



**John Keel, CPA**  
**State Auditor**

An Audit Report on

# **Performance Measures at the Pension Review Board**

August 2008  
Report No. 08-044

An Audit Report on  
***Performance Measures at the Pension  
Review Board***

---

SAO Report No. 08-044  
August 2008

## ***Overall Conclusion***

The Pension Review Board (Agency) reported reliable results for one of four (25 percent) performance measures for fiscal year 2007 and the first two quarters of fiscal year 2008. A performance measure is considered reliable if it is certified or certified with qualification.

Specifically:

- One key performance measure—Percent of Texas Public Retirement Systems That Are Actuarially or Financially Sound—was **certified with qualification** because the Agency does not have documented policies and procedures to ensure adequate controls exist over the collection, calculation, and reporting of that measure.
- Two key performance measures—Number of Reviews Completed and Number of Technical Assistance Reports Provided by Staff—were **inaccurate**. The Number of Reviews Completed was inaccurate because auditors' recalculations resulted in a difference greater than 5 percent from the Agency's reported results in the Automated Budget and Evaluation System of Texas (ABEST). The Number of Technical Assistance Reports Provided by Staff was inaccurate because the Agency deviated from the measure definition and/or methodology. These issues resulted in actual performance differing by more than 5 percent from the performance the Agency reported in ABEST for fiscal year 2007. The Agency has no documented policies and procedures or reviews for either measure.
- **Factors prevented certification** of one key performance measure—Percent of Plan Administrators Satisfied with Pension Review Board (PRB) Educational Services. This performance measure could not be certified because the Agency does not retain adequate source documentation or have documented policies and procedures for this performance measure.

### **Background Information**

Entities report results for their key measures to the Legislative Budget Board's budget and evaluation system, which is called the Automated Budget and Evaluation System of Texas, or ABEST.

The Pension Review Board (Agency) monitors the actuarial soundness of approximately 390 Texas public retirement systems covering about 2.3 million state and local employees and retirees. A public retirement system is considered actuarially sound if an actuary determines that the plan has sufficient money to pay ongoing normal costs and the unfunded liability is amortized over a period not to exceed 40 years.

Appropriations for the Agency increased by 60.1 percent between fiscal year 2007 and fiscal year 2008. Appropriated full-time equivalent employees increased by 62.5 percent in that same time period.

Sources: Pension Review Board strategic plan for 2009-2013, the General Appropriations Acts (79th and 80th Legislatures), and ABEST.

Auditors communicated other, less significant issues separately in writing to the Agency.

Table 1 summarizes the results of the four key performance measures tested.

Table 1

Pension Review Board (Agency 338)					
Related Objective or Strategy, Classification	Description of Measure	Fiscal Year	Results Reported in ABEST	Year-to-Date Targets	Certification Results
A. Outcome	Percent of Texas Public Retirement Systems That Are Actuarially or Financially Sound	2007	99.2%	98%	Certified with Qualification
A.1.1. Output	Number of Reviews Completed	2007-1st quarter	66	550	Inaccurate
		2007-2nd quarter	23		
		2007-3rd quarter	65		
		2007-4th quarter	213		
		2008-1st quarter	220		
		2008-2nd quarter	99		
A.2.1. Output	Number of Technical Assistance Reports Provided by Staff	2007-1st quarter	44	200	Inaccurate
		2007-2nd quarter	24		
		2007-3rd quarter	357		
		2007-4th quarter	17		
		2008-1st quarter	39		
		2008-2nd quarter	44		
A. Outcome	Percent of Plan Administrators Satisfied with Pension Review Board (PRB) Educational Services	2007	98.4%	98%	Factors Prevented Certification
<p>A measure is <b>Certified</b> if reported performance is accurate within 5 percent of actual performance and if it appears that controls to ensure accuracy are in place for collecting and reporting performance data.</p> <p>A measure is <b>Certified with Qualification</b> when reported performance appears accurate but the controls over data collection and reporting are not adequate to ensure continued accuracy. A measure is also certified with qualification when controls are strong but source documentation is unavailable for testing. A measure is also certified with qualification if the agency's calculation of performance deviated from the measure definition but caused less than a 5 percent difference between the number reported in ABEST and the correct performance measure result.</p> <p>A measure is <b>Inaccurate</b> when the actual performance is not within 5 percent of reported performance, or when there is more than a 5 percent error in the sample of documentation tested. A measure is also inaccurate if the agency's calculation deviated from the measure definition and caused more than a 5 percent difference between the number reported in ABEST and the correct performance measure result.</p> <p>A <b>Factors Prevented Certification</b> designation is used if documentation is unavailable and controls are not adequate to ensure accuracy. This designation also will be used when there is a deviation from the measure definition and the auditor cannot determine the correct performance measure result.</p>					

## ***Summary of Management's Response***

The Agency agrees with the recommendations in this report. Detailed management responses are included in the Detailed Results section of this report.

## ***Summary of Information Technology Review***

The Agency should improve overall information technology controls to ensure the integrity and accuracy of performance measure data. Auditors communicated details about these controls in writing to the Agency's executive management.

## ***Summary of Objectives, Scope, and Methodology***

The objectives of the audit were to determine whether the Agency:

- Accurately reports key performance measures to ABEST.
- Has adequate control systems in place over the collecting, calculating, and reporting of key performance measures.

The audit scope included the four key performance measures the Agency reported for fiscal year 2007 and the first two quarters of fiscal year 2008. Auditors also reviewed controls over the collection, calculation, and submission of data used in reporting performance measures and traced the performance measure documentation to the original source when available.

The audit methodology consisted of selecting the four key performance measures to audit, auditing reported results for accuracy and adherence to measure definitions, evaluating controls over the performance measures, reviewing the performance measure process and related information systems, and conducting a high-level review of all information systems that support the performance measure data.

# Contents

## *Detailed Results*

---

Chapter 1  
The Agency Should Develop and Implement Detailed  
Policies and Procedures for Collecting, Calculating,  
Reviewing, and Reporting Performance Measures ..... 1

Chapter 2  
The Agency Should Strengthen Controls Over  
Information Technology ..... 10

## *Appendix*

---

Appendix  
Objectives, Scope, and Methodology ..... 12

# Detailed Results

## Chapter 1

### ***The Agency Should Develop and Implement Detailed Policies and Procedures for Collecting, Calculating, Reviewing, and Reporting Performance Measures***

---

One of the four key performance measures that the Pension Review Board (Agency) reported for fiscal year 2007 is considered reliable because it was certified with qualification. A performance measure result is considered reliable if it is certified or certified with qualification. Results for two other measures audited were inaccurate, and results for the remaining measure audited could not be certified due to insufficient source documentation.

The Agency can improve the reliability of its measures by developing and implementing adequate controls over the collection, calculation, review, and reporting of performance measures. Two important controls on which the Agency should focus to improve the reliability of reported results are:

- Developing, documenting, and implementing detailed policies and procedures for the collection, calculation, review, and reporting of performance measure data that is entered into the Automated Budget and Evaluation System of Texas (ABEST). Documented policies and procedures provide a basis for consistent collection and calculation of measure results.
- Conducting management reviews and documenting approvals to ensure that (1) calculations are consistent with each measure's definition and methodology in ABEST and (2) all employees consistently follow policies and procedures for performance measures.

The Agency should refer to existing tools and develop others for implementing controls. The *Guide to Performance Measure Management* (State Auditor's Office Report No. 06-329, August 2006) is a helpful resource for developing written procedures for performance measure reporting. To improve its review process, the Agency developed a summary sheet to document performance measure results, reviews, and approvals prior to the submission of data into ABEST. However, the Agency does not use the summary sheet to document management approval or review of measure calculations and results prior to submission of data into ABEST.

## Recommendation

The Agency should develop, document, and implement policies and procedures for the collection, calculation, review, and reporting of performance measure data.

## Management's Response

*The State Pension Review Board (PRB) appreciates the State Auditor's Office (SAO) report regarding the performance measures and how they are calculated. Indeed, this report comes at a critical time for this agency. The PRB has been granted increased funding and has new staff, including a recently hired Executive Director, and a newly appointed Chairman to consider these findings. The PRB had already begun an internal review of its operations and welcomes the professional help offered by the SAO to improve this agency's work and create the efficient operations that safeguard taxpayers' money while serving the public interest of overseeing the Texas public pension system. This response is a supplement to the important concepts in this audit, a way for this agency to address those actions that have already taken place as part of the PRB's review process.*

*The audit serves an important function and the PRB views these findings as important to establishing a strong and enduring system of measuring internal performance. Efforts have been made to quickly address issues that required immediate attention. As a result, the PRB has already cured the majority of the issues addressed in this report. The agency now stands ready to accomplish the final recommendation of setting firm guidelines to train staff to consistently and accurately measure the PRB's performance. The Board sees staff achievement in preparing these measures as necessary to accomplish the core work of the agency. It does not serve the goal of transparency to serve the public pension system without also showing that this agency is committed to serving the needs of the legislature and taxpayers of Texas to be informed as to our successes. The PRB has issued statements consistent with this vital goal.*

*The PRB agrees with the recommendation that staff can be given better and more detailed policies regarding the calculation of its performance measures. This is an issue that the agency has begun to implement in various places. The agency has struggled to keep up with written policies based on its previous smaller size (the agency had 5 total staff until 2006 and only 8 until 2008). Recently, the agency has expanded in size to 13 total staff and, as a result, the need for implementing written policies has become apparent. As a result, the PRB has been implementing new policies in regards to staff procedures. Staff was in the process of reviewing the performance measures practices when the SAO announced its intention to audit PRB performance measures. The PRB*

*saw this as a perfect opportunity to use this expert advice to better craft written policies and, therefore, will use this report to direct staff in developing detailed guidelines.*

## Key Measures

### Percent of Texas Public Retirement Systems That Are Actuarially or Financially Sound

#### Results: Certified with Qualification

A measure is Certified with Qualification when reported performance appears accurate, but the controls over data collection and reporting are not adequate to ensure continued accuracy.

The Agency's reported results for this performance measure were accurate; however, the measure was certified with qualification because the Agency has not developed documented policies and procedures for (1) the collection and calculation of this performance measure data and (2) review of the results prior to their release into ABEST. The Agency also does not have supporting documentation for the manual calculation it uses to produce the results for this performance measure.

The calculation methodology as stated in ABEST for this performance measure mistakenly refers to unsound instead of sound plans. The Agency has calculated this measure accurately based on the Legislative Budget Board's description for this performance measure, which is Percent of Texas Public Retirement Systems That Are Actuarially or Financially Sound.

## Recommendations

The Agency should:

- Develop documented policies and procedures that include specific steps required for the collection, calculation, review, and reporting of performance measure data.
- Consult with the Legislative Budget Board to correct the description in the performance measure methodology.

## Management's Response

*The PRB agrees that there is a need for developing written policies. The new management and staff supporting the agency will make this process possible. The State Auditor's Office findings will serve as an important base for defining the PRB practices.*

*The PRB has already met with the Legislative Budget Board to change language regarding the methodology measure. The corrected language is in effect for the most recent Legislative Appropriations Request produced in July 2008.*



## Number of Reviews Completed

The Agency reported inaccurate results for this measure. Auditors recalculated the number of reviews completed for fiscal year 2007 and

### Results: Inaccurate

A measure is **Inaccurate** when the actual performance is not within 5 percent of reported performance, or when there is more than a 5 percent error rate in the sample of documentation tested.

determined that the Agency over-reported the results by 5.5 percent in ABEST; for the first two quarters of fiscal year 2008, the Agency over-reported the results by 22.2 percent in ABEST.

### Early Warning System and Quarterly Pension Plan Financial Data

The 79th Legislature appropriated funds to the Agency to establish an early warning system that would capture quarterly financial data entered by pension plans. This became the Agency's Quarterly Reporting System (QRS).

The Legislature appropriated General Revenue for the early warning system (\$93,349 in fiscal year 2006 and \$50,034 in fiscal year 2007).

Source: General Appropriations Act (79th Legislature).

To calculate the number of completed reviews, the Agency counts annual financial reports and quarterly financial reports that local and state pension plans submit to the Agency. The Agency indicated that it performs a comprehensive review of the annual financial reports, and it does a limited review of the pension plans' self-reported quarterly financial reports. The Agency does not perform a comprehensive review of the data entered into its system, even though the measure is for the number of reviews "completed." The Agency's Executive Director stated that the Legislative Budget Board and the Agency decided to include the quarterly reports in this measure to capture the use of a new reporting system by the pension plans beginning in the last quarter of fiscal year 2007 (see text box for additional details). A partial review of the quarterly data will be included in the measure definition beginning in 2010.

The performance measure results for the first three quarters of fiscal year 2007 were accurate. However, starting in the fourth quarter, when the Agency began including the quarterly financial reports in the measure, the results became inaccurate. This occurred because the Quarterly Reporting System (QRS) did not include edit checks to prevent pension plans from entering duplicate financial reports in the system.

The Agency also does not have documented policies and procedures for the collection, calculation, review, and reporting of performance measure results prior to their release in ABEST.

## Recommendations

The Agency should:

- Consult with the Legislative Budget Board to determine whether reviews of the quarterly reported data should begin sooner if they are to be included in this measure.
- Develop procedures or add edit checks to ensure that information in the Quarterly Reporting System (QRS) is not duplicated.

- Develop written policies and procedures for the collection, calculation, review, and reporting of performance measure data.

### Management's Response

*The PRB has a general duty to monitor the public pension systems of Texas on an ongoing basis. This performance measure is used to track the work in this area. The measure was changed after the 79th Legislative Session to allow the agency to reflect the reviews that accompany the early warning system listed as part of the 2006-2007 general appropriations.*

*The early warning system was passed by rule by the PRB as the quarterly reporting system (QRS) to comply with the language within the 79th Legislature's General Appropriations Act. In the rulemaking process several issues were brought before the PRB relating to whether unaudited figures would be reviewed by the PRB as if they were true figures. Plans were not able to audit numbers on a quarterly basis due to cost and availability of data from certain investments. To assuage the concern that unaudited figures would be treated as actual plan experience, the PRB adopted a disclaimer provided by an attorney working on behalf of several plans. This disclaimer limits the ability of PRB staff to rely on the quarterly numbers, thus increasing the confidence of the plans that they may reveal numbers without repercussions for using unaudited figures but reducing the effectiveness of a review.*

*PRB staff members do review specific quarterly data provided by the plans. However, the disclaimer that is attached to this data limits the effect of the reviews. Additionally, the reviews take place without supporting audited written documentation, making them only a "partial" and not a "comprehensive" review. When staff reviews annual financial data they are generally concerned with inherent consistency; checking the data for factual errors compared to other reports, checking the historical development of assets, checking the allotment of assets, et cetera. QRS does not offer the level of detail implied by the term "comprehensive review". Additionally, PRB staff is limited in contacting plans regarding curious findings because the disclaimer foresees inherent data issues (e.g. non-matching ending and beginning period data). For example, a quarterly number that seems to reveal a drop in the value of assets may simply reflect the lag in a private investment being valued. Therefore, reviews of the QRS data are being used to check logical consistency of the figures for macro-level analysis. For example, the data is appropriate and currently being used to give the PRB an idea of overall trends developing throughout the entire public pension system but it remains inappropriate for plan specific analysis.*

*The end result of the PRB's current macro manner of review of a quarterly report is naturally limited. A review of an annual report can result in a*

*conversation with a plan regarding the numbers that are reflected. However, a micro-level of analysis of a quarterly plan cannot engage a plan because of the disclaimer. Any discovered errors may simply be a reflection of the unaudited nature or preliminary findings by the plan. That means that the review process results in the appearance of no action. This does not mean the review is fruitless; indeed, the review is significant to further macro-level analysis. This interpretation is in agreement with the Legislative Budget Board (LBB), who has increased the threshold of reviews expected from the PRB every year because of the quarterly reviews being performed. Unfortunately, the word "comprehensive" had remained a part of the performance measure definition. This word "comprehensive" has been removed with LBB's approval and, as a result, will specifically allow the QRS reviews for the 2010-2011 fiscal years to be counted. Until then, the PRB has a continuing understanding with the LBB that current macro QRS reviews were and are a part of this performance metric.*

*QRS was launched in the early summer of 2007. QRS is a database with a web page interface that allows plans to login and enter their own information. This information is stored for later analysis. Initially, the system was programmed with errors. These errors were responsible for creating a highly inaccurate first quarter result for 2008. The program did not restrict users from inputting multiple entries for the same quarter. As a result, the first quarter figure was bloated by many dual entries as plans went to revise a figure they inadvertently created a new entry for an existing quarter. One of the first things the new executive director initiated was a reprogramming of QRS to remove these and other errors. The current system, as implemented in February 2008, disallows multiple entries for the same quarter. With the permission of the LBB, PRB will re-enter the 2008 first quarter results.*

*The PRB agrees that better written policies need to follow these implemented changes and will use the State Auditor's Office findings to help guide us in that process.*

## Number of Technical Assistance Reports Provided by Staff

### Results: Inaccurate

A measure is **Inaccurate** when the actual performance is not within 5 percent of reported performance, or when there is more than a 5 percent error rate in the sample of documentation tested.

The Agency reported inaccurate results for this performance measure. The Legislative Budget Board and the Agency have different interpretations of how to define "technical assistance." When auditors recalculated the measure and included items that the Legislative Budget Board advised should not be included as technical assistance reports, the error rate was still more than 5 percent, and this did not change the certification results for this measure.

The Agency has not developed documented policies and procedures for the collection and calculation of performance measure data and review of the results prior to their release in ABEST.

## Recommendations

The Agency should:

- Consult with the Legislative Budget Board to obtain clarification regarding the definition of a technical assistance report.
- Develop documented policies and procedures for the collection, calculation, review, and reporting of performance measure data.

## Management's Response

*Technical assistance is a performance measure meant to provide a metric for the level of external demand on PRB staff resources. The definition of the measure is broad, allowing for any written response to an outside query to be counted as a technical assistance report. One issue that arises from the broad interpretation of the measure is whether the PRB may count two external requests from two separate agencies for the same information as two technical assistance reports or just one. The Legislative Budget Board (LBB) has communicated to the PRB that unique requests from separate agencies may be counted per request per agency. However, previous practice had been for the PRB to count multiple technical assistance requests per request per category. For example, if a legislative office requested information and an executive office requested the same information, that would be two technical assistance reports (one for the legislative branch and one for the executive branch). However, if two executive agencies requested the same information, the PRB would count only one request (one for the executive branch).*

*This disparate view created the problem in the calculation. The State Auditor's Office (SAO) does not see PRB's categorization of technical assistance requests as a valid interpretation of the rule; instead, PRB should count by unique agency. As a result, the SAO revised the number of requests for the same information categorized as multiple requests down to a single report. In other words, multiple requests for the same data from different agencies was counted as one technical assistance report. However, the multiple requests should have then been increased to reflect the number of agencies making the request, consistent with the LBB interpretation. Under the SAO's measure, the agency over-counted. Conversely, under the latter LBB approved measure, the agency is undercounting. The PRB realizes that under either scenario the count is incorrect and will adopt the multiple agency definition moving forward.*

*The technical assistance sheets are initially collected by the PRB office manager but they are counted by the executive director for the purpose of the performance measure. This secularization of duties is important as a method of providing oversight to ensure that some independent verification of the number is taking place.*

*PRB agrees that a written policy is imperative. This agency will use the SAO's findings to implement the correct interpretation.*

## Percent of Plan Administrators Satisfied with Pension Review Board (PRB) Educational Services

### Results: Factors Prevented Certification

Factors Prevented Certification of a measure when documentation is unavailable and controls are not adequate to ensure accuracy.

Factors prevented certification of this measure for fiscal year 2007 because of weaknesses in the collection, calculation, review, and reporting of this performance measure. Auditors were unable to recalculate performance measure data because of inadequate source documentation. Additionally, the Agency had several survey questions that gauged different aspects of "satisfaction," but it could not demonstrate how it used the answers to these questions to calculate the measure results. Beginning in May 2008, the Agency added one survey question to directly address how satisfied plan administrators are with the Agency's educational services. According to the Agency, the results to this survey question will be used to report satisfaction for the fiscal year 2008 measure.

The Agency also does not have policies and procedures for the collection, calculation, review, and reporting of the performance measure results into ABEST.

## Recommendations

The Agency should:

- Develop formal policies and procedures that describe the collection, calculation, review, and reporting processes for the measure.
- Implement a documented review process to verify the accuracy of the reported measure results.
- Ensure that adequate documentation to support the calculation of the performance measure is collected and retained.
- Document and implement its plan to clarify which survey results are used to measure customer satisfaction.

## Management's Response

*In order to assess whether the PRB is correctly serving the plans that rely on the agency's educational resources, the PRB annually polls plans regarding staff's performance. In anticipation of this year's survey, PRB's new staff realized that the agency failed to ask the specific question called for in the performance measure in either the 2006 or 2007 surveys. This issue was corrected immediately. The May 2008 survey was sent out before the State Auditor's Office (SAO) contacted this agency and it included the proper question regarding satisfaction with PRB educational services.*

*The previous 2006-2007 surveys aggregated several questions to provide a single result for the performance measure. The data left behind was insufficient for current staff to assess how this aggregation technique worked in 2007. The inability of this office to verify previous findings served as an impetus to be cautious in collecting data, calculating results in a predictable and transparent manner, and preserving findings. This realization changed PRB policy as of May 2008.*

*The PRB was in the process of considering written policies when contacted by the SAO. As a result, the PRB decided to delay developing written policies until after SAO shared the audited findings. The PRB will now move forward with drafting written policies regarding the method of correctly surveying and storing results to report an accurate measure of whether plans are satisfied with that aspect of this agency's functions.*

## ***The Agency Should Strengthen Controls Over Information Technology***

---

The Agency should strengthen controls over information technology to better ensure the integrity and accuracy of performance measure data.

### **Application Controls**

Applications the Agency uses for performance measure data do not have edit checks to prevent users from mistakenly entering new data and overwriting older data. These applications also do not have edit checks to prevent users from entering information for a time period that has not yet occurred. Without these edit checks, the data's integrity may be compromised.

The Agency's controls over data input, output, and processing for performance measure data should be improved to increase the integrity of the performance measure data.

### **General Controls**

The Agency has an outdated disaster recovery plan, and it has not tested that plan on an annual basis as required by Title 1, Texas Administrative Code, Section 202.24. Disaster recovery plans are intended to minimize downtime in the case of a disaster.

The Agency also does not have adequate controls for password management and user identification management for information systems that contain performance measure data. The Agency should ensure that controls exist to protect against unauthorized changes to performance measure data and against disruptions to the Agency's applications and operating systems.

Auditors communicated details about control weaknesses in writing to the Agency's executive director.

### **Recommendations**

The Agency should:

- Develop, document, and implement controls to protect against unauthorized changes to performance measure data and against disruptions to the Agency's applications and operating systems.
- Implement proper input, output, and processing controls for applications that capture performance measure data.
- Update its disaster recover plan and test it annually, as required.

## Management's Response

*The PRB has already taken steps to promote more secure practices in the office and with staff. Before the audit, in January 2008, the PRB hired an independent company to manage the internal network. The agency is in the process of re-evaluating IT security, assessing the new needs created by a larger staff size, and providing better information to plans via more efficient automated systems. Furthermore, as the agency grows more complex, the disaster recovery plan needs to be reconsidered to reflect these changes. The PRB lists the disaster recovery plan as an important policy but one that may not achieve the immediate priority of other competing requirements.*

*It should be noted that the PRB is still a small agency with a restricted budget. Over 87 percent of the budget is consumed by salaries for staff, leaving little remaining for operational and IT work. Given this, the agency realizes it will struggle to implement the full breadth of IT changes necessary to ensure that all best practices are met. In the interim, the PRB will continue to work with independent and state resources to ensure the data integrity is improved to the extent practicable under the current budget.*



# Appendix

Appendix

## **Objectives, Scope, and Methodology**

---

### **Objectives**

The objectives of this audit were to determine whether the Pension Review Board (Agency):

- Accurately reports key performance measures to the Automated Budget and Evaluation System of Texas (ABEST).
- Has adequate control systems in place over the collecting, calculating, and reporting of key performance measures.

### **Scope**

The scope of the audit included the four key performance measures the Agency reported for fiscal year 2007 and the first two quarters of fiscal year 2008. Auditors reviewed controls over the collection, calculation, and submission of data used in reporting performance measures and traced performance measure documentation to the original source when available.

### **Methodology**

The audit methodology consisted of selecting the four key performance measures the Agency reported in ABEST. The Agency completed questionnaires related to its performance measurement process to help identify control information.

Procedures and tests conducted included the following:

- Auditing measure calculations for accuracy and to ensure that they were consistent with the methodology on which the Agency and the Legislative Budget Board agreed.
- Analyzing data flow to evaluate whether proper controls were in place.
- Testing a sample of source documents, when available, to verify the accuracy of reported performance.
- Conducting a high-level review of all information systems that support the performance measure data.
- Certifying performance measure results in one of four categories: (1) Certified, (2) Certified with Qualification, (3) Inaccurate, and (4) Factors Prevented Certification.

Criteria used included the following:

- The *Guide to Performance Measure Management* (State Auditor's Office Report No. 06-329, August 2006).
- ABEST measure definitions.

### **Project Information**

Audit fieldwork was conducted from May 2008 through June 2008. We conducted this performance audit in accordance with generally accepted government auditing standards. Those standards require that we plan and perform the audit to obtain sufficient, appropriate evidence to provide a reasonable basis for our findings and conclusions based on our audit objectives. We believe that the evidence obtained provides a reasonable basis for our findings and conclusions based on our audit objectives.

The following members of the State Auditor's staff performed the audit:

- Karen Smith, CGAP (Project Manager)
- Brendi Tubbs (Assistant Project Manager)
- Kathryn K. Hawkins
- Anne Hoel, CGAP
- Willie Showels
- Leslie Ashton, CPA (Quality Control Reviewer)
- Sandra Vice, CIA, CGAP, CISA (Assistant State Auditor)

Copies of this report have been distributed to the following:

### **Legislative Audit Committee**

The Honorable David Dewhurst, Lieutenant Governor, Joint Chair  
The Honorable Tom Craddick, Speaker of the House, Joint Chair  
The Honorable Steve Ogden, Senate Finance Committee  
The Honorable Thomas “Tommy” Williams, Member, Texas Senate  
The Honorable Warren Chisum, House Appropriations Committee  
The Honorable Jim Keffer, House Ways and Means Committee

### **Office of the Governor**

The Honorable Rick Perry, Governor

### **Pension Review Board**

Members of the Pension Review Board

Mr. Richard E. McElreath, Chair  
Ms. Shari O. Shivers, Vice Chair  
Mr. Paul A. Braden  
Mr. Roy V. Casanova, Jr.  
The Honorable Craig Eiland, State Representative  
Mr. Jerry R. Massengale  
Mr. Norman W. Parrish  
Mr. Frederick E. Rowe, Jr.  
The Honorable John H. Whitmire, State Senator  
Mr. Paul Janssen Nicholson, Executive Director



This document is not copyrighted. Readers may make additional copies of this report as needed. In addition, most State Auditor's Office reports may be downloaded from our Web site: [www.sao.state.tx.us](http://www.sao.state.tx.us).

In compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act, this document may also be requested in alternative formats. To do so, contact our report request line at (512) 936-9880 (Voice), (512) 936-9400 (FAX), 1-800-RELAY-TX (TDD), or visit the Robert E. Johnson Building, 1501 North Congress Avenue, Suite 4.224, Austin, Texas 78701.

The State Auditor's Office is an equal opportunity employer and does not discriminate on the basis of race, color, religion, sex, national origin, age, or disability in employment or in the provision of services, programs, or activities.

To report waste, fraud, or abuse in state government call the SAO Hotline: 1-800-TX-AUDIT.