

A Legislative Summary Document Regarding Department of Mental Health and Mental Retardation

Contents

Financial Profile

Key Findings from Previous Audits and Reviews

Performance Management

Quality Assurance Team Reviews

Disaster Preparedness

Information System Vulnerability Assessments

Travel Expenditures

State Auditor's Observations

The Department of Mental Health and Mental Retardation (MHMR) has established procedures that should ensure that the financial information in its Legislative Appropriations Request (LAR) is reasonably accurate.

While MHMR has reasonable methods for determining forecasts for performance measures relating to its most significant goal, methods for estimating some of the lesser measures may not be reliable.

MHMR does not adequately establish and monitor community service contracts to ensure that client services result in appropriate outcomes and that funds are properly managed.

MHMR has weaknesses in fund balance management and in controls over travel advance and petty cash.

We were unable to certify without qualifications any of the ten fiscal year 2000 performance measures we tested.

Prepared for the 78th Legislature by the State Auditor's Office

January 2003 SAO No. 03-323

SAO Contact: Joanna Peavy (512) 936-9500

Financial Profile

Revenue Projections

Generally, the Department of Mental Health and Mental Retardation (MHMR) bases revenue budgets on past actual amounts and annualized estimates, although specific methods differ according to the nature of the revenue source. MHMR starts with the prior year budget and then adjusts these initial estimates for expected changes in federal matching assistance payments, changes in master lease purchase program requirements, one-time funding requests, and the restoration of unfunded cost increases that reduced salaries.

An exception to this methodology is for the Medicaid Waiver Services strategy. According to MHMR, it expanded service levels for this strategy in fiscal year 2002. However, the expansion of service levels was not in effect for the whole year, so some 2002 appropriations in this strategy were lapsed.

Reconciliations to USAS and ABEST

MHMR's process for reconciling its internal accounting system to the Uniform Statewide Accounting System (USAS) includes daily and weekly reconciliations and the generation of daily deposit reports and weekly cash balance reports. The reconcilers also prepare monthly unmatched item reports for the various MHMR facilities. These reports list the entries from the internal system and USAS that have not been matched.

MHMR reconciles USAS to the Automated Budget and Evaluation System for Texas (ABEST) each quarter. As MHMR's accounting system does not report information by method of finance, MHMR relies on its budget analysts to assign Legislative Budget Board (LBB) method of finance codes to the USAS information before entering it to ABEST.

Expenditures by Category

The table below shows MHMR's expenditures by Comptroller of Public Accounts category as reported by MHMR in USAS for appropriation years 2000, 2001, and 2002. This data has not been audited. It is provided for informational purposes to show how MHMR has spent its funds. We obtained explanations from MHMR for fluctuations across years that appeared unusual.

Expenditures by Comptroller USAS Category Groups					
Comptroller USAS Category Group	Appropriation Year 2000	Appropriation Year 2001	Appropriation Year 2002		
Public Assistance Payments (Note A)	\$ 1,367,150,161	\$ 1,379,950,201	\$ 1,510,887,455		
Salaries and Wages ^a	513,028,449	475,238,802	513,362,374		
Supplies and Materials	63,425,067	61,803,214	63,171,602		
Interfund Transfers/Other (Note B)	44,661,392	20,535,924	34,832,592		
Employee Benefits (Note C)	37,177,129	125,305,598	147,681,351		
Professional Services and Fees	24,734,908	22,217,216	25,850,057		
Other Expenditures	19,536,011	19,400,229	14,647,082		
Communications and Utilities (Note D)	19,495,642	24,367,896	18,520,189		
Repairs and Maintenance	12,819,357	11,330,762	5,535,818		
Rentals and Leases	4,528,348	3,468,040	3,319,033		
Capital Outlay	4,458,142	4,579,689	2,544,876		
Cost of Goods Sold	3,094,018	1,484,102	1,440,735		

SAO Contact: Joanna Peavy (512) 936-9500

Expenditures by Comptroller USAS Category Groups					
Comptroller USAS Category Group	Appropriation Year 2000	Appropriation Year 2001	Appropriation Year 2002		
Travel	2,495,529	1,888,505	2,053,209		
Claims and Judgments	610,366	384,517	700,035		
Printing and Reproduction	166,402	91,226	113,266		
Intergovernmental Payments	0	0	2,000		
Interest/Prompt Payment Penalties	13,226	18,051	27,128		
Total Expenditures	\$ 2,117,394,147	\$ 2,152,063,972	\$ 2,344,688,802		

^a The amounts shown here for Salaries and Wages will not agree with the Salary Expenditures in the Workforce Summary Document prepared by the State Classification Office (SCO) because the USAS Salaries and Wages category does not include certain object codes that SCO considers employee compensation. These include performance awards and employee recognition awards.

Source: USAS - All funds including appropriated, unappropriated, and non-appropriated as of November 30, 2002.

Note A – An object code in this category is used as a mechanism to transfer state hospital funds to the Health and Human Services Commission (HHSC), which uses those funds to draw down matching federal funds under the Disproportionate Share program. Once HHSC receives the federal funds, this amount is given back to MHMR. The required method of recording this as a transfer out and a subsequent receipt back (rather than netting the receipt against this same object code) makes it look like MHMR is spending more on Public Assistance Payments than it actually is.

Note B – Interfund transfers may include transactions and adjustments made by the Comptroller of Public Accounts, as well as transfers between funds within MHMR and transfers out to other State agencies. A primary source of the higher-than-usual interfund transfers in 2000 was the allocation of retirement costs for federal programs, for which there was no allocation in 2001 or 2002. Similarly, in 2002 an assessment from the State Office of Risk Management was in excess of \$12 million, whereas in 2000 and 2001 no such assessment was recorded.

Note C – The fluctuation in employee benefits occurred because of a change in process. In previous years, the Employees Retirement System (ERS) paid for the State's portion of certain employee benefits for all agencies. In fiscal year 2000, agencies using the Uniform Statewide Payroll System (USPS) received the funding and paid the employee benefits directly. Because MHMR did not use USPS, ERS still paid the benefits in fiscal year 2000. The process changed in fiscal year 2001, and all agencies received the funding and paid the employee benefits directly.

Note D – According to MHMR, expenditures for communications and utilities increased in 2001 because of increased costs of natural gas being passed on to MHMR from its vendors. The increased natural gas costs began in late fiscal year 2000 and continued until late fiscal year 2001. The increased natural gas costs also caused an increase in the cost of electricity. The reduction in expenditures from fiscal year 2001 to fiscal year 2002 is due to deregulation in the electric industry. Also, cooler temperatures in the summer of 2002 reduced electricity consumption.

Key Findings from Previous Audits and Reviews

January 1, 2001-December 31, 2002

An Audit Report on State Entity Management of Travel Advance and Petty Cash Funds

(Report No. 02-070, August 2002)

Weaknesses in fund balance management at the Department of Mental Health and Mental Retardation (MHMR):

Three of the agencies we audited appear to have petty cash fund balances that they did not use or that were larger than necessary. In the case of MHMR, we

Status of Audit Recommendations as of November 30, 2002

No status is reported at this time to allow MHMR sufficient time to address recommendations in this recently released report.

SAO Contact: Joanna Peavy (512) 936-9500

found that that MHMR's Austin State School maintained a \$5,800 petty cash fund balance, but it spent an average of only \$1,356 of these funds each month during an eight-month period in fiscal year 2002.

Weaknesses in controls over travel advance and petty cash:

MHMR's Austin State School did not ensure that it always used the appropriate Uniform Statewide Accounting System (USAS) transaction codes for petty cash transactions. MHMR also did not have documented travel advance and petty cash policies and procedures specific to the Austin State School.

An Audit of Community Service Contracts at Selected Health and Human Service Agencies

(Report No. 02-052, June 2002)

The Department of Mental Health and Mental Retardation (MHMR) does not adequately establish and monitor community service contracts to ensure that client services result in appropriate outcomes and that funds are properly managed. As a result, MHMR may be unaware of providers that are providing substandard services and that have weak fiscal operations.

Status of Audit Recommendations as of November 30, 2002

No status is reported at this time to allow MHMR sufficient time to address recommendations in this recently released report.

Key facts and findings are as follows:

- MHMR appropriately identified that it could recoup \$2.4 million at 27 community mental health and mental retardation centers (community MHMR centers) because these centers were not meeting contractual performance targets during the last three quarters of fiscal year 2001. MHMR took no action to recoup these funds. However, MHMR recouped approximately \$700,000 from the first quarter of fiscal year 2001.
- MHMR should strengthen its administration of community MHMR center contracts by establishing contract provisions that adequately address client outcomes. Furthermore, MHMR should improve its contract monitoring to ensure that services result in appropriate outcomes and that funds are spent appropriately.
- MHMR needs to continue to closely monitor the financial health of community MHMR centers involved in the NorthSTAR managed care program.

A Financial Review of the Department of Mental Health and Mental Retardation

(Report No. 02-033, April 2002)

The Legislature and other oversight bodies can rely on the financial information generated from the internal accounting system of the Department of Mental Health and Mental Retardation (MHMR). This assurance is based on our testing of MHMR's financial system and processes in place as of August 2001. However, additional financial and client service information is reported to MHMR by community centers (non-state entities). We found the information reported by the community centers to be inconsistent and unreliable. As a result, MHMR does not know how community centers spent

Status of Audit Recommendations as of November 30, 2002 (unaudited)		
MHMR has reported the following:		
Implemented	1	
Partially implemented	1	
Has other explanatory information	1	
Total recommendations	3	

the funds provided to these centers or how many people these centers served. This unreliable information does not affect the overall amount of funding provided to the community centers and is not part of the financial information reported to the Legislature and other oversight bodies. However, it does affect program administration and future budget projections by

SAO Contact: Joanna Peavy (512) 936-9500

strategy. In fiscal year 2001, the community centers received more than \$475 million of MHMR's \$1.7 billion appropriated budget.

Our review of expenditures revealed that MHMR spent its appropriated funds in accordance with applicable laws and regulations. However, we were unable to confirm the alignment by strategies between expenditures and outcomes because of unreliable performance information and incomplete financial information.

An Audit Report on 19 Agencies' Compliance With Historically Underutilized Business Requirements

(Report No. 01-035, August 2001)

For fiscal year 2000, the Department of Mental Health and Mental Retardation (MHMR) did not fully comply with historically underutilized business (HUB) requirements in Texas Administrative Code (TAC) and Chapters 111 and 2161 of the Texas Government Code. However, we have determined that the Department made a "good-faith effort" to comply with HUB requirements.

Results of Entity Co	Did the Entity Make				
Planning	Outreach ^a	Reporting	Subcontracting	a "Good-Faith Effort"? ^b	
No material noncompliance	No material noncompliance	Under-reported the number of bids submitted and contracts awarded, and over- reported the amount of non-treasury funds paid to subcontractors (TAC, Section 111.16)	No material noncompliance	Yes	

^a Most of the agencies had not developed and implemented a mentor protégé program during fiscal year 2000. Of the HUB requirements, the mentor protégé program requirement had the latest effective date (June 2000). The agencies indicated there was not enough time to design and implement the program in the last quarter of the fiscal year.

Status of Corrective Action: In December 2002, the Department reported that it had implemented both of the recommendations we made in this audit report. This information has not been audited.

b The State Auditor's Office, in consultation with the General Services Commission, determined that an entity did not make a "good-faith effort" if it had noncompliance in at least three of the four basic HUB areas: planning, outreach, reporting, and subcontracting. (The General Services Commission was abolished effective September 1, 2001, and the newly created Texas Building and Procurement Commission subsequently assumed most of its responsibilities.)

SAO Contact: Joanna Peavy (512) 936-9500

An Audit Report on Property Reported as Lost or Stolen

(Report No. 01-032, June 2001)

The results of our statistical testing at four agencies and universities indicate that state property with a total book value of \$12.8 million may be missing (\$2.9 million for the Department of Mental Health and Mental Retardation). While the percentage of missing items at each of the four entities meets limited available standards for acceptable property loss, improvements in property management procedures could reduce the risk of loss or theft of state assets. The percentage of missing test items varied from 1.7 percent at the Department of Human Services to 3.8 percent at both the Department of Mental Health and Mental Retardation and The University of Texas Medical Branch at Galveston.

Status of Audit Recommendations ¹ as of November 30, 2002 (unaudited)				
MHMR has reported the following:				
Implemented	3			
Total recommendations	3			
¹ From management letter No. 01-467				

Performance Management

Performance Indicators Used by Management

To determine whether it is achieving its mission, the Department of Mental Health and Mental Retardation (MHMR) uses Legislative Budget Board (LBB) performance measures to monitor the performance of the state facilities and local mental health and mental retardation authorities.

In addition to data on LBB performance measures, MHMR collects data regarding service providers throughout the state, the services and support provided to consumers throughout the state, and the personal outcomes recognized by these consumers.

MHMR generates state mental health facilities' and state mental retardation facilities' performance indicators from information that facilities report in either the Client Assignment and Registration (CARE) or Medical Records systems. These reports are provided to the governing board twice per year and include summary information about each facility. The reports are also available on MHMR's Web site.

The Community Services Performance Report provides a risk analysis of each community MHMR center based on financial data and information on whether or not targeted performance has been met. MHMR produces the report each quarter and distributes it to management, local authorities and the governing board, and to the public via its Web site.

MHMR establishes benchmarks based on historical trends. The Center for Mental Health Services is currently conducting studies to establish national indicators, which will then allow the establishment of national benchmarks. The study should be complete in two or three years.

Estimating Performance Targets

MHMR appears to have reasonable methods for forecasting its performance for Goal C—Community MR Services, which represents 45 percent of its total budget. MHMR uses annualized information and staff knowledge of trends and programs to calculate most of its performance measure targets in the LAR. However, MHMR does not have complete data to determine the three measures relating to vocational or supported employment. It uses numbers reported in fiscal year 2002 surveys of randomly selected participants in vocational programs, and then it carries that number forward as the projection for future years. Information for intermediate care facilities comes from Medicaid reports of actual and projected bed days. The General Appropriations Act, 77th Legislature, Page II – 104, Rider 68 indicated that MHMR should take inflation into consideration in setting performance targets.

SAO Contact: Joanna Peavy (512) 936-9500

Most Recent Performance Measure Certification

Fiscal Year 1998—Fiscal Year 2003

The results of *An Audit on Performance Measures at 12 State Entities–Fiscal Year 2001* (Report No. 01-036, August 2001) for this entity are summarized below.

Period	od Goal/Strategy		Measure	Certification Results		
2000	A	Community Mental Health Services	Percent of Adult Customers Receiving Mental Health (MH) Community Services Whose Functional Level Stabilized or Increased	Inaccurate		
2000	A.1.3	Treatment	Average Monthly Number of Community Customers Receiving New Generation Medications	Inaccurate		
2001 Q1	A.1.3	Treatment	Average Monthly Number of Community Customers Receiving New Generation Medications	Inaccurate		
2000	A.1.5	Children's MH Services	Average Monthly Number of Children Receiving Treatment Services	Factors Prevented Certification		
2001 Q1	A.1.5	Children's MH Services	Average Monthly Number of Children Receiving Treatment Services	Factors Prevented Certification		
2000	В	MH Specialized Services	Percent of Customers Receiving MH Campus Services Whose Functional Level Stabilized or Increased	Certified with Qualification		
2000	B.1.1	State Hospital Services	Average Monthly Number of Psychiatric Facility Customers Receiving Mental Health New Generation Medication Services	Inaccurate		
2001 Q1	B.1.1	State Hospital Services	Average Monthly Number of Psychiatric Facility Customers Receiving Mental Health New Generation Medication Services	Inaccurate		
2000	B.1.1	State Hospital Services	Average Monthly Cost per Psychiatric Facility Customer Receiving New Generation Medication Services	Inaccurate		
2001 Q1	B.1.1 State Hospital Services		Average Monthly Cost per Psychiatric Facility Customer Receiving New Generation Medication Services	Inaccurate		
2000	C Community Mental Retardation (MR) Services		Number of Customers Moved from Mental Retardation Campus to Community	Inaccurate		
2000	C.1.4	MR Community Residential	Average Monthly Number of Customers Served in Home and Community Based Services (HCS)	Certified with Qualification		
2001 Q1	C.1.4	MR Community Residential	Average Monthly Number of Customers Served in HCS	Certified with Qualification		
2000	C.1.4	MR Community Residential	Average Monthly Cost per Customer Served in HCS	Certified with Qualification		
2001 Q1	C.1.4	MR Community Residential	Average Monthly Cost per Customer Served in HCS	Inaccurate		
2000	D MR Specialized Services Average Number of Days MR Campus Residents Recommended for Community Placement Wait for Placement		Inaccurate			
	Total Measures Certified Without Qualification a 0/16 (0%)					
	4/16 (25%)					

^a The percentage of unqualified certifications is presented because it is used in determining an entity's eligibility for performance rewards as established in the General Appropriations Act [77th Legislature, Article IX, Sec. 6.31(d)(2)].

SAO Contact: Joanna Peavy (512) 936-9500

Category	Definition		
Certified	Reported performance is accurate within +/-5 percent, and controls appear adequate to ensure accurate collection and reporting of performance data.		
Certified with Qualification	Reported performance is within +/-5 percent, but the controls over data collection and reporting are not adequate to ensure the continued accuracy of performance data.		
Factors Prevented Certification	Actual performance cannot be determined because of inadequate controls and insufficient documentation.		
Inaccurate	Reported performance is not within +/-5 percent of actual performance, or there is an error rate of at least 5 percent in the supporting documentation.		
Not Applicable	A justifiable reason exists for not reporting performance.		

Quality Assurance Team Reviews

Conducted by the Legislative Budget Board and State Auditor's Office

Completed Projects

Quality Assurance Team Annual Report – January 2003

The Department of Mental Health and Mental Retardation (MHMR) completed the Human Resources System project at a cost of \$5,701,540 on February 28, 2002. The initial budget was \$5,365,500, and the initial completion date was August 31, 2001.

Completed Projects

Quality Assurance Team Annual Report – January 2002

MHMR completed the Computer-Aided Facilities Management project at a total cost of \$7,079,812.

MHMR completed the Decision Support Technologies project at a total cost of \$3,635,478.

Canceled Projects

Quality Assurance Team Annual Report – January 2002

MHMR canceled the Texas Community Accountability Project at a total cost of \$0.

Ongoing Projects

Quality Assurance Team Annual Report – January 2003

<u>Client Record Systems (CRS)</u> — In September 1997, MHMR began developing an integrated client record for all MHMR inpatient facilities using an off-the-shelf software product. The project is 78 percent complete. Current expenditures are \$4,959,857.

Project	Function	Initial Budget	Current Budget	Budget Change	Initial End Date	Current End Date	Time Change
CRS	Integrate client records	\$13,270,000	\$6,738,264	(\$6,531,736)	08/31/00	08/31/03	36 months

Disaster Preparedness

We gathered information from MHMR on plans in place to provide continued operations and services in the event of a disaster. Standard audit criteria for disaster preparedness have not been established; therefore, we are not evaluating MHMR's plans. Our objective was only to provide the information reported by MHMR.

SAO Contact: Joanna Peavy (512) 936-9500

MHMR has individual disaster recovery plans for its facilities and policies for reviewing and updating the plans. The plans include procedures for making mission-critical functions operational as soon as possible after a disaster. MHMR's Information Services division has disaster recovery plans for each of its facilities (including the central office) that address hardware configuration, personal computers, and software licensing issues. MHMR also has disaster recovery coverage on its mainframe computer through the West Texas Disaster Recovery and Operations Center.

At the time of our assessment, the central office facility at MHMR had not finalized its customization of the MHMR Emergency Management Plan and was operating under a draft version. The State Office of Risk Management (SORM) recommended, in its March 2002 consultation, that the central office facility finalize and implement its emergency management plan. The central office facility responded to SORM

The Information Systems disaster recovery plans are tested at least every six months, and Information Systems regional managers meet periodically to discuss disaster recovery issues. MHMR is also involved in the recently chartered State Agency Disaster Recovery Workgroup.

Information System Vulnerability Assessments

The State Auditor's Office (SAO) and/or the Department of Information Resources performed one or more information system vulnerability assessments at the Department of Mental Health and Mental Retardation between January 2000 and November 2002. Detailed results of this work are confidential under Texas Government Code, Section 2054.077(c). The SAO's Legislative Summary Document titled "Information System Vulnerability Assessments" provides general information about the results of information system vulnerability assessments.

Travel Expenditures

Travel Expenditures by Appropriation Year (unaudited)					
	2000	2001	2002		
In-State Travel	\$ 2,330,989	\$ 1,731,306	\$ 1,944,688		
Out-of-State Travel	173,513	153,143	104,456		
Foreign Travel	0	593	0		
Other Travel Costs	(8,973)	3,463	4,066		
Total Travel Expenditures	\$ 2,495,529	\$ 1,888,505	\$ 2,053,209		
Limit on Travel Expenditures (Cap)	4,490,923	4,490,923	173,513ª		
Expenditures in Excess of Cap	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0		

^a Caps apply to total travel in appropriation years 2000 and 2001, but caps apply only to out-of-state travel and foreign travel in appropriation year 2002. Caps, calculated by the Comptroller of Public Accounts, have been adjusted for any increases requested by MHMR and approved by the Legislative Budget Board in accordance with the General Appropriations Act.

Source: Uniform Statewide Accounting System (USAS) as of November 30, 2002. Amounts are subject to change as agencies continue to record additional expenditures or adjustments.