build a qualified interpreter corps. Yet nearly a decade has passed since the issuance of Executive Order 13166 and publication of initial general guidance clarifying language access requirements for recipients. Reasonable efforts by now should have resulted in significant and continuing improvements for all recipients. With this passage of time, the need to show progress in providing all LEP persons with meaningful access has increased. DOJ expects that courts that have done well will continue to make progress toward full compliance in policy and practice. At the same time, we expect that court recipients that are furthest behind will take significant steps in order to move promptly toward compliance.

The DOJ guidance encourages recipients to develop and maintain a periodically-updated written plan on language assistance for LEP persons as an appropriate and cost-effective means of documenting compliance and providing a framework for the provision of timely and reasonable language assistance. Such written plans can provide additional benefits to recipients' managers in the areas of training, administrating, planning, and budgeting. The DOJ Guidance goes on to note that these benefits should lead most recipients to document in a written LEP plan their language assistance services, and how staff and LEP persons can access those services. In court systems, we have found that meaningful access inside the courtroom is most effectively implemented in states that have adopted a court rule, statute, or administrative order providing for universal, free, and qualified court interpreting. In addition, state court systems that have strong leadership and a designated coordinator of language services in the office of the court administrator, and that have identified personnel in charge of ensuring language access in each courthouse, will more likely be able to provide effective and consistent language access for LEP

- 5 -

individuals. Enclosed, for illustrative purposes only, are copies of Administrative Order JB-06-3 of the Supreme Judicial Court of Maine, together with the September 2008 Memorandum of Understanding between that court and DOJ. Also enclosed for your information is a copy of "Chapter 5: Tips and Tools Specific to Courts" from DOJ, *Executive Order 13166 Limited English Proficiency Document: Tips and Tools from the Field* (2004).

The Office of Justice Programs provides Justice Assistance Grant funds to the states to be used for state and local initiatives, technical assistance, training, personnel, equipment, supplies, contractual support, and criminal justice information systems that will improve or enhance criminal justice programs including prosecution and court programs. Funding language services in the courts is a permissible use of these funds.

DOJ has an abiding interest in securing state and local court system compliance with the language access requirements of Title VI and the Safe Streets Act and will continue to review courts for compliance and to investigate complaints. The Civil Rights Division also welcomes requests for technical assistance from state courts and can provide training for court personnel. Should you have any questions, please contact Mark J. Kappelhoff, Acting Chief, Federal Coordination and Compliance Section (formally known as Coordination and Review Section) at (202) 307-2222.

Sincerely,



Thomas E. Perez
Assistant Attorney General

Enclosures

JUDICIARY REPORT 10 FY2012 GOVERNOR RECOMMENDATION

DECISION ITEM DETAIL

Budget Unit	FY 2010	FY 2010	FY 2011	FY 2011	FY 2012	FY 2012	FY 2012	FY 2012
Decision Item	ACTUAL	ACTUAL	BUDGET	BUDGET	DEPT REQ	DEPT REQ	GOV REC	GOV REC
Budget Object Class	DOLLAR	FTE	DOLLAR	FTE	DOLLAR	FTE	DOLLAR	FTE
CIRCUIT PERSONNEL								
CC-Access to Justice Inter Ser - 1100002								
PROFESSIONAL SERVICES	0	0.00	0	0.00	595,740	0.00	0	0.00
TOTAL - EE	0	0.00	0	0.00	595,740	0.00	0	0.00
GRAND TOTAL	\$0	0.00	\$0	0.00	\$595,740	0.00	\$0	0.00
GENERAL REVENUE	\$0	0.00	\$0	0.00	\$595,740	0.00		0.00
FEDERAL FUNDS	\$0	0.00	\$0	0.00	\$0	0.00		0.00
OTHER FUNDS	\$0	0.00	\$0	0.00	\$0	0.00		0.00

**NEW DECISION ITEM
RANK: 6 OF 7**

Judiciary	Budget Unit <u>15001C</u>
Circuit Courts	
Judgeship Determined by Population (#1100001)	

1. AMOUNT OF REQUEST

	FY 2012 Budget Request					FY 2012 Governor's Recommendation			
	GR	Federal	Other	Total		GR	Federal	Other	Total
PS	421,626	0	0	421,626	PS	0	0	0	0
EE	7,872	0	0	7,872	EE	0	0	0	0
PSD	0	0	0	0	PSD	0	0	0	0
Total	429,498	0	0	429,498	Total	0	0	0	0
FTE	6.00	0.00	0.00	6.00	FTE	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00

Est. Fringe	315,872	0	0	315,872
--------------------	---------	---	---	---------

Note: Fringes budgeted in House Bill 5 except for certain fringes budgeted directly to MoDOT, Highway Patrol, and Conservation.

Est. Fringe	0	0	0	0
--------------------	---	---	---	---

Note: Fringes budgeted in House Bill 5 except for certain fringes budgeted directly to MoDOT, Highway Patrol, and Conservation.

Other Funds: _____ Other Funds: _____

2. THIS REQUEST CAN BE CATEGORIZED AS:

<input type="checkbox"/> New Legislation	<input type="checkbox"/> New Program	<input type="checkbox"/> Supplemental
<input type="checkbox"/> Federal Mandate	<input type="checkbox"/> Program Expansion	<input type="checkbox"/> Cost to Continue
<input type="checkbox"/> GR Pick-Up	<input type="checkbox"/> Space Request	<input type="checkbox"/> Equipment Replacement
<input type="checkbox"/> Pay Plan	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other: <u>Statutory Mandate</u>	

3. WHY IS THIS FUNDING NEEDED? PROVIDE AN EXPLANATION FOR ITEMS CHECKED IN #2. INCLUDE THE FEDERAL OR STATE STATUTORY OR CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORIZATION FOR THIS PROGRAM.

The number of associate circuit judges in any county is controlled by §478.320, RSMo, which provides for: one associate circuit judge in each county of less than 30,000 people; two associate circuit judges in counties of over 30,000 and less than 100,000; three or more associate circuit judges in counties of more than 100,000; and one additional associate circuit judge for each additional 100,000 inhabitants. A county shall gain an additional judgeship if it maintains the next level of population for three consecutive years.

The 2009 census estimates prepared by the United States Bureau of the Census that is certified by the State demographer show the population of Clay County to be over 200,000; and Polk and Warren Counties to be over 30,000. Based on this estimate, a new judgeship should be created in Clay, Polk, and Warren Counties.

**NEW DECISION ITEM
RANK: 6 OF 7**

Judiciary	Budget Unit <u>1501C</u>
Circuit Courts	
Judgeship Determined by Population (#1100001)	

4. DESCRIBE THE DETAILED ASSUMPTIONS USED TO DERIVE THE SPECIFIC REQUESTED AMOUNT. (How did you determine that the requested number of FTE were appropriate? From what source or standard did you derive the requested levels of funding? Were alternatives such as outsourcing or automation considered? If based on new legislation, does request tie to TAFP fiscal note? If not, explain why. Detail which portions of the request are one-times and how those amounts were calculated.)

The salary of the associate circuit judge is statutory and a state obligation, as are division clerks, to staff the new court. Space, equipment, and operating expenses are a county responsibility under the statutes, which predate the Hancock amendment.

For each new judgeship, the state costs are as follows:

Associate Circuit Judge	3.00 FTE	\$328,098
Court Clerk III	3.00 FTE	\$93,528
E & E - Computers (One-Time)		<u>\$7,872</u>
Total FTE and Cost:	6.00 FTE	\$429,498

5. BREAK DOWN THE REQUEST BY BUDGET OBJECT CLASS, JOB CLASS, AND FUND SOURCE. IDENTIFY ONE-TIME COSTS.

Budget Object Class/Job Class	Dept Req GR DOLLARS	Dept Req GR FTE	Dept Req FED DOLLARS	Dept Req FED FTE	Dept Req OTHER DOLLARS	Dept Req OTHER FTE	Dept Req TOTAL DOLLARS	Dept Req TOTAL FTE	Dept Req One-Time DOLLARS
Salaries/Wages Assoc. Cir. Judge	328,098	3.0					328,098	3.0	
Salaries/Wages Court Clerk III	93,528	3.0					93,528	3.0	
Total PS	421,626	6.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	421,626	6.0	0
Computers	<u>7,872</u>		<u>0</u>		<u>0</u>		<u>7,872</u>		<u>7,872</u>
Total EE	7,872		0		0		7,872		7,872
Program Distributions	<u>0</u>		<u>0</u>		<u>0</u>		<u>0</u>		<u>0</u>
Total PSD	0		0		0		0		0
Transfers	<u>0</u>		<u>0</u>		<u>0</u>		<u>0</u>		<u>0</u>
Total TRF	0		0		0		0		0
Grand Total	429,498	6.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	429,498	6.0	7,872

**NEW DECISION ITEM
RANK: 6 OF 7**

Judiciary		Budget Unit 1501C							
Circuit Courts									
Judgeship Determined by Population (#1100001)									
Budget Object Class/Job Class	Gov Rec GR DOLLARS	Gov Rec GR FTE	Gov Rec FED DOLLARS	Gov Rec FED FTE	Gov Rec OTHER DOLLARS	Gov Rec OTHER FTE	Gov Rec TOTAL DOLLARS	Gov Rec TOTAL FTE	Gov Rec One-Time DOLLARS
Salaries/Wages Assoc. Cir. Judge	0	0.0					0	0.0	
Salaries/Wages Court Clerk III	0	0.0					0	0.0	
Total PS	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0
Computers	0						0		0
Total EE	0		0		0		0		0
Program Distributions							0		
Total PSD	0		0		0		0		0
Transfers							0		
Total TRF	0		0		0		0		0
Grand Total	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0

**NEW DECISION ITEM
RANK: 6 OF 7**

Judiciary	Budget Unit <u>1501C</u>
Circuit Courts	
Judgeship Determined by Population (#1100001)	

6. PERFORMANCE MEASURES (If new decision item has an associated core, separately identify projected performance with & without additional funding.)

6a. Provide an effectiveness measure.

Judicial Resources

<u>Circuit</u>	<u>Demand</u>	<u>Current</u>	<u>Need</u>
7th - Clay	11.03	8.00	3.03
12th - Warren	5.90	5.00	0.90
30th - Polk	7.99	7.00	0.99

6b. Provide an efficiency measure.

N/A

6c. Provide the number of clients/individuals served, if applicable.

Clay County has a population of 215,707 per the Census Bureau FY 09 estimates.
 Polk County has a population of 30,626 per the Census Bureau FY 09 estimates.
 Warren County has a population of 31,485 per the Census Bureau FY 09 estimates.

6d. Provide a customer satisfaction measure, if available.

N/A

7. STRATEGIES TO ACHIEVE THE PERFORMANCE MEASUREMENT TARGETS:

N/A

JUDICIARY REPORT 10 FY2012 GOVERNOR RECOMMENDATION

DECISION ITEM DETAIL

Budget Unit	FY 2010	FY 2010	FY 2011	FY 2011	FY 2012	FY 2012	FY 2012	FY 2012
Decision Item	ACTUAL	ACTUAL	BUDGET	BUDGET	DEPT REQ	DEPT REQ	GOV REC	GOV REC
Budget Object Class	DOLLAR	FTE	DOLLAR	FTE	DOLLAR	FTE	DOLLAR	FTE
CIRCUIT PERSONNEL								
CC-Judgeship Determined by Pop - 1100001								
ASSOCIATE CIRCUIT JUDGE	0	0.00	0	0.00	328,098	3.00	0	0.00
COURT CLERK III	0	0.00	0	0.00	93,528	3.00	0	0.00
TOTAL - PS	0	0.00	0	0.00	421,626	6.00	0	0.00
COMPUTER EQUIPMENT	0	0.00	0	0.00	7,872	0.00	0	0.00
TOTAL - EE	0	0.00	0	0.00	7,872	0.00	0	0.00
GRAND TOTAL	\$0	0.00	\$0	0.00	\$429,498	6.00	\$0	0.00
GENERAL REVENUE	\$0	0.00	\$0	0.00	\$429,498	6.00		0.00
FEDERAL FUNDS	\$0	0.00	\$0	0.00	\$0	0.00		0.00
OTHER FUNDS	\$0	0.00	\$0	0.00	\$0	0.00		0.00

**NEW DECISION ITEM
RANK: 7 OF 7**

Judiciary	Budget Unit <u>1501C</u>
Circuit Courts	
Federal FTE Authority Increase (#1100005)	

1. AMOUNT OF REQUEST

	FY 2012 Budget Request					FY 2012 Governor's Recommendation			
	GR	Federal	Other	Total		GR	Federal	Other	Total
PS	0	76,445	0	76,445	PS	0	0	0	0
EE	0	0	0	0	EE	0	0	0	0
PSD	0	0	0	0	PSD	0	0	0	0
Total	0	76,445	0	76,445	Total	0	0	0	0
FTE	0.00	11.00	0.00	11.00	FTE	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00

Est. Fringe	0	42,542	0	42,542
--------------------	---	--------	---	--------

Note: Fringes budgeted in House Bill 5 except for certain fringes budgeted directly to MoDOT, Highway Patrol, and Conservation.

Est. Fringe	0	0	0	0
--------------------	---	---	---	---

Note: Fringes budgeted in House Bill 5 except for certain fringes budgeted directly to MoDOT, Highway Patrol, and Conservation.

Other Funds: _____ Other Funds: _____

2. THIS REQUEST CAN BE CATEGORIZED AS:

_____ New Legislation	_____ New Program	_____ Supplemental
_____ Federal Mandate	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Program Expansion	_____ Cost to Continue
_____ GR Pick-Up	_____ Space Request	_____ Equipment Replacement
_____ Pay Plan	_____ Other: _____	

3. WHY IS THIS FUNDING NEEDED? PROVIDE AN EXPLANATION FOR ITEMS CHECKED IN #2. INCLUDE THE FEDERAL OR STATE STATUTORY OR CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORIZATION FOR THIS PROGRAM.

The current clerical weighted workload shows a need of 222.8130 FTE in the circuit courts to handle the existing caseload. The judiciary realizes that due to the current economic climate, state funding is not available so we must look elsewhere for assistance. One opportunity that we have is maximizing the federal reimbursement for work done on child support cases. Unfortunately, our current federal FTE authority is not sufficient to meet our potential reimbursement limits. By gaining additional FTE authorization, we would be able to fully utilize the circuit courts' federal funds.

**NEW DECISION ITEM
RANK: 7 OF 7**

Judiciary	Budget Unit <u>1501C</u>
Circuit Courts	
Federal FTE Authority Increase (#1100005)	

4. DESCRIBE THE DETAILED ASSUMPTIONS USED TO DERIVE THE SPECIFIC REQUESTED AMOUNT. (How did you determine that the requested number of FTE were appropriate? From what source or standard did you derive the requested levels of funding? Were alternatives such as outsourcing or automation considered? If based on new legislation, does request tie to TAFP fiscal note? If not, explain why. Detail which portions of the request are one-times and how those amounts were calculated.)

We estimate an additional 11 court clerks would be reimbursable under the federal guidelines. The total cost for 11 FTE at the court clerk III level is \$342,936. The circuit courts currently have \$266,491 in empty federal spending authority for personal services. This item would also add \$76,445 to our spending authority.

5. BREAK DOWN THE REQUEST BY BUDGET OBJECT CLASS, JOB CLASS, AND FUND SOURCE. IDENTIFY ONE-TIME COSTS.

Budget Object Class/Job Class	Dept Req GR DOLLARS	Dept Req GR FTE	Dept Req FED DOLLARS	Dept Req FED FTE	Dept Req OTHER DOLLARS	Dept Req OTHER FTE	Dept Req TOTAL DOLLARS	Dept Req TOTAL FTE	Dept Req One-Time DOLLARS
Salaries/Wages Court Clerk III			76,445	11.0			76,445	0.0	
							0	0.0	
Total PS	0	0.0	76,445	11.0	0	0.0	76,445	11.0	0
Total EE	0		0		0		0		0
Program Distributions							0		
Total PSD	0		0		0		0		0
Transfers							0		
Total TRF	0		0		0		0		0
Grand Total	0	0.0	76,445	11.0	0	0.0	76,445	11.0	0

**NEW DECISION ITEM
RANK: 7 OF 7**

Judiciary		Budget Unit 1501C								
Circuit Courts										
Federal FTE Authority Increase (#1100005)										
Budget Object Class/Job Class	Gov Rec GR DOLLARS	Gov Rec GR FTE	Gov Rec FED DOLLARS	Gov Rec FED FTE	Gov Rec OTHER DOLLARS	Gov Rec OTHER FTE	Gov Rec TOTAL DOLLARS	Gov Rec TOTAL FTE	Gov Rec One-Time DOLLARS	
Salaries/Wages Court Clerk III	0	0.0					0	0.0		
	0	0.0					0	0.0		
Total PS	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	
							0			
Total EE	0		0		0		0		0	
Program Distributions							0			
Total PSD	0		0		0		0		0	
Transfers							0			
Total TRF	0		0		0		0		0	
Grand Total	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	

NEW DECISION ITEM
RANK: 7 OF 7

Judiciary	Budget Unit <u>15001C</u>
Circuit Courts	
Federal FTE Authority Increase (#1100005)	

6. PERFORMANCE MEASURES (If new decision item has an associated core, separately identify projected performance with & without additional funding.)

6a. Provide an effectiveness measure.

N/A

6b. Provide an efficiency measure.

N/A

6c. Provide the number of clients/individuals served, if applicable.

N/A

6d. Provide a customer satisfaction measure, if available.

N/A

7. STRATEGIES TO ACHIEVE THE PERFORMANCE MEASUREMENT TARGETS:

N/A

JUDICIARY REPORT 10 FY2012 GOVERNOR RECOMMENDATION

DECISION ITEM DETAIL

Budget Unit	FY 2010	FY 2010	FY 2011	FY 2011	FY 2012	FY 2012	FY 2012	FY 2012
Decision Item	ACTUAL	ACTUAL	BUDGET	BUDGET	DEPT REQ	DEPT REQ	GOV REC	GOV REC
Budget Object Class	DOLLAR	FTE	DOLLAR	FTE	DOLLAR	FTE	DOLLAR	FTE
CIRCUIT PERSONNEL								
CC-Federal FTE Authority Inc - 1100005								
COURT CLERK III	0	0.00	0	0.00	76,445	11.00	0	0.00
TOTAL - PS	0	0.00	0	0.00	76,445	11.00	0	0.00
GRAND TOTAL	\$0	0.00	\$0	0.00	\$76,445	11.00	\$0	0.00
GENERAL REVENUE	\$0	0.00	\$0	0.00	\$0	0.00		0.00
FEDERAL FUNDS	\$0	0.00	\$0	0.00	\$76,445	11.00		0.00
OTHER FUNDS	\$0	0.00	\$0	0.00	\$0	0.00		0.00

“THIS PAGE WAS INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK.”

INTRODUCTION
TO
DRUG COURTS COORDINATING COMMISSION

Drug Court Programs were designed for two primary purposes. First, they curtail substance abuse among non-violent offenders through intensive judicial supervision that treatment offenders do not receive in regular probation or incarceration sentencing options. Second, they are an effective way to divert non-violent offenders from incarceration in the state prison system, allowing for cost avoidance to the state correctional budget.

DWI courts provide an effective alternative to the traditional criminal justice system in addressing the risk to public safety caused by impaired drivers. DWI court is dedicated to changing the behavior of offenders that are arrested for DWI. This program was developed using the highly successful drug court model that employs accountability and long term treatment to address the root cause of impaired driving: alcohol and other substance abuse and addiction. Like drug courts, DWI courts effectively divert non-violent offenders from the state prison system, resulting in cost avoidance to the state correctional budget.

As of July 1, 2010, there were 3,022 people participating in drug courts and DWI courts. Through drug court and DWI court intervention strategies and treatment, the state realizes cost savings in incarceration, probation, foster care, youth services, and other social welfare programs. By keeping these non-violent offenders in this intensive community-based program, the state continues to receive the benefits of having these participants complete their GED, to be job ready or to continue their current employment, pay taxes, reduce the government benefits received, support their families, and are licensed, insured, and sober drivers.

The Drug Courts Coordinating Commission was established by House Bill 471 (2001) and is composed of eight members representing the Departments of Corrections, Social Services, Mental Health, Public Safety, and the Judiciary. The legislation also established a Drug Court Resources Fund to be administered by the Commission. The Commission is to evaluate, secure, coordinate, and allocate funding resources to the various drug courts and DWI courts around the state. Currently, there are 41 circuits that operate 125 adult, juvenile, and family drug courts and DWI Courts. The Drug Courts Coordinating Commission has been appointed and organized as provided in §478.009, RSMo; the Drug Court Resources Fund is administered as provided in §478.009, RSMo.

“THIS PAGE WAS INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK.”

JUDICIARY REPORT 9 FY2012 GOVERNOR RECOMMENDATION
DECISION ITEM SUMMARY

Budget Unit								
Decision Item	FY 2010	FY 2010	FY 2011	FY 2011	FY 2012	FY 2012	FY 2012	FY 2012
Budget Object Summary	ACTUAL	ACTUAL	BUDGET	BUDGET	DEPT REQ	DEPT REQ	GOV REC	GOV REC
Fund	DOLLAR	FTE	DOLLAR	FTE	DOLLAR	FTE	DOLLAR	FTE
DRUG COURTS TRANSFER								
CORE								
FUND TRANSFERS								
GENERAL REVENUE	5,725,500	0.00	5,725,500	0.00	5,725,500	0.00	5,725,500	0.00
TOTAL - TRF	5,725,500	0.00	5,725,500	0.00	5,725,500	0.00	5,725,500	0.00
TOTAL	5,725,500	0.00	5,725,500	0.00	5,725,500	0.00	5,725,500	0.00
DRUG CT-Treatment Exp Transfer - 1100003								
FUND TRANSFERS								
GENERAL REVENUE	0	0.00	0	0.00	4,920,501	0.00	0	0.00
TOTAL - TRF	0	0.00	0	0.00	4,920,501	0.00	0	0.00
TOTAL	0	0.00	0	0.00	4,920,501	0.00	0	0.00
GRAND TOTAL	\$5,725,500	0.00	\$5,725,500	0.00	\$10,646,001	0.00	\$5,725,500	0.00

CORE DECISION ITEM

Judiciary	Budget Unit <u>11115C</u>
Drug Courts Coordinating Commission	
Core - Transfer	

1. CORE FINANCIAL SUMMARY

	FY 2012 Budget Request					FY 2012 Governor's Recommendation			
	GR	Federal	Other	Total		GR	Federal	Other	Total
PS	0	0	0	0	PS	0	0	0	0
EE	0	0	0	0	EE	0	0	0	0
Transfer	5,725,500	0	0	5,725,500	Transfer	5,725,500	0	0	5,725,500
Total	5,725,500	0	0	5,725,500	Total	5,725,500	0	0	5,725,500
FTE	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	FTE	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Est. Fringe	0	0	0	0	Est. Fringe	0	0	0	0
<i>Note: Fringes budgeted in House Bill 5 except for certain fringes budgeted directly to MoDOT, Highway Patrol, and Conservation.</i>					<i>Note: Fringes budgeted in House Bill 5 except for certain fringes budgeted directly to MoDOT, Highway Patrol, and Conservation.</i>				
Other Funds:					Other Funds:				

2. CORE DESCRIPTION

See Drug Courts Coordinating Commission core description.

3. PROGRAM LISTING (list programs included in this core funding)


See Drug Courts Coordinating Commission program listing.

CORE DECISION ITEM

Judiciary	Budget Unit <u>11115C</u>
Drug Courts Coordinating Commission	
Core - Transfer	

4. FINANCIAL HISTORY

	FY 2008 Actual	FY 2009 Actual	FY 2010 Actual	FY 2011 Current Yr.
Appropriation (All Funds)	5,225,500	5,725,500	5,725,500	5,725,500
Less Reverted (All Funds)	0	0	0	N/A
Budget Authority (All Funds)	5,225,500	5,725,500	5,725,500	N/A
Actual Expenditures (All Funds)	5,225,500	5,725,500	5,725,500	N/A
Unexpended (All Funds)	0	0	0	N/A
Unexpended, by Fund:				
General Revenue	0	0	0	N/A
Federal	0	0	0	N/A
Other	0	0	0	N/A



Reverted includes Governor's standard 3 percent reserve (when applicable) and any extraordinary withholdings.

NOTES:

CORE RECONCILIATION DETAIL

JUDICIARY
DRUG COURTS TRANSFER

5. CORE RECONCILIATION DETAIL

	Budget Class	FTE	GR	Federal	Other	Total	Explanation
TAFP AFTER VETOES							
	TRF	0.00	5,725,500	0	0	5,725,500	
	Total	0.00	5,725,500	0	0	5,725,500	
DEPARTMENT CORE REQUEST							
	TRF	0.00	5,725,500	0	0	5,725,500	
	Total	0.00	5,725,500	0	0	5,725,500	
GOVERNOR'S RECOMMENDED CORE							
	TRF	0.00	5,725,500	0	0	5,725,500	
	Total	0.00	5,725,500	0	0	5,725,500	

JUDICIARY REPORT 10 FY2012 GOVERNOR RECOMMENDATION

DECISION ITEM DETAIL

Budget Unit	FY 2010	FY 2010	FY 2011	FY 2011	FY 2012	FY 2012	FY 2012	FY 2012
Decision Item	ACTUAL	ACTUAL	BUDGET	BUDGET	DEPT REQ	DEPT REQ	GOV REC	GOV REC
Budget Object Class	DOLLAR	FTE	DOLLAR	FTE	DOLLAR	FTE	DOLLAR	FTE
DRUG COURTS TRANSFER								
CORE								
TRANSFERS OUT	5,725,500	0.00	5,725,500	0.00	5,725,500	0.00	5,725,500	0.00
TOTAL - TRF	5,725,500	0.00	5,725,500	0.00	5,725,500	0.00	5,725,500	0.00
GRAND TOTAL	\$5,725,500	0.00	\$5,725,500	0.00	\$5,725,500	0.00	\$5,725,500	0.00
GENERAL REVENUE	\$5,725,500	0.00	\$5,725,500	0.00	\$5,725,500	0.00	\$5,725,500	0.00
FEDERAL FUNDS	\$0	0.00	\$0	0.00	\$0	0.00	\$0	0.00
OTHER FUNDS	\$0	0.00	\$0	0.00	\$0	0.00	\$0	0.00

**NEW DECISION ITEM
RANK: 5 OF 5**

Judiciary	Budget Unit <u>11115C</u>
Drug Courts Coordinating Commission	
Drug Court Treatment Expansion Transfer (#1100003)	

1. AMOUNT OF REQUEST

	FY 2012 Budget Request					FY 2012 Governor's Recommendation			
	GR	Federal	Other	Total		GR	Federal	Other	Total
PS	0	0	0	0	PS	0	0	0	0
EE	0	0	0	0	EE	0	0	0	0
PSD	0	0	0	0	PSD	0	0	0	0
TRF	4,920,501	0	0	4,920,501	TRF	0	0	0	0
Total	4,920,501	0	0	4,920,501	Total	0	0	0	0
FTE	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	FTE	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00

Est. Fringe	0	0	0	0
--------------------	---	---	---	---

Note: Fringes budgeted in House Bill 5 except for certain fringes budgeted directly to MoDOT, Highway Patrol, and Conservation.

Est. Fringe	0	0	0	0
--------------------	---	---	---	---

Note: Fringes budgeted in House Bill 5 except for certain fringes budgeted directly to MoDOT, Highway Patrol, and Conservation.

Other Funds:

Other Funds:

2. THIS REQUEST CAN BE CATEGORIZED AS:

<input type="checkbox"/> New Legislation	<input type="checkbox"/> New Program	<input type="checkbox"/> Fund Switch
<input type="checkbox"/> Federal Mandate	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Program Expansion	<input type="checkbox"/> Cost to Continue
<input type="checkbox"/> GR Pick-Up	<input type="checkbox"/> Space Request	<input type="checkbox"/> Equipment Replacement
<input type="checkbox"/> Pay Plan	<input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____	

3. WHY IS THIS FUNDING NEEDED? PROVIDE AN EXPLANATION FOR ITEMS CHECKED IN #2. INCLUDE THE FEDERAL OR STATE STATUTORY OR CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORIZATION FOR THIS PROGRAM.

See new decision item for Drug Court Treatment Expansion.

**NEW DECISION ITEM
RANK: 5 OF 5**

Judiciary		Budget Unit <u>11115C</u>							
Drug Courts Coordinating Commission									
Drug Court Treatment Expansion Transfer (#1100003)									
4. DESCRIBE THE DETAILED ASSUMPTIONS USED TO DERIVE THE SPECIFIC REQUESTED AMOUNT. (How did you determine that the requested number of FTE were appropriate? From what source or standard did you derive the requested levels of funding? Were alternatives such as outsourcing or automation considered? If based on new legislation, does request tie to TAFP fiscal note? If not, explain why. Detail which portions of the request are one-times and how those amounts were calculated.)									
See new decision item for Drug Court Treatment Expansion.									
5. BREAK DOWN THE REQUEST BY BUDGET OBJECT CLASS, JOB CLASS, AND FUND SOURCE. IDENTIFY ONE-TIME COSTS.									
Budget Object Class/Job Class	Dept Req GR DOLLARS	Dept Req GR FTE	Dept Req FED DOLLARS	Dept Req FED FTE	Dept Req OTHER DOLLARS	Dept Req OTHER FTE	Dept Req TOTAL DOLLARS	Dept Req TOTAL FTE	Dept Req One-Time DOLLARS
Total PS	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0
Total EE	0		0		0		0		0
Program Distributions							0		
Total PSD	0		0		0		0		0
Transfers	4,920,501						4,920,501		
Total TRF	4,920,501		0		0		4,920,501		0
Grand Total	4,920,501	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	4,920,501	0.0	0

**NEW DECISION ITEM
RANK: 5 OF 5**

Judiciary		Budget Unit 11115C								
Drug Courts Coordinating Commission										
Drug Court Treatment Expansion Transfer (#110003)										
Budget Object Class/Job Class	Gov Rec GR DOLLARS	Gov Rec GR FTE	Gov Rec FED DOLLARS	Gov Rec FED FTE	Gov Rec OTHER DOLLARS	Gov Rec OTHER FTE	Gov Rec TOTAL DOLLARS	Gov Rec TOTAL FTE	Gov Rec One-Time DOLLARS	
							0	0.0		
							0	0.0		
Total PS	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>0</u>	
							0			
							0			
Total EE	<u>0</u>		<u>0</u>		<u>0</u>		<u>0</u>		<u>0</u>	
Program Distributions							0			
Total PSD	<u>0</u>		<u>0</u>		<u>0</u>		<u>0</u>		<u>0</u>	
Transfers							0			
Total TRF	<u>0</u>		<u>0</u>		<u>0</u>		<u>0</u>		<u>0</u>	
Grand Total	<u><u>0</u></u>	<u><u>0.0</u></u>	<u><u>0</u></u>	<u><u>0.0</u></u>	<u><u>0</u></u>	<u><u>0.0</u></u>	<u><u>0</u></u>	<u><u>0.0</u></u>	<u><u>0</u></u>	

NEW DECISION ITEM
RANK: 5 OF 5

Judiciary	Budget Unit <u>11115C</u>
Drug Courts Coordinating Commission	
Drug Court Treatment Expansion Transfer (#110003)	

6. PERFORMANCE MEASURES (If new decision item has an associated core, separately identify projected performance with & without additional funding.)

<p>6a. Provide an effectiveness measure. See new decision item for Drug Court Treatment Expansion.</p> <p>6c. Provide the number of clients/individuals served, if applicable. See new decision item for Drug Court Treatment Expansion.</p>	<p>6b. Provide an efficiency measure. See new decision item for Drug Court Treatment Expansion.</p> <p>6d. Provide a customer satisfaction measure, if available. See new decision item for Drug Court Treatment Expansion.</p>
---	--

7. STRATEGIES TO ACHIEVE THE PERFORMANCE MEASUREMENT TARGETS:

See new decision item for Drug Court Treatment Expansion.

JUDICIARY REPORT 10 FY2012 GOVERNOR RECOMMENDATION**DECISION ITEM DETAIL**

Budget Unit	FY 2010	FY 2010	FY 2011	FY 2011	FY 2012	FY 2012	FY 2012	FY 2012
Decision Item	ACTUAL	ACTUAL	BUDGET	BUDGET	DEPT REQ	DEPT REQ	GOV REC	GOV REC
Budget Object Class	DOLLAR	FTE	DOLLAR	FTE	DOLLAR	FTE	DOLLAR	FTE
DRUG COURTS TRANSFER								
DRUG CT-Treatment Exp Transfer - 1100003								
TRANSFERS OUT	0	0.00	0	0.00	4,920,501	0.00	0	0.00
TOTAL - TRF	0	0.00	0	0.00	4,920,501	0.00	0	0.00
GRAND TOTAL	\$0	0.00	\$0	0.00	\$4,920,501	0.00	\$0	0.00
GENERAL REVENUE	\$0	0.00	\$0	0.00	\$4,920,501	0.00		0.00
FEDERAL FUNDS	\$0	0.00	\$0	0.00	\$0	0.00		0.00
OTHER FUNDS	\$0	0.00	\$0	0.00	\$0	0.00		0.00

JUDICIARY REPORT 9 FY2012 GOVERNOR RECOMMENDATION**DECISION ITEM SUMMARY**

Budget Unit								
Decision Item	FY 2010	FY 2010	FY 2011	FY 2011	FY 2012	FY 2012	FY 2012	FY 2012
Budget Object Summary	ACTUAL	ACTUAL	BUDGET	BUDGET	DEPT REQ	DEPT REQ	GOV REC	GOV REC
Fund	DOLLAR	FTE	DOLLAR	FTE	DOLLAR	FTE	DOLLAR	FTE
DRUG COURTS								
CORE								
PERSONAL SERVICES								
DRUG COURT RESOURCES	156,239	3.93	193,656	4.00	193,656	4.00	193,656	4.00
TOTAL - PS	156,239	3.93	193,656	4.00	193,656	4.00	193,656	4.00
EXPENSE & EQUIPMENT								
DRUG COURT RESOURCES	5,516,188	0.00	5,723,698	0.00	5,723,698	0.00	5,723,698	0.00
TOTAL - EE	5,516,188	0.00	5,723,698	0.00	5,723,698	0.00	5,723,698	0.00
TOTAL	5,672,427	3.93	5,917,354	4.00	5,917,354	4.00	5,917,354	4.00
DRUG CT-Treatment Expansion - 1100004								
EXPENSE & EQUIPMENT								
DRUG COURT RESOURCES	0	0.00	0	0.00	4,920,501	0.00	0	0.00
TOTAL - EE	0	0.00	0	0.00	4,920,501	0.00	0	0.00
TOTAL	0	0.00	0	0.00	4,920,501	0.00	0	0.00
GRAND TOTAL	\$5,672,427	3.93	\$5,917,354	4.00	\$10,837,855	4.00	\$5,917,354	4.00

CORE DECISION ITEM


Judiciary					Budget Unit <u>11120C</u>				
Drug Courts Coordinating Commission									
Core									
1. CORE FINANCIAL SUMMARY									
	FY 2012 Budget Request					FY 2012 Governor's Recommendation			
	GR	Federal	Other	Total		GR	Federal	Other	Total
PS	0	0	193,656	193,656	PS	0	0	193,656	193,656
EE	0	0	5,723,698 E	5,723,698 E	EE	0	0	5,723,698 E	5,723,698 E
PSD	0	0	0	0	PSD	0	0	0	0
Total	0	0	5,917,354 E	5,917,354 E	Total	0	0	5,917,354 E	5,917,354 E
FTE	0.00	0.00	4.00	4.00	FTE	0.00	0.00	4.00	4.00
Est. Fringe	0	0	107,770	107,770	Est. Fringe	0	0	107,770	107,770
<i>Note: Fringes budgeted in House Bill 5 except for certain fringes budgeted directly to MoDOT, Highway Patrol, and Conservation.</i>					<i>Note: Fringes budgeted in House Bill 5 except for certain fringes budgeted directly to MoDOT, Highway Patrol, and Conservation.</i>				
Other Funds: Drug Court Resources Fund (0733) - \$5,917,354					Other Funds: Drug Court Resources Fund (0733) - \$5,917,354				
2. CORE DESCRIPTION									
<p>Drug Courts, authorized in §478.001 - §478.009, RSMo, provide alternatives to incarceration, juvenile detention and long-term foster care for individuals that have issues with drug usage. The community based, team oriented programs provide an array of treatment and other services in order to meet the individual needs of the participants based upon a comprehensive assessment. The Drug Courts Coordinating Commission distributes funds from the Drug Court Resources fund to the drug court programs. During FY 2010, adult drug courts provided treatment for approximately 3,000 participants, with an approximate cost per participant of \$6,190 per year, which includes federal, state, and local funds. Currently, there are 41 circuits that operate 125 adult, juvenile, and family drug courts and DWI Courts. There are 9 Drug Courts currently in the planning process.</p>									
3. PROGRAM LISTING (list programs included in this core funding)									
Adjudication and Treatment (page 207)									

CORE DECISION ITEM

Judiciary	Budget Unit <u>11120C</u>
Drug Courts Coordinating Commission	
Core	

4. FINANCIAL HISTORY

	FY 2008 Actual	FY 2009 Actual	FY 2010 Actual	FY 2011 Current Yr.
Appropriation (All Funds)	5,860,410	5,917,354	5,917,354	5,917,354
Less Reverted (All Funds)	0	0	0	N/A
Budget Authority (All Funds)	5,860,410	5,917,354	5,917,354	N/A
Actual Expenditures (All Funds)	5,757,126	5,525,493	5,672,427	N/A
Unexpended (All Funds)	103,284	391,861	244,927	N/A
Unexpended, by Fund:				
General Revenue	0	0	0	N/A
Federal	0	0	0	N/A
Other	103,284	391,861	244,927	N/A



Reverted includes Governor's standard 3 percent reserve (when applicable) and any extraordinary withholdings.

NOTES:

CORE RECONCILIATION DETAIL

JUDICIARY
DRUG COURTS

5. CORE RECONCILIATION DETAIL

	Budget Class	FTE	GR	Federal	Other	Total	Explanation
TAFP AFTER VETOES							
	PS	4.00	0	0	193,656	193,656	
	EE	0.00	0	0	5,723,698	5,723,698	
	Total	4.00	0	0	5,917,354	5,917,354	
DEPARTMENT CORE REQUEST							
	PS	4.00	0	0	193,656	193,656	
	EE	0.00	0	0	5,723,698	5,723,698	
	Total	4.00	0	0	5,917,354	5,917,354	
GOVERNOR'S RECOMMENDED CORE							
	PS	4.00	0	0	193,656	193,656	
	EE	0.00	0	0	5,723,698	5,723,698	
	Total	4.00	0	0	5,917,354	5,917,354	

JUDICIARY REPORT 10 FY2012 GOVERNOR RECOMMENDATION

DECISION ITEM DETAIL

Budget Unit	FY 2010	FY 2010	FY 2011	FY 2011	FY 2012	FY 2012	FY 2012	FY 2012
Decision Item	ACTUAL	ACTUAL	BUDGET	BUDGET	DEPT REQ	DEPT REQ	GOV REC	GOV REC
Budget Object Class	DOLLAR	FTE	DOLLAR	FTE	DOLLAR	FTE	DOLLAR	FTE
DRUG COURTS								
CORE								
PROGRAM COORDINATOR I	52,200	1.00	57,864	1.00	57,864	1.00	57,864	1.00
PROGRAM SPECIALIST II	32,855	0.93	43,344	1.00	43,344	1.00	43,344	1.00
PROGRAM SPECIALIST III	39,468	1.00	49,104	1.00	49,104	1.00	49,104	1.00
SUPPORT TECHNICIAN III	31,716	1.00	43,344	1.00	43,344	1.00	43,344	1.00
TOTAL - PS	156,239	3.93	193,656	4.00	193,656	4.00	193,656	4.00
TRAVEL, IN-STATE	0	0.00	1,500	0.00	1,500	0.00	1,500	0.00
FUEL & UTILITIES	0	0.00	1,000	0.00	1,000	0.00	1,000	0.00
SUPPLIES	8,987	0.00	26,300	0.00	26,300	0.00	26,300	0.00
COMMUNICATION SERV & SUPP	0	0.00	3,000	0.00	3,000	0.00	3,000	0.00
PROFESSIONAL SERVICES	5,479,909	0.00	5,659,698	0.00	5,659,698	0.00	5,659,698	0.00
OFFICE EQUIPMENT	0	0.00	5,000	0.00	5,000	0.00	5,000	0.00
OTHER EQUIPMENT	0	0.00	5,800	0.00	5,800	0.00	5,800	0.00
BUILDING LEASE PAYMENTS	27,092	0.00	11,400	0.00	11,400	0.00	11,400	0.00
MISCELLANEOUS EXPENSES	200	0.00	10,000	0.00	10,000	0.00	10,000	0.00
TOTAL - EE	5,516,188	0.00	5,723,698	0.00	5,723,698	0.00	5,723,698	0.00
GRAND TOTAL	\$5,672,427	3.93	\$5,917,354	4.00	\$5,917,354	4.00	\$5,917,354	4.00
GENERAL REVENUE	\$0	0.00	\$0	0.00	\$0	0.00	\$0	0.00
FEDERAL FUNDS	\$0	0.00	\$0	0.00	\$0	0.00	\$0	0.00
OTHER FUNDS	\$5,672,427	3.93	\$5,917,354	4.00	\$5,917,354	4.00	\$5,917,354	4.00

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

Judiciary

Drug Courts Coordinating Commission

Adjudication and Treatment

	Circuit Courts	Drug Courts Coordinating Commission	Department of Public Safety	Total
GR	\$1,752,162	\$0	\$0	\$1,752,162
FEDERAL	\$0	\$0	\$450,000	\$450,000
OTHER	\$0	\$5,483,007	\$0	\$5,483,007
TOTAL	\$1,752,162	\$5,483,007	\$450,000	\$7,685,169

1. What does this program do?

Drug Courts:

- Provide a cost effective method to allow non-violent drug users to be diverted from incarceration in the state's prison system;
- Have a proven track record of improved program outcomes compared to regular probation or incarceration resulting in immediate cost avoidance and resulting in a lower recidivism rate;
- Allow non-violent offenders to remain active taxpayers in their communities or to obtain training or education so they are more employable at the time of graduation from drug court;
- Reduce the number of drug addicted babies being born;
- Decrease the negative consequences of drug abuse such as a reduction in the number cases filed involving family disputes, abuse and neglect, truancy, property crimes, domestic violence, and crimes of violence;
- Increase child support payments, number of families reunited, employment of those participating in drug court treatment plans, community service activity, and number of GEDs earned; and
- Reduce participant reliance on state and federal assistance programs like: Women, Infant and Children Services (WIC), Temporary Assistance to Needy Families (TANF), Food Stamps, Social Security Disability (SSD), and Social Security Income Benefits (SSI).
- Assist the Drug Courts Coordinating Commission in the administration of the drug court programs throughout the state; administer the methods and systems adopted by the Commission; and process the payment of state monies appropriated for the treatment programs.

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

Judiciary
Drug Courts Coordinating Commission
Adjudication and Treatment

2. What is the authorization for this program, i.e., federal or state statute, etc? (Include the federal program number, if applicable.)

§478.001 - §478.009, RSMo


3. Are there federal matching requirements? If yes, please explain.

No.

4. Is this a federally mandated program? If yes, please explain.

No.

5. Provide actual expenditures for the prior three fiscal years.




6. What are the sources of the "Other " funds?

Drug Court Resources Fund


PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

Judiciary
Drug Courts Coordinating Commission
Adjudication and Treatment

7a. Provide an effectiveness measure.





SSI - Social Security Income Benefits
 SSD - Social Security Disability
 TANF - Temporary Assistance to Needy Families
 WIC - Women, Infant and Children Services



PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

Judiciary
Drug Courts Coordinating Commission
Adjudication and Treatment



7b. Provide an efficiency measure.


	Number of Drug Court Participants	Drug Court Treatment Cost	Cost without Treatment	Potential Savings
Incarceration Cost Savings	2,660	\$16,465,400	\$43,379,280	\$26,913,880
Youth Service Savings	138	\$854,220	\$6,808,506	\$5,954,286

Drug treatment costs are estimated at \$6,190 per year. Department of Corrections FY 10 cost per inmate is \$16,308. Department of Youth Services FY 09 costs average \$49,337 per youth. It is anticipated that approximately 70% of the adults would spend some time in prison if they did not receive treatment through Drug Courts.

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

Judiciary						
Drug Courts Coordinating Commission						
Adjudication and Treatment						
7c. Provide the number of clients/individuals served (if applicable)						
	<u>Actual FY 07</u>	<u>Actual FY 08</u>	<u>Actual FY 09</u>	<u>Actual FY 10</u>	<u>Projected FY 11</u>	<u>Projected FY12</u>
Number of participants	3,000	3,248	2,806	3,022	3,500	3,800
Number of Drug Free Babies	45	43	58	48	N/A	N/A
7d. Provide a customer satisfaction measure, if available.						
N/A						

Missouri Treatment Courts



July 1, 2010

Treatment Court in Planning Stage

Current Treatment Court (as of July 1, 2010)

Current Treatment Court with a Drug Court Administrator

Current Treatment Court with a Drug Court Commissioner

Current Treatment Court with a Drug Court Administrator and Commissioner

**NEW DECISION ITEM
RANK: 5 OF 5**

Judiciary	Budget Unit <u>11120C</u>
Drug Courts Coordinating Commission	
Drug Court Treatment Expansion (#1100004)	

1. AMOUNT OF REQUEST

	FY 2012 Budget Request				FY 2012 Governor's Recommendation			
	GR	Federal	Other	Total	GR	Fed	Other	Total
PS	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
EE	0	0	4,920,501	4,920,501	0	0	0	0
PSD	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>4,920,501</u>	<u>4,920,501</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>
FTE	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00

Est. Fringe	0	0	0	0
--------------------	---	---	---	---

Note: Fringes budgeted in House Bill 5 except for certain fringes budgeted directly to MoDOT, Highway Patrol, and Conservation.

Est. Fringe	0	0	0	0
--------------------	---	---	---	---

Note: Fringes budgeted in House Bill 5 except for certain fringes budgeted directly to MoDOT, Highway Patrol, and Conservation.

Other Funds:

Other Funds:

2. THIS REQUEST CAN BE CATEGORIZED AS:

<input type="checkbox"/> New Legislation	<input type="checkbox"/> New Program	<input type="checkbox"/> Supplemental
<input type="checkbox"/> Federal Mandate	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Program Expansion	<input type="checkbox"/> Cost to Continue
<input type="checkbox"/> GR Pick-Up	<input type="checkbox"/> Space Request	<input type="checkbox"/> Equipment Replacement
<input type="checkbox"/> Pay Plan	<input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____	

3. WHY IS THIS FUNDING NEEDED? PROVIDE AN EXPLANATION FOR ITEMS CHECKED IN #2. INCLUDE THE FEDERAL OR STATE STATUTORY OR CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORIZATION FOR THIS PROGRAM.

Drug courts offer a court-supervised treatment program that has been successful in treating the addiction of drugs and alcohol. Drug courts are also a viable alternative to incarceration for non-violent, drug-related offenders. They also result in significant cost avoidance to the Department of Corrections. The last study on the average cost per participant in drug courts showed an annual cost per participant of \$6,190 while the current cost for incarceration of an inmate is \$16,308 per year. As a result of the state's investment in drug courts, Missouri has a core treatment appropriation of \$5,483,008 that is allocated by the Drug Courts Coordinating Commission to local drug courts for treatment services. This allocation is distributed based upon an annual competitive request for proposals. For FY 11, local drug courts requested \$10,403,509 from the Commission. That leaves a requested need of \$4,920,501. These funds will allow drug courts to operate at or near capacity to maximize the benefits of drug courts. Drug courts are authorized in §478.001 - §478.009, RSMo.

**NEW DECISION ITEM
RANK: 5 OF 5**

Judiciary	Budget Unit <u>11120C</u>
Drug Courts Coordinating Commission	
Drug Court Treatment Expansion (#1100004)	

4. DESCRIBE THE DETAILED ASSUMPTIONS USED TO DERIVE THE SPECIFIC REQUESTED AMOUNT. (How did you determine that the requested number of FTE were appropriate? From what source or standard did you derive the requested levels of funding? Were alternatives such as outsourcing or automation considered? If based on new legislation, does request tie to TAFP fiscal note? If not, explain why. Detail which portions of the request are one-times and how those amounts were calculated.)

Please see page 219 for a breakdown of the history of FY 11 requests and awards by drug court applicant.

5. BREAK DOWN THE REQUEST BY BUDGET OBJECT CLASS, JOB CLASS, AND FUND SOURCE. IDENTIFY ONE-TIME COSTS.

	Dept Req GR DOLLARS	Dept Req GR FTE	Dept Req FED DOLLARS	Dept Req FED FTE	Dept Req OTHER DOLLARS	Dept Req OTHER FTE	Dept Req TOTAL DOLLARS	Dept Req TOTAL FTE	Dept Req One-Time DOLLARS
Total PS	<u>0</u>	0.0	<u>0</u>	0.0	<u>0</u>	0.0	<u>0</u>	0.0	<u>0</u>
							0		
							0		
							0		
Professional Services					4,920,501		4,920,501		
Total EE	<u>0</u>		<u>0</u>		<u>4,920,501</u>		<u>4,920,501</u>		<u>0</u>
Program Distributions							0		
Total PSD	<u>0</u>		<u>0</u>		<u>0</u>		<u>0</u>		<u>0</u>
Grand Total	<u>0</u>	0.0	<u>0</u>	0.0	4,920,501	0.0	4,920,501	0.0	<u>0</u>

**NEW DECISION ITEM
RANK: 5 OF 5**


Judiciary		Budget Unit 11120C							
Drug Courts Coordinating Commission									
Drug Court Treatment Expansion (#1100004)									
Budget Object Class/Job Class	Gov Rec GR DOLLARS	Gov Rec GR FTE	Gov Rec FED DOLLARS	Gov Rec FED FTE	Gov Rec OTHER DOLLARS	Gov Rec OTHER FTE	Gov Rec TOTAL DOLLARS	Gov Rec TOTAL FTE	Gov Rec One-Time DOLLARS
Total PS	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>0</u>
Professional Services							0		
Total EE	<u>0</u>		<u>0</u>		<u>0</u>		<u>0</u>		<u>0</u>
Program Distributions							0		
Total PSD	<u>0</u>		<u>0</u>		<u>0</u>		<u>0</u>		<u>0</u>
Grand Total	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>0</u>

NEW DECISION ITEM
RANK: 5 OF 5


Judiciary	Budget Unit <u>11120C</u>
Drug Courts Coordinating Commission	
Drug Court Treatment Expansion (#1100004)	

6. PERFORMANCE MEASURES (If new decision item has an associated core, separately identify projected performance with & without additional

6a. Provide an effectiveness measure.





SSI - Social Security Income Benefits
 SSD - Social Security Disability
 TANF - Temporary Assistance to Needy Families
 WIC - Women, Infant and Children Services



**NEW DECISION ITEM
RANK: 5 OF 5**

Judiciary
Drug Courts Coordinating Commission
Drug Court Treatment Expansion (#1100004)

Budget Unit 11120C



6b. Provide an efficiency measure.

	Number of Drug Court Participants	Drug Court Treatment Cost	Cost without Treatment	Potential Savings
Incarceration Cost Savings	2,660	\$16,465,400	\$43,379,280	\$26,913,880
Youth Service Savings	138	\$854,220	\$6,808,506	\$5,954,286

Drug treatment costs are estimated at \$6,190 per year. Department of Corrections FY 10 cost per inmate is \$16,308. Department of Youth Services FY 09 costs average \$49,337 per youth. It is anticipated that approximately 70% of the adults would spend some time in prison if they did not receive treatment through Drug Courts.

NEW DECISION ITEM
RANK: 5 OF 5

Judiciary		Budget Unit	11120C
Drug Courts Coordinating Commission			
Drug Court Treatment Expansion (#1100004)			
6c.	Provide the number of clients/individuals served, if applicable.	6d.	Provide a customer satisfaction measure, if available.
	3,500 participants projected for FY 11		N/A
7. STRATEGIES TO ACHIEVE THE PERFORMANCE MEASUREMENT TARGETS:			
Expand the funds available to the Drug Courts Coordinating Commission for award to local drug courts, allowing increased capacity for new non-violent offenders into this successful alternative sentencing program.			

Fiscal Year 2011 DCCC Fund Award Recommendations as of January 18, 2011

Cir.	County	Type of Drug Court	FY 11 Court Requests	FY 11 DCCC Allocations	ARRA Allocations
1	Clark	Adult	\$ 76,897.59	\$ 53,737.94	
2	Adair	Adult	\$ 101,837.00	\$ 48,500.00	
2	Lewis	Adult	\$ 24,660.00	\$ 24,518.08	
3	Grundy, Harrison, Mercer and Putnam	Adult	\$ 96,385.56	\$ 44,500.00	
4	Atchison, Gentry, Holt, Nodaway and Worth	Adult	\$ 64,176.40	\$ 45,347.03	
5	Buchanan	Adult/DWI	\$ 283,391.99	\$ 282,054.55	
7	Clay	Adult	\$ 325,335.00	\$ 17,544.74	
9	Linn and Sullivan	Adult	\$ 86,738.00	\$ 39,500.00	
10	Marion	Adult	\$ 36,288.11	\$ 29,754.85	
11	St. Charles	Family	\$ 37,847.00	\$ 37,847.00	
11	St. Charles	Adult/DWI	\$ 771,240.00	\$ 323,953.43	\$ 75,000.00
11	St. Charles	Reintegration	\$ 17,328.00	\$ -	
12	Audrain, Montgomery and Warren	Adult/DWI	\$ 296,816.00	\$ 78,041.56	\$ 25,000.00
13	Boone and Callaway	Adult/DWI	\$ 334,200.00	\$ 310,102.07	
13	Boone	Reintegration	\$ 200,725.00	\$ 193,126.97	
14	Randolph	Adult	\$ 36,783.40	\$ 29,383.54	
15	Lafayette and Saline	Adult	\$ 178,800.00	\$ 88,211.79	
16	Jackson	Adult	\$ 360,675.00	\$ 205,539.36	
16	Jackson	Reintegration	\$ 151,200.00	\$ -	
16	Jackson	Juvenile and Family	\$ 133,616.00	\$ 65,715.00	
17	Cass	Adult	\$ 156,123.00	\$ 71,524.41	
19	Cole	Adult	\$ 82,442.00	\$ 82,725.43	
19	Cole	Juvenile	\$ 68,300.00	\$ 30,550.16	
20	Gasconade, Franklin and Osage	Adult/DWI	\$ 395,469.00	\$ 151,704.13	\$ 75,000.00
21	St. Louis	Adult	\$ 340,080.69	\$ 339,227.95	
21	St. Louis	Family	\$ 70,100.00	\$ 38,115.00	
22	St. Louis City	Consolidated	\$ 695,958.00	\$ 604,933.88	
23	Jefferson	Juvenile and Family	\$ 46,875.70	\$ 51,875.00	
23	Jefferson	Adult/DWI	\$ 101,618.09	\$ 45,981.97	\$ 50,000.00
24	Madison, St. Francois, Ste. Genevieve and Washington	Adult	\$ 97,425.00	\$ 58,000.00	
25	Pheleps, Pulaski and Texas	Adult	\$ 100,000.00	\$ 45,000.00	
27	Bates, Henry and St. Clair	Adult	\$ 199,385.54	\$ 30,000.00	
28	Barton, Cedar and Vernon	Adult	\$ 164,732.00	\$ 135,662.31	
29	Jasper	Adult	\$ 40,374.63	\$ 40,374.63	
30	Benton	Adult	\$ 1,290.00	\$ 1,168.00	
30	Polk	Adult	\$ 83,249.05	\$ 52,959.07	
30	Webster	Adult	\$ 59,674.00	\$ 43,479.55	
31	Greene	Juvenile and Family	\$ 253,101.40	\$ 96,710.22	
31	Greene	Adult/DWI	\$ 1,203,363.00	\$ 381,655.85	\$ 150,000.00
32	Cape Girardeau and Perry	Consolidated	\$ 311,700.00	\$ 140,888.73	
33	Mississippi and Scott	Consolidated	\$ 116,565.00	\$ 67,500.00	
35	Dunklin and Stoddard	Consolidated	\$ 474,062.00	\$ 176,108.82	
36	Butler and Ripley	Adult/DWI	\$ 138,100.00	\$ 68,096.45	\$ 50,000.00
37	Carter, Howell, Oregon and Shannon	Consolidated	\$ 42,400.00	\$ 38,450.00	
38	Christian and Taney	Adult	\$ 245,348.00	\$ 137,750.90	
39	Stone	Adult and Juvenile	\$ 293,917.20	\$ 136,755.72	
39	Barry	Adult	\$ 144,913.92	\$ 15,000.00	
40	McDonald and Newton	Consolidated	\$ 171,766.20	\$ 131,763.02	
41	Macon and Shelby	Adult	\$ 36,685.96	\$ 30,500.00	
42	Crawford, Dent, Iron and Wayne	Adult	\$ 314,314.15	\$ 174,248.62	
44	Douglas, Ozark and Wright	Adult and Juvenile	\$ 136,044.60	\$ 94,419.78	
45	Lincoln and Pike	Consolidated	\$ 203,192.00	\$ 52,500.00	\$ 50,000.00
	Total		\$ 10,403,509.18	\$ 5,483,007.51	\$ 475,000.00

JUDICIARY REPORT 10 FY2012 GOVERNOR RECOMMENDATION

DECISION ITEM DETAIL

Budget Unit	FY 2010	FY 2010	FY 2011	FY 2011	FY 2012	FY 2012	FY 2012	FY 2012
Decision Item	ACTUAL	ACTUAL	BUDGET	BUDGET	DEPT REQ	DEPT REQ	GOV REC	GOV REC
Budget Object Class	DOLLAR	FTE	DOLLAR	FTE	DOLLAR	FTE	DOLLAR	FTE
DRUG COURTS								
DRUG CT-Treatment Expansion - 1100004								
PROFESSIONAL SERVICES	0	0.00	0	0.00	4,920,501	0.00	0	0.00
TOTAL - EE	0	0.00	0	0.00	4,920,501	0.00	0	0.00
GRAND TOTAL	\$0	0.00	\$0	0.00	\$4,920,501	0.00	\$0	0.00
GENERAL REVENUE	\$0	0.00	\$0	0.00	\$0	0.00		0.00
FEDERAL FUNDS	\$0	0.00	\$0	0.00	\$0	0.00		0.00
OTHER FUNDS	\$0	0.00	\$0	0.00	\$4,920,501	0.00		0.00

“THIS PAGE WAS INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK.”

**COMM. RET. REM.
& DISC.**

JUDICIARY REPORT 9 FY2012 GOVERNOR RECOMMENDATION
DECISION ITEM SUMMARY

Budget Unit								
Decision Item	FY 2010	FY 2010	FY 2011	FY 2011	FY 2012	FY 2012	FY 2012	FY 2012
Budget Object Summary	ACTUAL	ACTUAL	BUDGET	BUDGET	DEPT REQ	DEPT REQ	GOV REC	GOV REC
Fund	DOLLAR	FTE	DOLLAR	FTE	DOLLAR	FTE	DOLLAR	FTE
COMM ON RETIR. DISCPL & REMOV								
CORE								
PERSONAL SERVICES								
GENERAL REVENUE	164,151	2.01	177,977	2.75	177,977	2.75	177,977	2.75
TOTAL - PS	164,151	2.01	177,977	2.75	177,977	2.75	177,977	2.75
EXPENSE & EQUIPMENT								
GENERAL REVENUE	33,420	0.00	42,667	0.00	42,667	0.00	42,667	0.00
TOTAL - EE	33,420	0.00	42,667	0.00	42,667	0.00	42,667	0.00
TOTAL	197,571	2.01	220,644	2.75	220,644	2.75	220,644	2.75
GRAND TOTAL	\$197,571	2.01	\$220,644	2.75	\$220,644	2.75	\$220,644	2.75

CORE DECISION ITEM


Judiciary					Budget Unit <u>15004C</u>				
Commission on Retirement, Removal and Discipline									
Core									
1. CORE FINANCIAL SUMMARY									
	FY 2012 Budget Request					FY 2012 Governor's Recommendation			
	GR	Federal	Other	Total		GR	Federal	Other	Total
PS	177,977	0	0	177,977	PS	177,977	0	0	177,977
EE	42,667	0	0	42,667	EE	42,667	0	0	42,667
PSD	0	0	0	0	PSD	0	0	0	0
Total	220,644	0	0	220,644	Total	220,644	0	0	220,644
FTE	2.75	0.00	0.00	2.75	FTE	2.75	0.00	0.00	2.75
Est. Fringe	99,044	0	0	99,044	Est. Fringe	99,044	0	0	99,044
<i>Note: Fringes budgeted in House Bill 5 except for certain fringes budgeted directly to MoDOT, Highway Patrol, and Conservation.</i>					<i>Note: Fringes budgeted in House Bill 5 except for certain fringes budgeted directly to MoDOT, Highway Patrol, and Conservation.</i>				
Other Funds:					Other Funds:				
2. CORE DESCRIPTION									
<p>Article V, Section 24(2) of the Missouri Constitution requires the retirement of a judge who is found to be unable to perform his or her duties because of permanent sickness or a physical or mental infirmity. Under Article V, Section 24(3), a judge may be reprimanded, disciplined, suspended, or removed for misconduct or incompetence in office.</p> <p>Under Missouri Supreme Court Rule 12, the Commission on Retirement, Removal, and Discipline must investigate all complaints and requests except those which are obviously unfounded or without merit.</p> <p>The Commission consists of two non-lawyers appointed by the Governor, two lawyers appointed by the governing body of the Missouri Bar, one judge of the Court of Appeals chosen by a majority of the court's judges, and one circuit judge selected by a majority of the state's circuit judges. The number of judges under the Commission's jurisdiction is approximately 750. An administrator/counsel, a part-time investigator, and clerical support enable the Commission to perform its constitutional responsibilities.</p>									
3. PROGRAM LISTING (list programs included in this core funding)									
There are no programs included in this core funding.									

CORE DECISION ITEM

Judiciary	Budget Unit <u>15004C</u>
Commission on Retirement, Removal and Discipline	
Core	

4. FINANCIAL HISTORY

	FY 2008 Actual	FY 2009 Actual	FY 2010 Actual	FY 2011 Current Yr.
Appropriation (All Funds)	215,461	220,644	220,644	220,644
Less Reverted (All Funds)	0	(8,295)	0	N/A
Budget Authority (All Funds)	215,461	212,349	220,644	N/A
Actual Expenditures (All Funds)	201,379	206,533	197,571	N/A
Unexpended (All Funds)	14,082	5,816	23,073	N/A
Unexpended, by Fund:				
General Revenue	14,082	5,816	23,073	N/A
Federal	0	0	0	N/A
Other	0	0	0	N/A



Reverted includes Governor's standard 3 percent reserve (when applicable) and any extraordinary withholdings.

NOTES:

CORE RECONCILIATION DETAIL

JUDICIARY**COMM ON RETIR. DISCPL & REMOV**

5. CORE RECONCILIATION DETAIL

	Budget Class	FTE	GR	Federal	Other	Total	Explanation
TAFP AFTER VETOES							
	PS	2.75	177,977	0	0	177,977	
	EE	0.00	42,667	0	0	42,667	
	Total	2.75	220,644	0	0	220,644	
DEPARTMENT CORE REQUEST							
	PS	2.75	177,977	0	0	177,977	
	EE	0.00	42,667	0	0	42,667	
	Total	2.75	220,644	0	0	220,644	
GOVERNOR'S RECOMMENDED CORE							
	PS	2.75	177,977	0	0	177,977	
	EE	0.00	42,667	0	0	42,667	
	Total	2.75	220,644	0	0	220,644	

FLEXIBILITY REQUEST FORM

BUDGET UNIT NUMBER 15004C		DEPARTMENT: Judiciary	
BUDGET UNIT NAME: Comm. on Retirement, Removal, and Discipline		DIVISION: Comm. on Retirement, Removal, and Discipline	
<p>1. Provide the amount by fund of personal service flexibility and the amount by fund of expense and equipment flexibility you are requesting in dollar and percentage terms and explain why the flexibility is needed. If flexibility is being requested among divisions, provide the amount by fund of flexibility you are requesting in dollar and percentage terms and explain why the flexibility is needed.</p>			
DEPARTMENT REQUEST			
	General Revenue		
PS	\$ 16,393	10%	
E&E	\$ 4,267	10%	
<p>2. Estimate how much flexibility will be used for the budget year. How much flexibility was used in the Prior Year Budget and the Current Year Budget? Please specify the amount.</p>			
PRIOR YEAR ACTUAL AMOUNT OF FLEXIBILITY USED	CURRENT YEAR ESTIMATED AMOUNT OF FLEXIBILITY THAT WILL BE USED	BUDGET REQUEST ESTIMATED AMOUNT OF FLEXIBILITY THAT WILL BE USED	
No flexibility was used in FY 10.	HB 12.365 language allows for up to 10% flexibility between personal service and expense and equipment. The Commission on Retirement, Removal, and Discipline does not have an estimate of the amount of that flexibility that might be used in be used in FY 11.	10% flexibility is being requested for FY 12. The Commission on Retirement, Removal, and Discipline does not have an estimate on the amount of flexibility that might be used if approved.	
<p>3. Please explain how flexibility was used in the prior and/or current years.</p>			
PRIOR YEAR EXPLAIN ACTUAL USE	CURRENT YEAR EXPLAIN PLANNED USE		
No flexibility was used in FY 10.	The Commission on Retirement, Removal, and Discipline does not have an estimate of the amount of the available 10% flexibility that will be used in FY 11.		

COMMISSION ON RETIREMENT, REMOVAL, AND DISCIPLINE

	<u>FY 06</u>	<u>FY 07</u>	<u>FY 08</u>	<u>FY 09</u>	<u>FY 10</u>
Complaints received in reported year (including ethic complaints and disability matters)	212	198	194	203	247
Complaints dismissed without investigation for lack of merit	154	165	152	206	206
Complaints dismissed after investigation	16	20	15	30	23
Complaints dismissed after judge resigned	1	0	2	1	3
Complaints dismissed with an informal reprimand or cease and desist order	10	10	4	4	4
Complaints dismissed after formal hearing	0	0	0	0	0
Formal hearing where suspension without pay or formal reprimand was final sanction	1	0	0	0	0
Formal hearing where judge retired on disability	1	0	0	0	0
Formal hearing where removal was final sanction	0	0	0	0	0
Consolidated complaints/dispositions	0	0	0	3	0
Formal Opinions issued	0	0	0	1	1
Requests for formal Opinions denied or an informal Opinion issued	4	4	4	2	6

JUDICIARY REPORT 10 FY2012 GOVERNOR RECOMMENDATION

DECISION ITEM DETAIL

Budget Unit	FY 2010	FY 2010	FY 2011	FY 2011	FY 2012	FY 2012	FY 2012	FY 2012
Decision Item	ACTUAL	ACTUAL	BUDGET	BUDGET	DEPT REQ	DEPT REQ	GOV REC	GOV REC
Budget Object Class	DOLLAR	FTE	DOLLAR	FTE	DOLLAR	FTE	DOLLAR	FTE
COMM ON RETIR. DISCPL & REMOV								
CORE								
ADMINISTRATIVE SECRETARY	43,344	1.00	43,441	1.25	43,441	1.25	43,441	1.25
CRRD COUNSEL	120,484	1.00	120,484	1.00	120,484	1.00	120,484	1.00
INVESTIGATOR	323	0.01	14,052	0.50	14,052	0.50	14,052	0.50
TOTAL - PS	164,151	2.01	177,977	2.75	177,977	2.75	177,977	2.75
TRAVEL, IN-STATE	430	0.00	4,000	0.00	4,000	0.00	4,000	0.00
TRAVEL, OUT-OF-STATE	0	0.00	200	0.00	200	0.00	200	0.00
SUPPLIES	6,115	0.00	5,607	0.00	5,607	0.00	5,607	0.00
PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT	415	0.00	1,300	0.00	1,300	0.00	1,300	0.00
COMMUNICATION SERV & SUPP	6,029	0.00	6,404	0.00	6,404	0.00	6,404	0.00
PROFESSIONAL SERVICES	0	0.00	100	0.00	100	0.00	100	0.00
M&R SERVICES	313	0.00	1,000	0.00	1,000	0.00	1,000	0.00
COMPUTER EQUIPMENT	0	0.00	1,600	0.00	1,600	0.00	1,600	0.00
OFFICE EQUIPMENT	118	0.00	396	0.00	396	0.00	396	0.00
BUILDING LEASE PAYMENTS	20,000	0.00	20,652	0.00	20,652	0.00	20,652	0.00
EQUIPMENT RENTALS & LEASES	0	0.00	812	0.00	812	0.00	812	0.00
MISCELLANEOUS EXPENSES	0	0.00	596	0.00	596	0.00	596	0.00
TOTAL - EE	33,420	0.00	42,667	0.00	42,667	0.00	42,667	0.00
GRAND TOTAL	\$197,571	2.01	\$220,644	2.75	\$220,644	2.75	\$220,644	2.75
GENERAL REVENUE	\$197,571	2.01	\$220,644	2.75	\$220,644	2.75	\$220,644	2.75
FEDERAL FUNDS	\$0	0.00	\$0	0.00	\$0	0.00	\$0	0.00
OTHER FUNDS	\$0	0.00	\$0	0.00	\$0	0.00	\$0	0.00

“THIS PAGE WAS INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK.”

JUDICIARY REPORT 9 FY2012 GOVERNOR RECOMMENDATION
DECISION ITEM SUMMARY

Budget Unit								
Decision Item	FY 2010	FY 2010	FY 2011	FY 2011	FY 2012	FY 2012	FY 2012	FY 2012
Budget Object Summary	ACTUAL	ACTUAL	BUDGET	BUDGET	DEPT REQ	DEPT REQ	GOV REC	GOV REC
Fund	DOLLAR	FTE	DOLLAR	FTE	DOLLAR	FTE	DOLLAR	FTE
APPELLATE JUDICIAL COMM								
CORE								
EXPENSE & EQUIPMENT								
GENERAL REVENUE	3,390	0.00	7,741	0.00	7,741	0.00	7,741	0.00
TOTAL - EE	3,390	0.00	7,741	0.00	7,741	0.00	7,741	0.00
TOTAL	3,390	0.00	7,741	0.00	7,741	0.00	7,741	0.00
GRAND TOTAL	\$3,390	0.00	\$7,741	0.00	\$7,741	0.00	\$7,741	0.00

CORE DECISION ITEM

Judiciary	Budget Unit <u>15050C</u>
Appellate Judicial Commission	
Core	

1. CORE FINANCIAL SUMMARY

	FY 2012 Budget Request					FY 2012 Governor's Recommendation			
	GR	Federal	Other	Total		GR	Federal	Other	Total
PS	0	0	0	0	PS	0	0	0	0
EE	7,741	0	0	7,741	EE	7,741	0	0	7,741
PSD	0	0	0	0	PSD	0	0	0	0
Total	7,741	0	0	7,741	Total	7,741	0	0	7,741
FTE	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	FTE	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00

Est. Fringe	0	0	0	0
--------------------	---	---	---	---

Note: Fringes budgeted in House Bill 5 except for certain fringes budgeted directly to MoDOT, Highway Patrol, and Conservation.

Est. Fringe	0	0	0	0
--------------------	---	---	---	---

Note: Fringes budgeted in House Bill 5 except for certain fringes budgeted directly to MoDOT, Highway Patrol, and Conservation.

Other Funds: _____

2. CORE DESCRIPTION

Article V, Section 25(d) of the Missouri Constitution establishes the duty of the Appellate Judicial Commission as nominating candidates for vacancies on the Supreme Court and the Court of Appeals. This constitutional mandate includes the election of an attorney to serve on the Commission, conducted in one of the three Districts of the Court of Appeals on a rotating basis, every two years. The most recent election was conducted in FY 10. The Commission meets only when a vacancy occurs and it is necessary to make nominations to the Governor. Commission members do not receive salaries, but funds are needed to pay travel and operation expenses necessary for the work of the Commission.

3. PROGRAM LISTING (list programs included in this core funding)


No programs are included in this core funding.

CORE DECISION ITEM

Judiciary	Budget Unit <u>15050C</u>
Appellate Judicial Commission	
Core	

4. FINANCIAL HISTORY

	FY 2008 Actual	FY 2009 Actual	FY 2010 Actual	FY 2010 Current Yr.
Appropriation (All Funds)	7,741	7,741	7,741	7,741
Less Reverted (All Funds)	0	0	0	N/A
Budget Authority (All Funds)	7,741	7,741	7,741	N/A
Actual Expenditures (All Funds)	7,740	7,436	3,390	N/A
Unexpended (All Funds)	1	305	4,351	N/A
Unexpended, by Fund:				
General Revenue	1	305	4,351	N/A
Federal	0	0	0	N/A
Other	0	0	0	N/A



Reverted includes Governor's standard 3 percent reserve (when applicable) and any extraordinary withholdings.

NOTES:

CORE RECONCILIATION DETAIL

JUDICIARY
APPELLATE JUDICIAL COMM

5. CORE RECONCILIATION DETAIL

	Budget Class	FTE	GR	Federal	Other	Total	Explanation
TAFP AFTER VETOES	EE	0.00	7,741	0	0	7,741	
	Total	0.00	7,741	0	0	7,741	
DEPARTMENT CORE REQUEST	EE	0.00	7,741	0	0	7,741	
	Total	0.00	7,741	0	0	7,741	
GOVERNOR'S RECOMMENDED CORE	EE	0.00	7,741	0	0	7,741	
	Total	0.00	7,741	0	0	7,741	

JUDICIARY REPORT 10 FY2012 GOVERNOR RECOMMENDATION

DECISION ITEM DETAIL

Budget Unit	FY 2010	FY 2010	FY 2011	FY 2011	FY 2012	FY 2012	FY 2012	FY 2012
Decision Item	ACTUAL	ACTUAL	BUDGET	BUDGET	DEPT REQ	DEPT REQ	GOV REC	GOV REC
Budget Object Class	DOLLAR	FTE	DOLLAR	FTE	DOLLAR	FTE	DOLLAR	FTE
APPELLATE JUDICIAL COMM								
CORE								
TRAVEL, IN-STATE	2,546	0.00	3,000	0.00	3,000	0.00	3,000	0.00
SUPPLIES	68	0.00	500	0.00	500	0.00	500	0.00
COMMUNICATION SERV & SUPP	0	0.00	100	0.00	100	0.00	100	0.00
PROFESSIONAL SERVICES	0	0.00	3,391	0.00	3,391	0.00	3,391	0.00
MISCELLANEOUS EXPENSES	776	0.00	750	0.00	750	0.00	750	0.00
TOTAL - EE	3,390	0.00	7,741	0.00	7,741	0.00	7,741	0.00
GRAND TOTAL	\$3,390	0.00	\$7,741	0.00	\$7,741	0.00	\$7,741	0.00
GENERAL REVENUE	\$3,390	0.00	\$7,741	0.00	\$7,741	0.00	\$7,741	0.00
FEDERAL FUNDS	\$0	0.00	\$0	0.00	\$0	0.00	\$0	0.00
OTHER FUNDS	\$0	0.00	\$0	0.00	\$0	0.00	\$0	0.00

“THIS PAGE WAS INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK.”

JUDICIARY REPORT 9 FY2012 GOVERNOR RECOMMENDATION**DECISION ITEM SUMMARY**

Budget Unit								
Decision Item	FY 2010	FY 2010	FY 2011	FY 2011	FY 2012	FY 2012	FY 2012	FY 2012
Budget Object Summary	ACTUAL	ACTUAL	BUDGET	BUDGET	DEPT REQ	DEPT REQ	GOV REC	GOV REC
Fund	DOLLAR	FTE	DOLLAR	FTE	DOLLAR	FTE	DOLLAR	FTE
SENTENCING COMMISSION								
CORE								
PERSONAL SERVICES								
GENERAL REVENUE	35,316	1.00	35,316	1.00	35,316	1.00	35,316	1.00
TOTAL - PS	35,316	1.00	35,316	1.00	35,316	1.00	35,316	1.00
EXPENSE & EQUIPMENT								
GENERAL REVENUE	24,862	0.00	43,667	0.00	43,667	0.00	43,667	0.00
TOTAL - EE	24,862	0.00	43,667	0.00	43,667	0.00	43,667	0.00
TOTAL	60,178	1.00	78,983	1.00	78,983	1.00	78,983	1.00
GRAND TOTAL	\$60,178	1.00	\$78,983	1.00	\$78,983	1.00	\$78,983	1.00

CORE DECISION ITEM


Judiciary					Budget Unit 15060C				
Sentencing Commission									
Core									
1. CORE FINANCIAL SUMMARY									
FY 2012 Budget Request					FY 2012 Governor's Recommendation				
	GR	Federal	Other	Total		GR	Federal	Other	Total
PS	35,316	0	0	35,316	PS	35,316	0	0	35,316
EE	43,667	0	0	43,667	EE	43,667	0	0	43,667
PSD	0	0	0	0	PSD	0	0	0	0
Total	78,983	0	0	78,983	Total	78,983	0	0	78,983
FTE	1.00	0.00	0.00	1.00	FTE	1.00	0.00	0.00	1.00
Est. Fringe	19,653	0	0	19,653	Est. Fringe	19,653	0	0	19,653
<i>Note: Fringes budgeted in House Bill 5 except for certain fringes budgeted directly to MoDOT, Highway Patrol, and Conservation.</i>					<i>Note: Fringes budgeted in House Bill 5 except for certain fringes budgeted directly to MoDOT, Highway Patrol, and Conservation.</i>				
Other Funds:					Other Funds:				
2. CORE DESCRIPTION									
<p>The Sentencing Study Commission was created in House Bill 974 in 1990, and the Sentencing Advisory Commission was established in Senate Bill 763 in 1994. In 2003, Senate Bill 5 revised the Commission, creating new deadlines and responsibilities. In accordance with §558.019.6, RSMo, the Sentencing Advisory Commission is required to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Study and evaluate sentencing disparity; • Establish and distribute a system of recommended sentences; • Study alternative sentencing and prepare a feasibility study; and • Publish, distribute, and revise recommended sentences every two years. 									
3. PROGRAM LISTING (list programs included in this core funding)									
No programs are included in this core funding.									

CORE DECISION ITEM

Judiciary	Budget Unit 15060C
Sentencing Commission	
Core	

4. FINANCIAL HISTORY

	FY 2008 Actual	FY 2009 Actual	FY 2010 Actual	FY 2011 Current Yr.
Appropriation (All Funds)	77,954	78,983	78,983	78,983
Less Reverted (All Funds)	0	(17,043)	0	N/A
Budget Authority (All Funds)	77,954	61,940	78,983	N/A
Actual Expenditures (All Funds)	77,911	61,940	60,178	N/A
Unexpended (All Funds)	43	0	18,805	N/A
Unexpended, by Fund:				
General Revenue	43	0	18,805	N/A
Federal	0	0	0	N/A
Other	0	0	0	N/A



Reverted includes Governor's standard 3 percent reserve (when applicable) and any extraordinary withholdings.

NOTES:

CORE RECONCILIATION DETAIL

JUDICIARY
SENTENCING COMMISSION

5. CORE RECONCILIATION DETAIL

	Budget Class	FTE	GR	Federal	Other	Total	Explanation
TAFP AFTER VETOES							
	PS	1.00	35,316	0	0	35,316	
	EE	0.00	43,667	0	0	43,667	
	Total	1.00	78,983	0	0	78,983	
DEPARTMENT CORE REQUEST							
	PS	1.00	35,316	0	0	35,316	
	EE	0.00	43,667	0	0	43,667	
	Total	1.00	78,983	0	0	78,983	
GOVERNOR'S RECOMMENDED CORE							
	PS	1.00	35,316	0	0	35,316	
	EE	0.00	43,667	0	0	43,667	
	Total	1.00	78,983	0	0	78,983	

JUDICIARY REPORT 10 FY2012 GOVERNOR RECOMMENDATION

DECISION ITEM DETAIL

Budget Unit	FY 2010	FY 2010	FY 2011	FY 2011	FY 2012	FY 2012	FY 2012	FY 2012
Decision Item	ACTUAL	ACTUAL	BUDGET	BUDGET	DEPT REQ	DEPT REQ	GOV REC	GOV REC
Budget Object Class	DOLLAR	FTE	DOLLAR	FTE	DOLLAR	FTE	DOLLAR	FTE
SENTENCING COMMISSION								
CORE								
PROGRAM SPECIALIST II	35,316	1.00	35,316	1.00	35,316	1.00	35,316	1.00
TOTAL - PS	35,316	1.00	35,316	1.00	35,316	1.00	35,316	1.00
TRAVEL, IN-STATE	8,717	0.00	2,000	0.00	2,000	0.00	2,000	0.00
TRAVEL, OUT-OF-STATE	5,497	0.00	5,000	0.00	5,000	0.00	5,000	0.00
SUPPLIES	42	0.00	2,925	0.00	2,925	0.00	2,925	0.00
PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT	5,545	0.00	450	0.00	450	0.00	450	0.00
COMMUNICATION SERV & SUPP	357	0.00	1,000	0.00	1,000	0.00	1,000	0.00
PROFESSIONAL SERVICES	4,510	0.00	29,292	0.00	29,292	0.00	29,292	0.00
BUILDING LEASE PAYMENTS	0	0.00	2,500	0.00	2,500	0.00	2,500	0.00
MISCELLANEOUS EXPENSES	194	0.00	500	0.00	500	0.00	500	0.00
TOTAL - EE	24,862	0.00	43,667	0.00	43,667	0.00	43,667	0.00
GRAND TOTAL	\$60,178	1.00	\$78,983	1.00	\$78,983	1.00	\$78,983	1.00
GENERAL REVENUE	\$60,178	1.00	\$78,983	1.00	\$78,983	1.00	\$78,983	1.00
FEDERAL FUNDS	\$0	0.00	\$0	0.00	\$0	0.00	\$0	0.00
OTHER FUNDS	\$0	0.00	\$0	0.00	\$0	0.00	\$0	0.00

“THIS PAGE WAS INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK.”

FUND FINANCIAL SUMMARIES

**STATE OF MISSOURI
FUND FINANCIAL SUMMARY**

DEPARTMENT: Judiciary
FUND NAME: Judiciary - Federal
FUND NUMBER: 0137

Statute _____
 Constitution _____

Administratively Created
 Interest Deposited To Fund

Subject To Biennial Sweep
 Subject to Other Sweeps (see notes)

	FY 2009 ADJUSTED APPROP	FY 2009 ACTUAL SPENDING	FY 2010 ADJUSTED APPROP	FY 2011 REQUESTED	FY 2011 GOVERNOR RECOMMEND
FUND OPERATIONS					
BEGINNING CASH BALANCE	5,094,221	5,094,221	5,690,719	4,898,578	4,898,578
RECEIPTS:					
REVENUE (Cash Basis: July 1 - June 30)	7,407,190	7,407,190	7,407,190	7,407,190	7,407,190
TRANSFERS IN	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL RECEIPTS	<u>7,407,190</u>	<u>7,407,190</u>	<u>7,407,190</u>	<u>7,407,190</u>	<u>7,407,190</u>
TOTAL RESOURCES AVAILABLE	<u>12,501,411</u>	<u>12,501,411</u>	<u>13,097,909</u>	<u>12,305,768</u>	<u>12,305,768</u>
APPROPRIATIONS (INCLUDES REAPPROPS):					
OPERATING APPROPS	10,408,187	5,709,316	10,408,187	10,408,187	0
TRANSFER APPROPS	1,633,817	1,101,376	1,791,144	0	0
CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS APPROPS	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL APPROPRIATIONS	<u>12,042,004</u>	<u>6,810,692</u>	<u>12,199,331</u>	<u>10,408,187</u>	<u>0</u>
BUDGET BALANCE	459,407	5,690,719	898,578	1,897,581	12,305,768
UNEXPENDED APPROPRIATION *	5,231,312	0	4,000,000	2,500,000	0
OTHER ADJUSTMENTS	0	0	0	0	0
ENDING CASH BALANCE	<u>5,690,719</u>	<u>5,690,719</u>	<u>4,898,578</u>	<u>4,397,581</u>	<u>12,305,768</u>
FUND OBLIGATIONS					
ENDING CASH BALANCE	5,690,719	5,690,719	4,898,578	4,397,581	12,305,768
OTHER OBLIGATIONS					
OUTSTANDING PROJECTS	0	0	0	0	0
CASH FLOW NEEDS	2,000,000	2,000,000	2,000,000	2,000,000	0
TOTAL OTHER OBLIGATIONS	<u>2,000,000</u>	<u>2,000,000</u>	<u>2,000,000</u>	<u>2,000,000</u>	<u>0</u>
UNOBLIGATED CASH BALANCE	<u>3,690,719</u>	<u>3,690,719</u>	<u>2,898,578</u>	<u>2,397,581</u>	<u>12,305,768</u>

**STATE OF MISSOURI
FUND FINANCIAL SUMMARY**

DEPARTMENT: Judiciary
FUND NAME: Judiciary - Federal
FUND NUMBER: 0137

FUND PURPOSE: Federal monies and grants used for operations and processing bills for the circuit courts in the counties.

NOTES:

* Do not include in the Prior Year Actual column as doing so would double count lapse & reserve.

**STATE OF MISSOURI
FUND FINANCIAL SUMMARY**

DEPARTMENT: Judiciary
FUND NAME: Statewide Court Automation
FUND NUMBER: 0270

FUND PURPOSE: To account for an additional court cost to be assessed in all civil cases filed in circuit courts and all criminal cases including municipal or county ordinance violations heard by an associated judge and violations of traffic laws of the state. Monies collected are to be used to develop and implement a plan for statewide court automation system.

NOTES:

* Do not include in the Prior Year Actual column as doing so would double count lapse & reserve.

**STATE OF MISSOURI
FUND FINANCIAL SUMMARY**

DEPARTMENT: Judiciary
FUND NAME: Statewide Court Automation
FUND NUMBER: 0270

Statute 476.055 and 488.5025 RSMo
 Constitution _____

Administratively Created
 Interest Deposited To Fund

Subject To Biennial Sweep
 Subject to Other Sweeps (see notes)

FUND OPERATIONS	FY 2009 ADJUSTED APPROP	FY 2009 ACTUAL SPENDING	FY 2010 ADJUSTED APPROP	FY 2011 REQUESTED	FY 2011 GOVERNOR RECOMMEND
BEGINNING CASH BALANCE	744,534	744,534	573,452	739,703	739,703
RECEIPTS:					
REVENUE (Cash Basis: July 1 - June 30)	5,930,426	5,930,426	5,428,012	5,428,012	5,428,012
TRANSFERS IN	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL RECEIPTS	<u>5,930,426</u>	<u>5,930,426</u>	<u>5,428,012</u>	<u>5,428,012</u>	<u>5,428,012</u>
TOTAL RESOURCES AVAILABLE	<u>6,674,960</u>	<u>6,674,960</u>	<u>6,001,464</u>	<u>6,167,715</u>	<u>6,167,715</u>
APPROPRIATIONS (INCLUDES REAPPROPS):					
OPERATING APPROPS	5,446,479	5,437,051	4,446,202	4,446,202	0
TRANSFER APPROPS	739,729	664,457	815,559	815,559	0
CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS APPROPS	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL APPROPRIATIONS	<u>6,186,208</u>	<u>6,101,508</u>	<u>5,261,761</u>	<u>5,261,761</u>	<u>0</u>
BUDGET BALANCE	<u>488,752</u>	<u>573,452</u>	<u>739,703</u>	<u>905,954</u>	<u>6,167,715</u>
UNEXPENDED APPROPRIATION *	84,700	0	0	0	0
OTHER ADJUSTMENTS	0	0	0	0	0
ENDING CASH BALANCE	<u>573,452</u>	<u>573,452</u>	<u>739,703</u>	<u>905,954</u>	<u>6,167,715</u>
FUND OBLIGATIONS					
ENDING CASH BALANCE	573,452	573,452	739,703	905,954	6,167,715
OTHER OBLIGATIONS					
OUTSTANDING PROJECTS	0	0	0	0	0
CASH FLOW NEEDS	500,000	500,000	500,000	500,000	0
TOTAL OTHER OBLIGATIONS	<u>500,000</u>	<u>500,000</u>	<u>500,000</u>	<u>500,000</u>	<u>0</u>
UNOBLIGATED CASH BALANCE	<u>73,452</u>	<u>73,452</u>	<u>239,703</u>	<u>405,954</u>	<u>6,167,715</u>

**STATE OF MISSOURI
FUND FINANCIAL SUMMARY**

DEPARTMENT: Judiciary
 FUND NAME: Supreme Court Publication Revolving Fund
 FUND NUMBER: 0525

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Statute <u>477.235 RSMo</u>	<input type="checkbox"/> Administratively Created	<input type="checkbox"/> Subject To Biennial Sweep
<input type="checkbox"/> Constitution _____	<input type="checkbox"/> Interest Deposited To Fund	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Subject to Other Sweeps (see notes)

FUND OPERATIONS	FY 2009 ADJUSTED APPROP	FY 2009 ACTUAL SPENDING	FY 2010 ADJUSTED APPROP	FY 2011 REQUESTED	FY 2011 GOVERNOR RECOMMEND
BEGINNING CASH BALANCE	37,682	37,682	53,820	67,470	67,470
RECEIPTS:					
REVENUE (Cash Basis: July 1 - June 30)	84,845	84,845	95,000	95,000	95,000
TRANSFERS IN	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL RECEIPTS	<u>84,845</u>	<u>84,845</u>	<u>95,000</u>	<u>95,000</u>	<u>95,000</u>
TOTAL RESOURCES AVAILABLE	<u>122,527</u>	<u>122,527</u>	<u>148,820</u>	<u>162,470</u>	<u>162,470</u>
APPROPRIATIONS (INCLUDES REAPPROPS):					
OPERATING APPROPS	150,000	67,145	150,000	150,000	0
TRANSFER APPROPS	1,562	1,562	1,350	1,350	0
CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS APPROPS	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL APPROPRIATIONS	<u>151,562</u>	<u>68,707</u>	<u>151,350</u>	<u>151,350</u>	<u>0</u>
BUDGET BALANCE	(29,035)	53,820	(2,530)	11,120	162,470
UNEXPENDED APPROPRIATION *	82,855	0	70,000	50,000	0
OTHER ADJUSTMENTS	0	0	0	0	0
ENDING CASH BALANCE	53,820	53,820	67,470	61,120	162,470
FUND OBLIGATIONS					
ENDING CASH BALANCE	53,820	53,820	67,470	61,120	162,470
OTHER OBLIGATIONS					
OUTSTANDING PROJECTS	0	0	0	0	0
CASH FLOW NEEDS	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000
TOTAL OTHER OBLIGATIONS	<u>50,000</u>	<u>50,000</u>	<u>50,000</u>	<u>50,000</u>	<u>50,000</u>
UNOBLIGATED CASH BALANCE	3,820	3,820	17,470	11,120	112,470

**STATE OF MISSOURI
FUND FINANCIAL SUMMARY**

DEPARTMENT: Judiciary
FUND NAME: Supreme Court Publication Revolving Fund
FUND NUMBER: 0525

FUND PURPOSE: Funded annually by appropriation and monies from the sale of publications, opinion summaries, pending issues digests and subscriptions available to the public. The monies are to be spent to cover the cost of compiling, publishing, mailing and personnel costs.

NOTES: As per Section 477.235.3 RSMo, \$50,000 is exempt from the provision of Section 33.080 RSMo.

* Do not include in the Prior Year Actual column as doing so would double count lapse & reserve.

**STATE OF MISSOURI
FUND FINANCIAL SUMMARY**

DEPARTMENT: Judiciary
FUND NAME: CASA Program
FUND NUMBER: 0590

Statute 476.777 RSMo.
 Constitution _____

Administratively Created
 Interest Deposited To Fund

Subject To Biennial Sweep
 Subject to Other Sweeps (see notes)

	FY 2009 ADJUSTED APPROP	FY 2009 ACTUAL SPENDING	FY 2010 ADJUSTED APPROP	FY 2011 REQUESTED	FY 2011 GOVERNOR RECOMMEND
FUND OPERATIONS					
BEGINNING CASH BALANCE	83,032	83,032	81,150	82,190	82,190
RECEIPTS:					
REVENUE (Cash Basis: July 1 - June 30)	82,178	82,178	83,150	83,150	83,150
TRANSFERS IN	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL RECEIPTS	<u>82,178</u>	<u>82,178</u>	<u>83,150</u>	<u>83,150</u>	<u>83,150</u>
TOTAL RESOURCES AVAILABLE	<u>165,210</u>	<u>165,210</u>	<u>164,300</u>	<u>165,340</u>	<u>165,340</u>
APPROPRIATIONS (INCLUDES REAPPROPS):					
OPERATING APPROPS	100,000	83,032	100,000	100,000	0
TRANSFER APPROPS	1,028	1,028	960	960	0
CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS APPROPS	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL APPROPRIATIONS	<u>101,028</u>	<u>84,060</u>	<u>100,960</u>	<u>100,960</u>	<u>0</u>
BUDGET BALANCE	<u>64,182</u>	<u>81,150</u>	<u>63,340</u>	<u>64,380</u>	<u>165,340</u>
UNEXPENDED APPROPRIATION *	16,968	0	18,850	16,850	0
OTHER ADJUSTMENTS	0	0	0	0	0
ENDING CASH BALANCE	<u>81,150</u>	<u>81,150</u>	<u>82,190</u>	<u>81,230</u>	<u>165,340</u>
FUND OBLIGATIONS					
ENDING CASH BALANCE	81,150	81,150	82,190	81,230	165,340
OTHER OBLIGATIONS					
OUTSTANDING PROJECTS	0	0	0	0	0
CASH FLOW NEEDS	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL OTHER OBLIGATIONS	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>
UNOBLIGATED CASH BALANCE	<u>81,150</u>	<u>81,150</u>	<u>82,190</u>	<u>81,230</u>	<u>165,340</u>

**STATE OF MISSOURI
FUND FINANCIAL SUMMARY**

DEPARTMENT: Judiciary
FUND NAME: CASA Program
FUND NUMBER: 0590

FUND PURPOSE: To account for monies appropriated by the General Assembly, gifts, contributions, grants, bequests or other aid received from federal, private, or other sources, and a surcharge of two dollars per domestic relations' case collected by the circuit courts clerks.

NOTES:

* Do not include in the Prior Year Actual column as doing so would double count lapse & reserve.

**STATE OF MISSOURI
FUND FINANCIAL SUMMARY**

DEPARTMENT: Judiciary
FUND NAME: Circuit Court Escrow Fund
FUND NUMBER: 0718

Statute 488.5028 RSMo
 Constitution _____

Administratively Created
 Interest Deposited To Fund

Subject To Biennial Sweep
 Subject to Other Sweeps (see notes)

FUND OPERATIONS	FY 2009 ADJUSTED APPROP	FY 2009 ACTUAL SPENDING	FY 2010 ADJUSTED APPROP	FY 2011 REQUESTED	FY 2011 GOVERNOR RECOMMEND
BEGINNING CASH BALANCE	48,511	48,511	213,917	11,876	11,876
RECEIPTS:					
REVENUE (Cash Basis: July 1 - June 30)	1,510,991	1,510,991	1,503,500	1,503,500	1,503,500
TRANSFERS IN	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL RECEIPTS	<u>1,510,991</u>	<u>1,510,991</u>	<u>1,503,500</u>	<u>1,503,500</u>	<u>1,503,500</u>
TOTAL RESOURCES AVAILABLE	<u>1,559,502</u>	<u>1,559,502</u>	<u>1,717,417</u>	<u>1,515,376</u>	<u>1,515,376</u>
APPROPRIATIONS (INCLUDES REAPPROPS):					
OPERATING APPROPS	1,505,500	1,345,585	1,705,500	505,500	0
TRANSFER APPROPS	0	0	41	41	0
CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS APPROPS	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL APPROPRIATIONS	<u>1,505,500</u>	<u>1,345,585</u>	<u>1,705,541</u>	<u>505,541</u>	<u>0</u>
BUDGET BALANCE	<u>54,002</u>	<u>213,917</u>	<u>11,876</u>	<u>1,009,835</u>	<u>1,515,376</u>
UNEXPENDED APPROPRIATION *	159,915	0	0	0	0
OTHER ADJUSTMENTS	0	0	0	0	0
ENDING CASH BALANCE	<u>213,917</u>	<u>213,917</u>	<u>11,876</u>	<u>1,009,835</u>	<u>1,515,376</u>
FUND OBLIGATIONS					
ENDING CASH BALANCE	213,917	213,917	11,876	1,009,835	1,515,376
OTHER OBLIGATIONS					
OUTSTANDING PROJECTS	213,917	213,917	11,876	1,009,835	1,515,376
CASH FLOW NEEDS	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL OTHER OBLIGATIONS	<u>213,917</u>	<u>213,917</u>	<u>11,876</u>	<u>1,009,835</u>	<u>1,515,376</u>
UNOBLIGATED CASH BALANCE	<u>(0)</u>	<u>(0)</u>	<u>(0)</u>	<u>(0)</u>	<u>(0)</u>

**STATE OF MISSOURI
FUND FINANCIAL SUMMARY**

DEPARTMENT: Judiciary
FUND NAME: Circuit Court Escrow Fund
FUND NUMBER: 0718

FUND PURPOSE: To account for monies setoff of an income tax refund for the purpose of paying delinquent court costs, fines, fees, or other sums ordered by a court. Monies are disbursed to the state, other political subdivision or refunded back to the taxpayer or taxpayer's spouse.

NOTES:

* Do not include in the Prior Year Actual column as doing so would double count lapse & reserve.

**STATE OF MISSOURI
FUND FINANCIAL SUMMARY**

DEPARTMENT: Judiciary
FUND NAME: Drug Court Resource Fund
FUND NUMBER: 0733

Statute 478.009 RSMo
 Constitution _____

Administratively Created
 Interest Deposited To Fund

Subject To Biennial Sweep
 Subject to Other Sweeps (see notes)

	FY 2009 ADJUSTED APPROP	FY 2009 ACTUAL SPENDING	FY 2010 ADJUSTED APPROP	FY 2011 REQUESTED	FY 2011 GOVERNOR RECOMMEND
FUND OPERATIONS					
BEGINNING CASH BALANCE	187,335	187,335	286,059	50,000	50,000
RECEIPTS:					
REVENUE (Cash Basis: July 1 - June 30)	5,726,925	5,726,925	5,725,500	10,404,239	10,404,239
TRANSFERS IN	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL RECEIPTS	<u>5,726,925</u>	<u>5,726,925</u>	<u>5,725,500</u>	<u>10,404,239</u>	<u>10,404,239</u>
TOTAL RESOURCES AVAILABLE	<u>5,914,260</u>	<u>5,914,260</u>	<u>6,011,559</u>	<u>10,454,239</u>	<u>10,454,239</u>
APPROPRIATIONS (INCLUDES REAPPROPS):					
OPERATING APPROPS	5,917,354	5,525,736	5,917,354	10,599,093	0
TRANSFER APPROPS	115,212	102,465	121,813	121,813	0
CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS APPROPS	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL APPROPRIATIONS	<u>6,032,566</u>	<u>5,628,201</u>	<u>6,039,167</u>	<u>10,720,906</u>	<u>0</u>
BUDGET BALANCE	<u>(118,306)</u>	<u>286,059</u>	<u>(27,608)</u>	<u>(266,667)</u>	<u>10,454,239</u>
UNEXPENDED APPROPRIATION *	404,365	0	77,608	316,667	0
OTHER ADJUSTMENTS	0	0	0	0	0
ENDING CASH BALANCE	<u>286,059</u>	<u>286,059</u>	<u>50,000</u>	<u>50,000</u>	<u>10,454,239</u>
FUND OBLIGATIONS					
ENDING CASH BALANCE	286,059	286,059	50,000	50,000	10,454,239
OTHER OBLIGATIONS					
OUTSTANDING PROJECTS	0	0	0	0	0
CASH FLOW NEEDS	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000	0
TOTAL OTHER OBLIGATIONS	<u>50,000</u>	<u>50,000</u>	<u>50,000</u>	<u>50,000</u>	<u>0</u>
UNOBLIGATED CASH BALANCE	<u>236,059</u>	<u>236,059</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>10,454,239</u>

**STATE OF MISSOURI
FUND FINANCIAL SUMMARY**

DEPARTMENT: Judiciary
FUND NAME: Drug Court Resource Fund
FUND NUMBER: 0733

FUND PURPOSE: This fund will account for monies available for allocation or distribution by the Drug Court Coordinating Commission.

NOTES:

* Do not include in the Prior Year Actual column as doing so would double count lapse & reserve.

**STATE OF MISSOURI
FUND FINANCIAL SUMMARY**

DEPARTMENT: Judiciary
FUND NAME: Basic Civil Legal Services Fund
FUND NUMBER: 0757

Statute 477.650 RSMo
 Constitution _____

Administratively Created
 Interest Deposited To Fund

Subject To Biennial Sweep
 Subject to Other Sweeps (see notes)

	FY 2009 ADJUSTED APPROP	FY 2009 ACTUAL SPENDING	FY 2010 ADJUSTED APPROP	FY 2011 REQUESTED	FY 2011 GOVERNOR RECOMMEND
FUND OPERATIONS					
BEGINNING CASH BALANCE	167,575	167,575	1,149,460	64,050	64,050
RECEIPTS:					
REVENUE (Cash Basis: July 1 - June 30)	5,104,082	5,104,082	3,481,000	3,481,000	3,481,000
TRANSFERS IN	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL RECEIPTS	<u>5,104,082</u>	<u>5,104,082</u>	<u>3,481,000</u>	<u>3,481,000</u>	<u>3,481,000</u>
TOTAL RESOURCES AVAILABLE	<u>5,271,657</u>	<u>5,271,657</u>	<u>4,630,460</u>	<u>3,545,050</u>	<u>3,545,050</u>
APPROPRIATIONS (INCLUDES REAPPROPS):					
OPERATING APPROPS	4,193,476	4,051,148	4,493,476	3,293,476	0
TRANSFER APPROPS	72,720	71,049	72,934	72,934	0
CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS APPROPS	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL APPROPRIATIONS	<u>4,266,196</u>	<u>4,122,197</u>	<u>4,566,410</u>	<u>3,366,410</u>	<u>0</u>
BUDGET BALANCE	<u>1,005,461</u>	<u>1,149,460</u>	<u>64,050</u>	<u>178,640</u>	<u>3,545,050</u>
UNEXPENDED APPROPRIATION *	143,999	0	0	0	0
OTHER ADJUSTMENTS	0	0	0	0	0
ENDING CASH BALANCE	<u>1,149,460</u>	<u>1,149,460</u>	<u>64,050</u>	<u>178,640</u>	<u>3,545,050</u>
FUND OBLIGATIONS					
ENDING CASH BALANCE	1,149,460	1,149,460	64,050	178,640	3,545,050
OTHER OBLIGATIONS					
OUTSTANDING PROJECTS	0	0	0	0	0
CASH FLOW NEEDS	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000
TOTAL OTHER OBLIGATIONS	<u>50,000</u>	<u>50,000</u>	<u>50,000</u>	<u>50,000</u>	<u>50,000</u>
UNOBLIGATED CASH BALANCE	<u>1,099,460</u>	<u>1,099,460</u>	<u>14,050</u>	<u>128,640</u>	<u>3,495,050</u>

**STATE OF MISSOURI
FUND FINANCIAL SUMMARY**

DEPARTMENT: Judiciary
FUND NAME: Basic Civil Legal Services Fund
FUND NUMBER: 0757

FUND PURPOSE: Moneys for the fund shall come from an additional filing fee on certain civil and criminal actions of \$20 in the Missouri Supreme Court and Courts of Appeals, \$10 in the Circuit Courts and \$8 in the Associate Circuit Courts. Moneys shall be disbursed to legal services organizations in this state to provide legal representation to eligible low-income persons in this state in civil matters.

NOTES:

* Do not include in the Prior Year Actual column as doing so would double count lapse & reserve.

**STATE OF MISSOURI
FUND FINANCIAL SUMMARY**

DEPARTMENT: Judiciary
FUND NAME: State court Administration Revolving Fund
FUND NUMBER: 0831

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Statute	<input type="checkbox"/> Administratively Created	<input type="checkbox"/> Subject To Biennial Sweep
<input type="checkbox"/> Constitution	<input type="checkbox"/> Interest Deposited To Fund	<input type="checkbox"/> Subject to Other Sweeps (see notes)

FUND OPERATIONS	FY 2009 ADJUSTED APPROP	FY 2009 ACTUAL SPENDING	FY 2010 ADJUSTED APPROP	FY 2011 REQUESTED	FY 2011 GOVERNOR RECOMMEND
BEGINNING CASH BALANCE	65,835	65,835	89,797	89,799	89,799
RECEIPTS:					
REVENUE (Cash Basis: July 1 - June 30)	168,779	168,779	182,000	182,000	182,000
TRANSFERS IN	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL RECEIPTS	<u>168,779</u>	<u>168,779</u>	<u>182,000</u>	<u>182,000</u>	<u>182,000</u>
TOTAL RESOURCES AVAILABLE	<u>234,614</u>	<u>234,614</u>	<u>271,797</u>	<u>271,799</u>	<u>271,799</u>
APPROPRIATIONS (INCLUDES REAPPROPS):					
OPERATING APPROPS	230,000	143,186	230,000	230,000	0
TRANSFER APPROPS	1,631	1,631	1,998	1,998	0
CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS APPROPS	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL APPROPRIATIONS	<u>231,631</u>	<u>144,817</u>	<u>231,998</u>	<u>231,998</u>	<u>0</u>
BUDGET BALANCE	<u>2,983</u>	<u>89,797</u>	<u>39,799</u>	<u>39,801</u>	<u>271,799</u>
UNEXPENDED APPROPRIATION *	86,814	0	50,000	50,000	0
OTHER ADJUSTMENTS	0	0	0	0	0
ENDING CASH BALANCE	<u>89,797</u>	<u>89,797</u>	<u>89,799</u>	<u>89,801</u>	<u>271,799</u>
FUND OBLIGATIONS					
ENDING CASH BALANCE	89,797	89,797	89,799	89,801	271,799
OTHER OBLIGATIONS					
OUTSTANDING PROJECTS	0	0	0	0	0
CASH FLOW NEEDS	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000
TOTAL OTHER OBLIGATIONS	<u>50,000</u>	<u>50,000</u>	<u>50,000</u>	<u>50,000</u>	<u>50,000</u>
UNOBLIGATED CASH BALANCE	<u>39,797</u>	<u>39,797</u>	<u>39,799</u>	<u>39,801</u>	<u>221,799</u>

**STATE OF MISSOURI
FUND FINANCIAL SUMMARY**

DEPARTMENT: Judiciary
FUND NAME: State court Administration Revolving Fund
FUND NUMBER: 0831

FUND PURPOSE: To account for moneys received by or on behalf of the state court administrator for registration fees, grants, transcripts fees or other sources in connection with the training and education of court personnel and for the payment of transcription services. The state treasurer shall administer and disburse moneys to provide training and purchase goods and services related to the training and education of court personnel and for the preparation of an official court transcript.

NOTES:

* Do not include in the Prior Year Actual column as doing so would double count lapse & reserve.

**STATE OF MISSOURI
FUND FINANCIAL SUMMARY**

DEPARTMENT: Judiciary
FUND NAME: Judiciary Education & Training
FUND NUMBER: 0847

Statute 476.057 RSMo
 Constitution _____

Administratively Created
 Interest Deposited To Fund

Subject To Biennial Sweep
 Subject to Other Sweeps (see notes)

	FY 2009 ADJUSTED APPROP	FY 2009 ACTUAL SPENDING	FY 2010 ADJUSTED APPROP	FY 2011 REQUESTED	FY 2011 GOVERNOR RECOMMEND
FUND OPERATIONS					
BEGINNING CASH BALANCE	504,599	504,599	367,545	150,000	150,000
RECEIPTS:					
REVENUE (Cash Basis: July 1 - June 30)	1,126,291	1,126,291	1,395,733	1,670,363	1,670,363
TRANSFERS IN	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL RECEIPTS	<u>1,126,291</u>	<u>1,126,291</u>	<u>1,395,733</u>	<u>1,670,363</u>	<u>1,670,363</u>
TOTAL RESOURCES AVAILABLE	<u>1,630,890</u>	<u>1,630,890</u>	<u>1,763,278</u>	<u>1,820,363</u>	<u>1,820,363</u>
APPROPRIATIONS (INCLUDES REAPPROPS):					
OPERATING APPROPS	1,797,982	1,067,699	1,786,340	2,061,340	0
TRANSFER APPROPS	257,570	195,646	298,994	298,994	0
CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS APPROPS	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL APPROPRIATIONS	<u>2,055,552</u>	<u>1,263,345</u>	<u>2,085,334</u>	<u>2,360,334</u>	<u>0</u>
BUDGET BALANCE	<u>(424,662)</u>	<u>367,545</u>	<u>(322,056)</u>	<u>(539,971)</u>	<u>1,820,363</u>
UNEXPENDED APPROPRIATION *	792,207	0	472,056	689,971	0
OTHER ADJUSTMENTS	0	0	0	0	0
ENDING CASH BALANCE	<u>367,545</u>	<u>367,545</u>	<u>150,000</u>	<u>150,000</u>	<u>1,820,363</u>
FUND OBLIGATIONS					
ENDING CASH BALANCE	367,545	367,545	150,000	150,000	1,820,363
OTHER OBLIGATIONS					
OUTSTANDING PROJECTS	0	0	0	0	0
CASH FLOW NEEDS	150,000	150,000	150,000	150,000	150,000
TOTAL OTHER OBLIGATIONS	<u>150,000</u>	<u>150,000</u>	<u>150,000</u>	<u>150,000</u>	<u>150,000</u>
UNOBLIGATED CASH BALANCE	<u>217,545</u>	<u>217,545</u>	<u>(0)</u>	<u>(0)</u>	<u>1,670,363</u>

**STATE OF MISSOURI
FUND FINANCIAL SUMMARY**

DEPARTMENT: Judiciary
FUND NAME: Judiciary Education & Training
FUND NUMBER: 0847

FUND PURPOSE: To account for the proceeds from adjusted fees collected and deposited to the general revenue fund, subject to a transfer of no more than two percent (2%) of the amount expended for personal service by state and local government entities for judicial personnel. The state treasurer shall administer the fund and, pursuant to appropriations, shall disburse moneys from the fund to the state courts administrator in order to provide training and to purchase goods and services determined appropriate by the state court administrator related to the training and education of judicial personnel.

NOTES:

* Do not include in the Prior Year Actual column as doing so would double count lapse & reserve.

**STATE OF MISSOURI
FUND FINANCIAL SUMMARY**

DEPARTMENT: Judiciary
FUND NAME: Domestic Relations Resolution Fund
FUND NUMBER: 0852

Statute 452.554 RSMo
 Constitution _____

Administratively Created
 Interest Deposited To Fund

Subject To Biennial Sweep
 Subject to Other Sweeps (see notes)

	FY 2009 ADJUSTED APPROP	FY 2009 ACTUAL SPENDING	FY 2010 ADJUSTED APPROP	FY 2011 REQUESTED	FY 2011 GOVERNOR RECOMMEND
FUND OPERATIONS					
BEGINNING CASH BALANCE	481,065	481,065	588,442	516,265	516,265
RECEIPTS:					
REVENUE (Cash Basis: July 1 - June 30)	228,127	228,127	230,000	230,000	230,000
TRANSFERS IN	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL RECEIPTS	<u>228,127</u>	<u>228,127</u>	<u>230,000</u>	<u>230,000</u>	<u>230,000</u>
TOTAL RESOURCES AVAILABLE	<u>709,192</u>	<u>709,192</u>	<u>818,442</u>	<u>746,265</u>	<u>746,265</u>
APPROPRIATIONS (INCLUDES REAPPROPS):					
OPERATING APPROPS	300,000	217,654	300,000	300,000	0
TRANSFER APPROPS	18,456	1,949	18,886	2,177	0
CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS APPROPS	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL APPROPRIATIONS	<u>318,456</u>	<u>219,603</u>	<u>318,886</u>	<u>302,177</u>	<u>0</u>
BUDGET BALANCE	<u>390,736</u>	<u>489,589</u>	<u>499,556</u>	<u>444,088</u>	<u>746,265</u>
UNEXPENDED APPROPRIATION *	98,853	98,853	16,709	0	0
OTHER ADJUSTMENTS	0	0	0	0	0
ENDING CASH BALANCE	<u>489,589</u>	<u>588,442</u>	<u>516,265</u>	<u>444,088</u>	<u>746,265</u>
FUND OBLIGATIONS					
ENDING CASH BALANCE	489,589	588,442	516,265	444,088	746,265
OTHER OBLIGATIONS					
OUTSTANDING PROJECTS	0	0	0	0	0
CASH FLOW NEEDS	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL OTHER OBLIGATIONS	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>
UNOBLIGATED CASH BALANCE	<u>489,589</u>	<u>588,442</u>	<u>516,265</u>	<u>444,088</u>	<u>746,265</u>

**STATE OF MISSOURI
FUND FINANCIAL SUMMARY**

DEPARTMENT: Judiciary
FUND NAME: Domestic Relations Resolution Fund
FUND NUMBER: 0852

FUND PURPOSE: To account for all moneys received from: a three dollar surcharge shall be paid by the person filing on civil cases. These moneys will be used to pay the cost associated with creating and approving a handbook as created in section 452.556 and to reimburse local judicial circuits for the costs associated with the implementation of this act.

NOTES:

* Do not include in the Prior Year Actual column as doing so would double count lapse & reserve.

**STATE OF MISSOURI
FUND FINANCIAL SUMMARY**

DEPARTMENT: Judiciary
FUND NAME: Judiciary - Federal
FUND NUMBER: 0888

Statute 476.385 and 488.200 RSMo
 Constitution _____

Administratively Created
 Interest Deposited To Fund

Subject To Biennial Sweep
 Subject to Other Sweeps (see notes)

FUND OPERATIONS	FY 2009 ADJUSTED APPROP	FY 2009 ACTUAL SPENDING	FY 2010 ADJUSTED APPROP	FY 2011 REQUESTED	FY 2011 GOVERNOR RECOMMEND
BEGINNING CASH BALANCE	1,113	1,113	1,113	1,109	1,109
RECEIPTS:					
REVENUE (Cash Basis: July 1 - June 30)	0	0	0	0	0
TRANSFERS IN	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL RECEIPTS	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>
TOTAL RESOURCES AVAILABLE	<u>1,113</u>	<u>1,113</u>	<u>1,113</u>	<u>1,109</u>	<u>1,109</u>
APPROPRIATIONS (INCLUDES REAPPROPS):					
OPERATING APPROPS	0	0	0	0	0
TRANSFER APPROPS	0	0	4	4	0
CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS APPROPS	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL APPROPRIATIONS	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>0</u>
BUDGET BALANCE	<u>1,113</u>	<u>1,113</u>	<u>1,109</u>	<u>1,105</u>	<u>1,109</u>
UNEXPENDED APPROPRIATION *	0	0	0	0	0
OTHER ADJUSTMENTS	0	0	0	0	0
ENDING CASH BALANCE	<u>1,113</u>	<u>1,113</u>	<u>1,109</u>	<u>1,105</u>	<u>1,109</u>
FUND OBLIGATIONS					
ENDING CASH BALANCE	1,113	1,113	1,109	1,105	1,109
OTHER OBLIGATIONS					
OUTSTANDING PROJECTS	0	0	0	0	0
CASH FLOW NEEDS	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL OTHER OBLIGATIONS	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>
UNOBLIGATED CASH BALANCE	<u>1,113</u>	<u>1,113</u>	<u>1,109</u>	<u>1,105</u>	<u>1,109</u>

**STATE OF MISSOURI
FUND FINANCIAL SUMMARY**

DEPARTMENT: Judiciary
FUND NAME: Judiciary - Federal
FUND NUMBER: 0888

FUND PURPOSE: To account for all interest earned on funds deposited into the Central Violation Bureau fund. The state treasurer shall be the custodian of the revolving fund, and shall make disbursements, as allowed by lawful appropriations, only to the judicial branch of state government for goods and services related to the administration of the judicial system.

NOTES:

* Do not include in the Prior Year Actual column as doing so would double count lapse & reserve.

**STATE OF MISSOURI
FUND FINANCIAL SUMMARY**

DEPARTMENT: Judiciary
 FUND NAME: Criminal Non-Support Court Resources
 FUND NUMBER: 0936

Statute 478.1000 RSMo
 Constitution _____

Administratively Created
 Interest Deposited To Fund

Subject To Biennial Sweep
 Subject to Other Sweeps (see notes)

	FY 2010 ADJUSTED APPROP	FY 2010 ACTUAL SPENDING	FY 2011 ADJUSTED APPROP	FY 2012 REQUESTED	FY 2012 GOVERNOR RECOMMEND
FUND OPERATIONS					
BEGINNING CASH BALANCE	0	0	0	0	0
RECEIPTS:					
REVENUE (Cash Basis: July 1 - June 30)	0	0	0	0	0
TRANSFERS IN	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL RECEIPTS	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>
TOTAL RESOURCES AVAILABLE	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>
APPROPRIATIONS (INCLUDES REAPPROPS):					
OPERATING APPROPS	0	0	1	1	0
TRANSFER APPROPS	0	0	0	0	0
CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS APPROPS	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL APPROPRIATIONS	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>0</u>
BUDGET BALANCE	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	(1)	(1)	0
UNEXPENDED APPROPRIATION *	0	0	1	1	0
OTHER ADJUSTMENTS	0	0	0	0	0
ENDING CASH BALANCE	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>
FUND OBLIGATIONS					
ENDING CASH BALANCE	0	0	0	0	0
OTHER OBLIGATIONS					
OUTSTANDING PROJECTS	0	0	0	0	0
CASH FLOW NEEDS	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL OTHER OBLIGATIONS	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>
UNOBLIGATED CASH BALANCE	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>

**STATE OF MISSOURI
FUND FINANCIAL SUMMARY**

DEPARTMENT: Judiciary
FUND NAME: Criminal Non-Support Court Resources
FUND NUMBER: 0936

FUND PURPOSE: These funds shall be administered by the Criminal Nonsupport Courts Coordinating Commission, who shall allocate funds to established criminal nonsupport courts.

NOTES:

* Do not include in the Prior Year Actual column as doing so would double count lapse & reserve.

FY 2011 Judiciary's Estimated Appropriation Request

HB Section	Fund	Agency	Org	Org name	Approp	Approp Name	Amount
12.300	0757	100	2112	Judicial Proceed & Review	7518	Basic Legal Services - 0757	\$ 3,200,000
12.310	0137	100	2116	Office of State Courts Admin.	0734	Court Improve Project E&E - 0137	\$ 5,609,649
12.315	0270	100	2116	Office of State Courts Admin.	3137	Court Automation E&E - 0270	\$ 2,885,181
12.350	0718	100	2130	Circuit Courts	1209	Circuit Court Debt Offset - 0718	\$ 500,000
12.350	0590	100	2130	Circuit Courts	5196	CASA Programs - 0590	\$ 100,000
12.350	0852	100	2130	Circuit Courts	4618	Domestic Relations - 0852	\$ 300,000
12.360	0733	100	2140	Drug Court Coord Commission	5197	Drug Court E&E - 0733	\$ 5,723,698

FY 2011 Judiciary's Flexibility Request

HB Section	Fund	Agency	Org	Org name	Approp	Approp Name	Flex Percentage
12.300	0101	100	2112	Judicial Proceed & Review	0030	Jud Proceed & Review PS - 0101	10%
12.300	0101	100	2116	Judicial Proceed & Review	0033	Jud Proceed & Review E&E - 0101	10%
12.300	0101	100	2116	Judicial Proceed & Review	0907	Supreme Court Judges Salaries - 0101	10%
12.330	0101	100	3120	Western District	0041	Appeals West Dist PS - 0101	10%
12.330	0101	100	3120	Western District	0044	Appeals West Dist E&E - 0101	10%
12.330	0101	100	3120	Western District	0847	Judges Salaries West Dist - 0101	10%
12.335	0101	100	3121	Eastern District	0046	Appeals East Dist PS - 0101	10%
12.335	0101	100	3121	Eastern District	0050	Appeals East Dist E&E - 0101	10%
12.335	0101	100	3121	Eastern District	0046	Judges Salaries East Dist - 0101	10%
12.340	0101	100	3122	Southern District	0052	Appeals South Dist PS - 0101	10%
12.340	0101	100	3122	Southern District	0054	Appeals South Dist E&E - 0101	10%
12.340	0101	100	3122	Southern District	0849	Judges Salaries South Dist - 0101	10%
12.345	0101	100	2130	Circuit Courts	0853	CP - Judges-Comm PS - 0101	10%
12.345	0101	100	2130	Circuit Courts	0856	CP - Statutory PS - 0101	10%
12.345	0101	100	2130	Circuit Courts	3354	CP - Non-Statutory PS - 0101	10%
12.345	0101	100	2130	Circuit Courts	5274	Circuit Personnel E&E - 0101	10%
12.345	0101	100	2130	Circuit Courts	6847	Entitlement Program E&E - 0101	10%
12.365	0101	100	3230	Comm. Retire Removal & Disc.	2204	Retire Discpl & Remove PS - 0101	10%
12.365	0101	100	3230	Comm. Retire Removal & Disc.	2205	Retire Discpl & Remove E&E - 0101	10%

Judiciary

FY 2012 CORE RECONCILIATION - GENERAL REVENUE

	<u>\$s</u>	<u>\$s</u>	<u>FTE</u>	<u>FTE</u>
Appropriations Less Vetoes (including transfers to Judicial Education and Training Fund and Drug Court Resources Fund)	169,074,144		3,244.30	
FY 2010 One-Time Expenditures				
Total One-Times	0	0	0.00	0.00
Approps - Vetoes - One-Times		<u>169,074,144</u>		<u>3,244.30</u>
Core Transfers In	<u>0</u>		<u>0.00</u>	
Total Transfers In		0		0.00
Core Transfers Out	<u>0</u>		<u>0.00</u>	
Total Transfers Out		0		0.00
Net Core Transfers		0		0.00
Agency Core Reductions	0		0.00	
Total Agency Core Reductions		<u>0</u>		<u>0.00</u>
Governor Core Reduction				
Total Governor Core Reductions		0		0.00
Requested Core Base		<u><u>169,074,144</u></u>		<u><u>3,244.30</u></u>

Judiciary

FY 2012 CORE RECONCILIATION - FEDERAL FUNDS

	<u>\$s</u>	<u>\$s</u>	<u>FTE</u>	<u>FTE</u>
Appropriations Less Vetoes	10,408,187		101.25	
FY 2010 One-Time Expenditures				
	<u>0</u>		<u>0.00</u>	
Total One-Times		0		0.00
Approps - Vetoes - One-Times		<u>10,408,187</u>		<u>101.25</u>
Core Transfers In	<u>0</u>		<u>0.00</u>	
Total Transfers In		0		0.00
Core Transfers Out	<u>0</u>		<u>0.00</u>	
Total Transfers Out		0		0.00
Net Core Transfers		0		0.00
Agency Core Reductions				
	<u>0</u>		<u>0.00</u>	
Total Agency Core Reductions		<u>0</u>		<u>0.00</u>
Governor Core Reduction				
		<u>0</u>		<u>0.00</u>
Total Governor Core Reductions		<u>0</u>		<u>0.00</u>
Requested Core Base		<u><u>10,408,187</u></u>		<u><u>101.25</u></u>

Judiciary

FY 2012 CORE RECONCILIATION - ALL OTHER FUNDS

	<u>\$s</u>	<u>\$s</u>	<u>FTE</u>	<u>FTE</u>
Appropriations* Less Vetoes	10,292,941		56.50	
FY 2010 One-Time Expenditures	0		0.00	
Total One-Times		0		0.00
Approps - Vetoes - One-Times		<u>10,292,941</u>		<u>56.50</u>
Core Transfers In	0		0.00	
Total Transfers In	<u>0</u>	0	<u>0.00</u>	0.00
Core Transfers Out	0		0.00	
Total Transfers Out	<u>0</u>	0	<u>0.00</u>	0.00
Net Core Transfers		0		0.00
Agency Core Reductions	0.00		0.00	
Total Agency Core Reductions		<u>0</u>		<u>0.00</u>
Governor Core Reductions	0.00		-	
Total Governor Core Reductions		<u>0.00</u>		<u>-</u>
Requested Core Base		<u><u>10,292,941</u></u>		<u><u>56.50</u></u>