

Agency Name: Supreme Court

Lead Administrator: Michael D. Evans

Lead Financial Officer: Tammy Reaves

FY'14 Budgeted FTE						
	Supervisors	Classified	Unclassified	\$0 - \$35 K	\$35 K - \$70 K	\$70 K - \$\$\$
Justices/Staff	9		47	1	12	34
AOC	3		25		22	3
COCA-OKC	6		22		4	18
COCA-Tulsa	6		22		4	18
Dispute	1		3		2	1
Clerk	1		10		9	1
MIS	10		80		66	14
Law Library	1		6		5	1
Total	36	0	209	1	119	89

FTE History					
	2014 Budgeted	2013	2010	2009	2004
Supreme Court		215		215	
Total	0	215	0	215	0

*In 2006, the legislature increase FTE's by 18

FY'14 Projected Division/Program Funding By Source						
	Appropriations	Federal	Revolving	Local	Other*	Total
Justices/Staff	\$6,096,747				\$86,000	\$6,182,747
AOC	\$4,285,496	\$1,500,000	\$40,000		\$324,839	\$6,150,335
COCA-OKC	\$2,909,590				\$19,700	\$2,929,290
COCA-Tulsa	\$3,128,338				\$49,700	\$3,178,038
Dispute	\$815,029				\$284,594	\$1,099,623
Clerk	\$64,800				\$835,167	\$899,967
MIS	\$0		\$25,866,182			\$25,866,182
Law Library			\$2,032,203			\$2,032,203
Total	\$17,300,000	\$1,500,000	\$27,938,385	\$0	\$1,600,000	\$48,338,385

*Source of "Other" and % of "Other" total for each.

Other=FY13 Carryover

FY'13 Carryover by Funding Source						
	Appropriations	Federal	Revolving	Local	Other*	Total
FY'13 Carryover	\$1,600,000	\$0	\$0	\$0		\$1,600,000

*Source of "Other" and % of "Other" total for each.

What Changes did the Agency Make between FY'13 and FY'14?
1.) Are there any services no longer provided because of budget cuts? N/A
2.) What services are provided at a higher cost to the user? N/A
3.) What services are still provided but with a slower response rate? N/A

FY'15 Requested Division/Program Funding By Source						
	Appropriations	Federal	Revolving	Other	Total	% Change
Justices & Staff	\$6,418,593				\$6,418,593	3.81%
AOC	\$4,603,452	\$1,500,000			\$6,103,452	-0.76%
COCA-OKC	\$2,999,139				\$2,999,139	2.38%
COCA-Tulsa	\$3,292,595					
Dispute	\$1,055,332				\$1,055,332	-4.03%
Clerk	\$916,759				\$916,759	1.87%
MIS			\$25,800,000		\$25,800,000	-0.26%
Law Library			\$2,000,000		\$2,000,000	-1.58%
Total	\$19,285,870	\$1,500,000	\$27,800,000	\$0	\$45,293,275	-6.30%

*Source of "Other" and % of "Other" total for each.

FY'15 Top Five Appropriation Funding Requests	
	\$ Amount
Request 1: Stand still budget for FY2015	\$0
Request 2:	\$0
Request 3:	\$0
Request 4:	\$0
Request 5:	\$0

How would the agency handle a 3% appropriation reduction in FY'15?

Operational costs vary and we have little control over costs due to legislative mandates and directives. Further reductions in staff cannot be absorbed without a loss of essential basic court services.

How would the agency handle a 5% appropriation reduction in FY'15?

Operational costs vary and we have little control over costs due to legislative mandates and directives. Further reductions in staff cannot be absorbed without a loss of essential basic court services.

Is the agency seeking any fee increases for FY'15?	
	\$ Amount
Increase 1: No	\$0
Increase 2:	\$0
Increase 3:	\$0

Federal Government Impact

1.) How much federal money received by the agency is tied to a mandate by the Federal Government?
\$0.00

2.) Are any of those funds inadequate to pay for the federal mandate?
N/A

3.) What would the consequences be of ending all of the federal funded programs for your agency?
The Courts would be unable to provide the education for Judges and lawyers in deprived child cases as directed by Oklahoma Statutes.

4.) How will your agency be affected by federal budget cuts in the coming fiscal year?
N/A

5.) Has the agency requested any additional federal earmarks or increases?
No.

Division and Program Descriptions

Administrative

Performance Measure Review					
	FY13	FY12	FY11	FY10	FY09
Administrative None	0	0	0	0	0