



**Office of Court Administration**

**Collection Improvement Program**

**Independent Auditor's Report  
on Court Collections**

**Wichita County**

**June 26, 2013**

# CONTENTS

Transmittal Letter	
Executive Summary .....	1
Detailed Procedures and Findings .....	2
Appendix A – Objective, Scope, and Methodology .....	6
Appendix B – Report Distribution.....	7

# EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

## Audit Results

The Collection Improvement Program (CIP) Audit Department of the Office of Court Administration (OCA) has performed the procedures enumerated below, which were agreed to by the CIP Technical Support Department of the OCA and Wichita County (County). The procedures were performed to assist you in evaluating whether the collection program of the County has complied with Article 103.0033 of the Code of Criminal Procedure and Title 1, §175.3 of the Texas Administrative Code (TAC).

Our testing indicates the collection program for the County is compliant with the requirements of Article 103.0033 of the Code of Criminal Procedure and 1 TAC §175.3. In the course of our fieldwork testing, we noted that courts do not notify the Collection Department of defendants that will seek a payment plan. As a result, the Collection Department does not know when a defendant fails to complete a payment plan application.

We were not engaged to, and did not, conduct an examination of the County, the objective of which would be the expression of an opinion on the County's financial records. Accordingly, we do not express such an opinion. Had we performed additional procedures, other matters may have come to our attention that would have been reported to you.

Wichita County's management is responsible for operating the collection program in compliance with the requirements of Article 103.0033 of the Code of Criminal Procedure and 1 TAC §175.3.

The sufficiency of these procedures is solely the responsibility of the CIP Technical Support Department of the OCA, and we make no representation regarding the sufficiency of the procedures for the purpose for which this report has been requested or for any other purpose.

The compliance engagement was conducted in accordance with standards for an agreed-upon procedures attestation engagement as defined in *Government Auditing Standards* issued by the Comptroller General of the United States and attestation standards established by the American Institute of Certified Public Accountants.

## Objective

The objective of the engagement was to determine if the County complied with Article 103.0033 of the Code of Criminal Procedure and 1 TAC §175.3.

## Summary of Scope and Methodology

This compliance engagement covers cases for which court costs, fees, and fines were assessed during the period of October 1, 2012 through November 30, 2012, but were not paid at the time of assessment. Cases were tested beyond the audit period to determine compliance with all components of the collection program. The procedures performed are enumerated in the Detailed Procedures and Findings section of this report.

## Reporting of Sampling Risk

In performing the procedures, the auditor did not include a detailed inspection of every transaction. A random sample of cases was tested as required by 1 TAC §175.5(b). In consideration of the sampling error inherent in testing a sample of a population, a specific error rate cannot be reported; however, we can report the range within which we have calculated the error rate to fall.

## DETAILED PROCEDURES AND FINDINGS

1. *Obtain a population of all adjudicated cases in which the defendant does not pay in full within one (1) month of the date court costs, fees, and fines are assessed.*

Wichita County provided a list of defendants who accepted payment plans for the court costs, fees, and fines during the period of October 1, 2012 and November 31, 2012.

2. *Select a randomly-generated, statistically-valid sample of cases to be tested.*

Wichita County was unable to provide a list that identified cases with missed payments or that identified cases that had a Capias Pro Fine issued. As a result, we reviewed 270 cases in order to test 40 cases for Procedures 8-13 and 30 cases for Procedure 14 listed below.

3. *Obtain a completed survey, in a form prescribed by CIP Audit, from the county/municipality.*

A completed survey was obtained and reviewed for information pertinent to the engagement. Responses were used to determine compliance in Procedures 4 – 6 below.

4. *Evaluate the survey to determine if the local collection program has designated at least one (1) employee whose job description contains an essential job function of collection activities. Answers received will be verified during field work.*

Per the survey, the County has two (2) staff members dedicated to the collection program. At the time of the engagement, only one of the positions was filled but the County was in the process of hiring for the second position.

5. *Evaluate the survey to determine if program staff members are monitoring defendants' compliance with the terms of their payment plans or extensions. Answers will be verified through testing of Defendant Communication components.*

The County's Case Management system generates a daily "Call Queue" for late payments. The collection staff makes phone calls and sends letters as directed by the system.

6. *Evaluate the survey to determine if the program has a component designed to improve collections of balances more than 60 days past due. Answers will be verified through testing of Defendant Communication components.*

The County continues to make phone calls and send out letters to collect on seriously delinquent cases. A Capias Pro Fine is also issued for non-probation cases within the County Courts-at-Law and Justice Courts.

7. *Verify with CIP Technical Support and/or CIP Audit Financial Analyst(s) that the program is compliant with reporting requirements described in 1 TAC §175.4.*

Per the Regional Collection Specialist, Wichita County is compliant with the program's reporting requirements.

8. *Test samples generated in Procedure #2 (above) to determine if an application was obtained within one (1) month of the assessment date, and contains both contact and ability-to-pay information for the defendant.*

Of the 40 cases that were tested, three (3) errors were noted. Two (2) of the errors occurred because courts do not consistently notify the Collection Department of defendants that will seek a payment plan. As a result, the Collection Department did not make attempts to obtain the application within the required time.

Taking into consideration the inherent sampling error, we are 90% confident that the error rate is between 2.00% and 17.54%. The County is compliant with this component.

9. *Test samples generated in Procedure #2 (above) to determine if contact information obtained within the application was verified within five (5) days of obtaining the data.*

Of the 40 cases that were tested, two (2) errors were noted. Taking into consideration the inherent sampling error, we are 90% confident that the error rate is between .86% and 14.33%. The County is compliant with this component.

10. *Test samples generated in Procedure #2 (above) to determine if local program or court staff conducted an interview with the defendant within 14 days of receiving the application.*

Of the 40 cases that were tested, two (2) errors were noted. Taking into consideration the inherent sampling error, we are 90% confident that the error rate is between .86% and 14.33%. The County is compliant with this component.

11. *Test samples generated in Procedure #2 (above) to determine if the payment plans meet the Documentation, Payment Guidelines, and Time Requirements standards defined in TAC §175.3(c)(4).*

Of the 40 cases that were tested, no errors were noted. Taking into consideration the inherent sampling error, we are 90% confident that the error rate is no higher than 6.93%. The County is compliant with this component.

12. *Test samples generated in Procedure #2 (above) to determine if telephone contact with the defendant within one (1) month of a missed payment was documented.*

Of the 40 cases that were tested, three (3) errors were noted. Taking into consideration the inherent sampling error, we are 90% confident that the error rate is between 2.00% and 17.54%. The County is compliant with this component.

13. *Test samples generated in Procedure #2 (above) to determine if a written delinquency notice was sent to the defendant within one (1) month of a missed payment.*

Of the 40 cases that were tested, three (3) errors were noted. Taking into consideration the inherent sampling error, we are 90% confident that the error rate is between 2.00% and 17.54%. The County is compliant with this component.

14. *Test samples generated in Procedure #2 (above) to determine if another attempt of contact, either by phone or by mail, was made within one (1) month of the telephone contact or written delinquency notice, whichever is later, on any defendant in which a *capias pro fine* was sought.*

Of the 30 cases that were tested, no errors were noted. Taking into consideration the inherent sampling error, we are 90% confident that the error rate is no higher than 6.61%. The County is compliant with this component.

15. *Make a determination, based on results of the testing in Procedures #5 – 14 (above), as to whether the jurisdiction is compliant with Article 103.0033 of the Code of Criminal Procedure and 1 TAC §175.3 based on the criteria defined in 1 TAC §175.5(c).*

Wichita County is compliant with Article 103.0033 of the Code of Criminal Procedure and 1 TAC §175.3. The County is compliant with all four (4) of the Operational Components, and maintained a compliance rate greater than 80% for all of the seven (7) Defendant Communication Components.

## **APPENDICES**

# APPENDIX A

## OBJECTIVE, SCOPE, AND METHODOLOGY

### Objective

The CIP Audit Department of the Office of Court Administration applied procedures, which the CIP Technical Support Department (client) and Wichita County (responsible party) have agreed-upon, to determine if the County's collection program is compliant with Article 103.0033 of the Code of Criminal Procedure and 1 TAC §175.3.

### Scope

This compliance engagement covers cases for which court costs, fees, and fines were assessed during the period of October 1, 2012 through November 30, 2012, but were not paid at the time of assessment. Cases were tested beyond the audit period to determine compliance with all components of the collection program. All cases that included court costs, fees, and fines that totaled \$10.00 or less were removed from testing.

### Methodology

Performed the procedures outlined in the Detailed Procedures and Findings section of this report to test records to enable us to issue a report of findings as to whether the County has complied, in all material respects, with the compliance criteria described in Article 103.0033 of the Code of Criminal Procedure and 1 TAC §175.3.

In performing the procedures, the 'tests' the auditor performed included tracing source documentation provided by the County to ensure the collection process met the terms of the criteria listed. Source documents include, but are not limited to, court dockets, applications for a payment plan, communication records, capias pro fine records, and payment records.

### Criteria Used

Code of Criminal Procedure, Article 103.0033  
Texas Administrative Code, Title 1, §175.3

### Team Members

Greg Magness, CIA, CGAP; Audit Manager  
Amanda Price, CFE, Auditor



## APPENDIX B

### REPORT DISTRIBUTION

Ms. Christy Cowan  
Warrant and Collections Supervisor  
Wichita County  
900 7<sup>th</sup> St., Room 135  
Wichita Falls, TX 76301

Chief Derek Meador  
Deputy Chief  
Wichita County  
900 7<sup>th</sup> St.  
Wichita Falls, TX 76301

Mr. David Slayton  
Administrative Director  
Office of Court Administration  
205 W. 14<sup>th</sup> Street, Suite 600  
Austin, Texas 78711-2066

Ms. Mary Cowherd  
Deputy Director  
Office of Court Administration  
205 W. 14<sup>th</sup> Street, Suite 600  
Austin, Texas 78711-2066

Ms. Glenna Bowman  
Chief Financial Officer  
Office of Court Administration  
205 W. 14<sup>th</sup> Street, Suite 600  
Austin, Texas 78711-2066

Mr. Jim Lehman  
Collection Improvement Program Technical Support  
Office of Court Administration  
205 W. 14<sup>th</sup> Street, Suite 600  
Austin, Texas 78711-2066

Ms. Daphne Webber  
Collection Improvement Program Technical Support  
Office of Court Administration  
205 W. 14<sup>th</sup> Street, Suite 600  
Austin, Texas 78711-2066