# LEGISLATIVE APPROPRIATIONS REQUEST for Fiscal Years 2022 and 2023 

Submitted to the Office of the Governor, Budget Division, and the Legislative Budget Board

BY
242 - State Commission on Judicial Conduct
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| Administrator＇s Statement <br> 87th Regular Session，Agency Submission，Version 1 <br> Automated Budget and Evaluation System of Texas（ABEST） |
| :--- |
| Sugarland，TX |
| Mr．Darrick McGill |
| Public Member State Commission on Judicial Conduct |
| Georgetown，TX |
| Mr．Frederick Tate |
| Public Member |
| Colleyville，TX |
| Mrs．Janis Holt |
| Public Member |
| Silsbee，TX |

The mission of the SCJC is to promote public confidence in the integrity，independence，and impartiality of the judiciary while encouraging judges to maintain high ethical standards of conduct on and off the bench．The primary method for achieving this mission is through the investigation of allegations of judicial misconduct or disability． In appropriate cases where there is sufficient evidence that a willful or persistent violation of the Texas Code of Judicial Conduct has occurred，the SCJC may take disciplinary action against a judge through（i）a private or public sanction and／or an order of additional education；（ii）a suspension order；（iii）acceptance of a voluntary resignation agreement；or（iv）formal public proceedings that could result in a judge＇s public sanction，censure，or a recommendation for removal from office．
I．Introduction：Workload Increases，FY 2015－2020
During FY 2019，the SCJC experienced a significant increase in total workload in two areas：complaints continued to increase，and the number of external proceedings also increased dramatically．
A．Increase in Filed Complaints
Over the last four years，the number of filings received by the Commission have dramatically increased．The following shows the number of filings received，dispositions and total caseload for each fiscal year since 2015.
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B. External Proceedings (Special Courts of Review)

The agency has also borne significant time and expense due to an increase in the number of external proceedings, including filing charges in five Special Courts of Review.
(1) Special Courts of Review
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The SCJC would greatly benefit from the addition of an investigator staff position to handle an ever-increasing caseload and to conduct a more regular and standard review of social media involving the conduct of judges. Having an investigator whose job duties would include, but would not be limited to, actively monitoring various social media platforms would allow the SCJC to identify and address more cases involving potential judicial misconduct.
In addition to the Chief Investigator, 2 staff investigators, and 1 investigator/screener currently share the responsibility of handling a pending caseload of more than 600 itional staff investigator to take over a share of the prefiminary investigations currently pending and pursue a more regular and standard review of judicial social media activity utilizing various social media platforms, would reduce the delay in resolving judicial misconduct cases and ensure high quality preliminary investigations that provide the SCJC with the best information needed to make the most informed decisions regarding the appropriate action.
Footnotes: proceedings, the SCJC experienced a brief decline in the number of complaints filed with the agency. (ii) On May 8, 2020 the Office of Court Administration (OCA), the information technology provider (IT) for the appellate courts and state judicial agencies within the Texas judicial branch, including the SCJC, experienced a Ransomware attack which disabled the SCJC's network including websites and servers for approximately 3 months. OCA provided a temporary means to enable the SCJC to continue its functions, but the agency's case management system is still in the process of being fully restored. The number represents a decline in dispositions due to the pandemic and the ransomware attack. (iii) Due to the Coronavirus (COVID-19) pandemic and the Governor Abbott's declaration of a state of disaster for all Texas Counties on March 13, 2020, and the Supreme Court of Texas's First Emergency Order regarding COVID-19 State of Disaster, the Special Courts of Review abated the proceedings until further notice. (iv) (1) Cause No. D-1-GN-20-003926, Diane Hensley, on Behalf of Herself and Others Similarly Situated vs. State Commission on Judicial Conduct, et. al. was originally filed on December 17, 2019 and is currently pending in the 459th Judicial District Court in Travis, County; and, (2) Cause No. 4:20-cv-00253-P, Brian Keith Umphress vs. David Hall, et. al. was filed on March 18, 2020 and is currently pending before the United States District Court for the Northern District of Texas, Fort Worth Division.
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## OUTSIDE LEGAL EXPENSES BY FY
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## OUTSIDE LEGAL EXPENSES BY FY
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## COMPLAINTS, DISPOSITIONS AND CASELOADS BY FY

$\longrightarrow$ Complaints Filed $\_$Complaints Disposed $\rightarrow$ Gap (Complaints - Dispositions)
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## CERTIFICATE

## Agency Name State Commission on Judicial Conduct

This is to certify that the information contained in the agency Legislative Appropriation Request filed with the Legislative Budget Board (LBB) and the Governor's Office Budget Division (Govemor's Office) is accurate to the best of my knowledge and that the electronic submission to the LBB via the Automated Budget and Evaluation System of Texas (ABEST) and the PDF file submitted via the LBB Document Submission application are identical.

Additionally, should it become likely at any time that unexpended balances will accrue for any account, the LBB and the Governor's Office will be notified in writing in accordance with Article IX, Section 7.01 (2020-21 GAA).


Jacqueline Habersham
Printed Name
Executive Director
Title

| 9 | 11 | 20 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Date |  |  |

Kathryn Crabtree
Printed Name
Staff Services Officer
Title



DavidHall
Printed Name
Commission Chair
Title


| Budget Overview - Biennial Amounts <br> 87th Regular Session, Agency Submission, Version 1 Automated Budget and Evaluation System of Texas (ABEST) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 242 State Commission on Judicial Conduct <br> Appropriation Years: 2022-23 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | GENERAL REVENUE FUNDS |  | GR DEDICATED |  | FEDERALFUNDS |  | OTHER FUNDS |  | ALL FUNDS |  | ITEM ITSAL FUNDS |
|  | 2020-21 | 2022-23 | 2020-21 | 2022-23 | 2020-21 | 2022-23 | 2020-21 | 2022-23 | 2020-21 | 2022-23 | 2022-23 |
| Goal: 1. Administration and |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Enforcement |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1.1.1. Administration And Enforcement | 2,383,908 | 2,383,908 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2,383,908 | 2,383,908 | 306,000 |
| Total, Goal | 2,383,908 | 2,383,908 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2,383,908 | 2,383,908 | 306,000 |
| Total, Agency | 2,383,908 | 2,383,908 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2,383,908 | 2,383,908 | 306,000 |
| Total FTEs |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 14.0 | 14.0 | 15.0 |

9/11/2020 5:33:59PM
9/11/2020 5:33:59PM

9/11/2020 5:34:00PM

Wdi0:ť:s ozoz/It/6
DATE: $\mathbf{9 / 1 1 / 2 0 2 0}$
TIME : 5:34:01PM


|  | 2.F. Summary of Total Request by Strategy 87th Regular Session, Agency Submission, Version 1 Automated Budget and Evaluation System of Texas (ABEST) |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { DATE : } \\ & \text { TIME : } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \text { 9/11/2020 } \\ \text { 5:34:02PM } \end{array}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Agency code: 242 Agency name: | State Commission on Judici | duct |  |  |  |  |
|  | Base | Base | Exceptional | Exceptional | Total Request | Total Request |
| Goal/Objective/STRATEGY |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1 Administration and Enforcement |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1 Administration and Enforcement |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1 ADMINISTRATION AND ENFORCEMENT | \$1,191,954 | \$1,191,954 | \$153,000 | \$153,000 | \$1,344,954 | \$1,344,954 |
| TOTAL, GOAL 1 | \$1,191,954 | \$1,191,954 | \$153,000 | \$153,000 | \$1,344,954 | \$1,344,954 |
| TOTAL, AGENCY |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| STRATEGY REQUEST | \$1,191,954 | \$1,191,954 | \$153,000 | \$153,000 | \$1,344,954 | \$1,344,954 |
| TOTAL, AGENCY RIDER |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| APPROPRIATIONS REQUEST |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| GRAND TOTAL, AGENCY REQUEST | \$1,191,954 | \$1,191,954 | \$153,000 | \$153,000 | \$1,344,954 | \$1,344,954 |


|  | 2.F. Summary of Total Request by Strategy 87th Regular Session, Agency Submission, Version 1 Automated Budget and Evaluation System of Texas (ABEST) |  |  |  |  | DATE: <br> TIME | $\begin{array}{r} \text { 9/11/2020 } \\ \text { 5:34:02PM } \end{array}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Agency code: 242 | Agency name: | State Commission on Judic | nduct |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | Base | Base | Exceptional | Exceptional | Total Request | Total Request |
| Goal/Objective/STRATEGY |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| General Revenue Funds: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1 General Revenue Fund |  | \$1,191,954 | \$1,191,954 | \$153,000 | \$153,000 | \$1,344,954 | \$1,344,954 |
|  |  | \$1,191,954 | \$1,191,954 | \$153,000 | \$153,000 | \$1,344,954 | \$1,344,954 |
| TOTAL, METHOD OF FINANCING |  | \$1,191,954 | \$1,191,954 | \$153,000 | \$153,000 | \$1,344,954 | \$1,344,954 |
| full time equivalent positions |  | 14.0 | 14.0 | 15.0 | 15.0 | 29.0 | 29.0 |



| GOAL: 1 Administration and Enforcement |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| OBJECTIVE: 1 Administration and Enforcement |  |  | Service Cate |  |  |
| STRATEGY: 1 Administration and Enforcement |  |  | Service: 01 | Income: A. 2 | Age: B. 3 |
| CODE DESCRIPTION | Exp 2019 | Est 2020 | Bud 2021 | BL 2022 | BL 2023 |
| Output Measures: |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1 Number of Cases Pending | 806.00 | 1,205.00 | 1,176.00 | 1,292.00 | 1,409.00 |
| 2 Number of Presentations on Judicial Ethics at Conferences and Meetings | 20.00 | 20.00 | 20.00 | 20.00 | 20.00 |
| 3 Formal Proceeding, Suspension, or Amicus Curiae Cases | 7.00 | 4.00 | 7.00 | 7.00 | 8.00 |
| 4 Cases Requesting Reconsideration Disposed | 19.00 | 20.00 | 20.00 | 20.00 | 20.00 |
| 5 Number of Cases Disposed | 1,694.00 | 1,230.00 | 1,723.00 | 1,802.00 | 1,882.00 |
| 6 Ethics Calls Taken by Staff | 500.00 | 350.00 | 500.00 | 500.00 | 500.00 |
| Efficiency Measures: |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1 Average Time for Case Resolution | 6.06 | 6.00 | 5.90 | 5.70 | 5.70 |
| 2 Average Cost Per Judge Assisted by the Amicus Curiae Program | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Explanatory/Input Measures: |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1 Number of Cases Filed | 1,849.00 | 1,585.00 | 2,020.00 | 2,081.00 | 2,143.00 |
| 2 Number of Post-sanction Appeals | 3.00 | 2.00 | 4.00 | 8.00 | 10.00 |
| 3 Amicus Curiae Assistance | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Objects of Expense: |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1001 SALARIES AND WAGES | \$920,586 | \$894,083 | \$1,051,985 | \$1,000,000 | \$1,000,000 |
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242 State Commission on Judicial Conduct
GOAL:
OBJECTIVE:
STRATEGY:


[^0]DESCRIPTION OF ANTICIPATED OUT-YEAR COSTS :
This Rider would only be used if the agency incurs external litigation cost.

| DATE: | 9/11/2020 |
| :--- | :--- |
| TIME: | $\mathbf{5 : 3 4 : 0 3 P M}$ |

87th Regular Session, Agency Submission, Version 1
Automated Budget and Evaluation System of Texas (ABEST)

| Agency code: 242 | Agency name: |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  |  | State Commission on Judicial Conduct |  |  |
| CODE | DESCRIPTION |  |  | Excp 2022 |

$$
\begin{array}{lc}
\text { DATE: } & \mathbf{9 / 1 1 / 2 0 2 0} \\
\text { TIME: } & \mathbf{5 : 3 4 : 0 3 P M}
\end{array}
$$

| $1,802.00 \%$ | $1,882.00 \%$ |
| ---: | :---: |
| $1,092.00$ | $1,209.00$ |
| 5.00 | 4.80 |
| $2,081.00$ | $2,143.00$ |
| 100,000 | 100,000 |
| $\mathbf{\$ 1 0 0 , 0 0 0}$ | $\mathbf{\$ 1 0 0 , 0 0 0}$ |
| 100,000 |  |
| $\mathbf{\$ 1 0 0 , 0 0 0}$ | 100,000 |
| 0.0 | $\mathbf{\$ 1 0 0 , 0 0 0}$ |


| $2,002.00 \%$ | $1,682.00 \%$ |
| ---: | ---: |
| $1,092.00$ | $1,209.00$ |
| 5.20 | 4.70 |
|  |  |
| $2,239.00$ | $2,446.00$ |
|  |  |
| 50,000 | 50,000 |
| 1,500 | 1,500 |
| 1,500 | 1,500 |
| $\$ 53,000$ | $\mathbf{5 3 3}, 000$ |
|  |  |
| 53,000 | 53,000 |
| $\mathbf{5 3 3 , 0 0 0}$ | $\mathbf{\$ 5 3 , 0 0 0}$ |
| 15.0 | 15.0 |




| 6.A. Historically Underutilized Business Supporting Schedule | Date: |
| :---: | :---: |
| 87th Regular Session, Agency Submission, Version 1 | Time: $\mathbf{5 : 3 4 : 0 4 P M}$ |
| Automated Budget and Evaluation System of Texas (ABEST) |  |


| Agency Code: | 242 Agency: | State Commission on Judicial Conduct |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | COMPARISON TO STATEWIDE HUB PROCUREMENT GOALS |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| A. Fiscal Year - HUB Expenditure Information |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| StatewideHUB Goals | Procurement | \% Goal | HUB Expenditures FY 2018 |  |  | Expenditures |  | HUB Expenditures FY 2019 |  |  | Total Expenditures <br> FY 2019 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Category |  | \% Actual | Diff | Actual \$ | FY 2018 | \% Goal | \% Actual | Diff | Actual \$ |  |
| 23.7\% | Professional Services | 23.7 \% | 0.0\% | -23.7\% | \$0 | \$4,925 | 0.0 \% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | \$0 | \$0 |
| 26.0\% | Other Services | 26.0 \% | 40.8\% | 14.8\% | \$14,100 | \$34,564 | 26.0 \% | 23.3\% | -2.7\% | \$5,537 | \$23,789 |
| 21.1\% | Commodities | 21.1 \% | 5.9\% | -15.2\% | \$1,661 | \$27,966 | 21.1 \% | 18.7\% | -2.4\% | \$1,490 | \$7,972 |
|  | Total Expenditures |  | 23.4\% |  | \$15,761 | \$67,455 |  | 22.1\% |  | \$7,027 | \$31,761 |

B. Assessment of Fiscal Year - Efforts to Meet HUB Procurement Goals Attainment:

The State Commission on Judicial Conduct strives to meet our HUB goals each year. We were able to meet our HUB goals for Other Services in FY18. Applicability:

The Heavy Construction, Building Construction, and Special Trade categories are not applicable to our agency.
Factors Affecting Attainment:
The agency was unable to obtain HUB vendors for Professional Services in FY18, for Other Services in FY19, and Commodity purchases in both FY18 and FY19. Our agency most substantial purchases included outside legal counsel, consultant services for our computer software obtained through a DIR contract, proprietary software licenses and database access fees.
"Good-Faith" Efforts:
The State Commission on Judicial Conduct has made "good faith" efforts to consider HUB vendors in our purchases and will continue to do so.

| 242 | Agency name: State Commission on Judicial Conduct |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Exp 2019 | Est 2020 | Bud 2021 | BL 2022 | BL 2023 |
| GRAND TOTALS |  |  |  |  |  |
| Objects of Expense |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1001 SALARIES AND WAGES | \$127,580 | \$124,000 | \$129,250 | \$129,250 | \$129,250 |
| 1002 OTHER PERSONNEL COSTS | \$3,827 | \$3,720 | \$3,878 | \$3,878 | \$3,878 |
| 2001 PROFESSIONAL FEES AND SERVICES | \$1,300 | \$1,300 | \$1,300 | \$1,300 | \$1,300 |
| 2003 CONSUMABLE SUPPLIES | \$500 | \$500 | \$500 | \$500 | \$500 |
| 2007 RENT - MACHINE AND OTHER | \$300 | \$300 | \$300 | \$300 | \$300 |
| 2009 OTHER OPERATING EXPENSE | \$1,000 | \$1,000 | \$1,000 | \$1,000 | \$1,000 |
| Total, Objects of Expense | \$134,507 | \$130,820 | \$136,228 | \$136,228 | \$136,228 |
| Method of Financing |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1 General Revenue Fund | \$134,507 | \$130,820 | \$136,228 | \$136,228 | \$136,228 |
| Total, Method of Financing | \$134,507 | \$130,820 | \$136,228 | \$136,228 | \$136,228 |
| Full-Time-Equivalent Positions (FTE) | 1.6 | 1.6 | 1.6 | 1.6 | 1.6 |


[^0]:    
    8utomated Budget and Evaluation System of Texas (ABEST)

