

**LEGAL SERVICES CORPORATION  
OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL**

**REVIEW OF CASE STATISTICAL REPORTS**

**Grantee: New Orleans Legal Assistance Corporation  
Recipient No. 619030**

**Report No. AU00-004  
February 2000**

[www.oig.lsc.gov](http://www.oig.lsc.gov)

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY .....	1
BACKGROUND.....	2
OBJECTIVES, SCOPE and METHODOLOGY .....	3
RESULTS OF AUDIT .....	4
Case Service Reporting .....	4
Case Service Reporting Requirements .....	4
LSC Uses of Grant Activity Report.....	4
Examination of Reported Cases .....	5
CLOSED CASES.....	6
Untimely Closure of Cases .....	6
Legal Assistance Not Provided .....	6
Missing Case File.....	6
OPEN CASES .....	6
Computer Malfunction .....	6
Untimely Closure of Cases .....	6
Rejected Cases.....	7
Duplicate Cases.....	7
ADDITIONAL CASE MANAGEMENT ISSUES .....	7
Private Attorney Involvement Oversight.....	7
CONCLUSIONS .....	8
RECOMMENDATIONS .....	8
SUMMARY OF GRANTEE'S COMMENTS AND OIG DECISIONS.....	9
APPENDIX I - Listing of Findings and Associated Recommendations .....	I - 1
APPENDIX II - New Orleans Legal Assistance Corporation Comments on Draft Report .....	II - 1
APPENDIX III - OIG Staff Responsible for the Audit and Report .....	III - 1

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The 1998 Grant Activity Report submitted by New Orleans Legal Assistance Corporation (grantee) overstated the number of cases closed during the year by 7 percent. The grantee reported 6,058 closed cases, but only an estimated 5,630 cases qualified to be reported as closed during 1998. The grantee also overstated cases open at year-end in its 1998 report. The grantee had an estimated 3,046 cases open at year-end, but reported 3,937 cases.

There were three causes for the overstatement of closed cases. Our review of a sample of 85 closed cases revealed that: three cases were reported as closed in 1998 even though legal activity had ceased prior to 1998; two cases did not involve the provision of legal services; and one case file could not be located by the grantee.

Open cases at year-end were overstated for four reasons. Due to a computer malfunction, 485 cases were reported open even though they had been closed during the year. Our review of a sample of 85 open cases revealed that: 8 cases should have been closed because legal activity had ceased; 1 case should have been rejected; and 1 case was a duplicate.

Another issue, not directly related to case counting, was disclosed during our review. In a sample of 85 open cases, 9 cases that were opened in 1997 or earlier years lacked documentation showing that the grantee provided oversight of the attorneys handling the cases under the Private Attorney Involvement program.

Recommendations to correct the above problems are on page 8.

## BACKGROUND

New Orleans Legal Assistance Corporation is a nonprofit entity organized to provide legal services to indigent individuals who meet established eligibility guidelines. Its priorities include housing, family, health, income maintenance and consumer issues. The grantee is headquartered in New Orleans, La. and has two branch offices, one in Marrero and the other in Chalmette. It is staffed with 22 attorneys, 5 paralegals, and 14 other staff who assist with cases and provide computer, accounting, and administrative support services. The grantee received funding totaling \$2,307,571 in 1998, of which about 88.8 percent or \$2,048,753 came from LSC. To satisfy its Private Attorney Involvement requirement, New Orleans Legal Assistance Corporation relies on a judicare program and a subgrant to the New Orleans Pro Bono Project.

The grantee prepares and submits an annual Grant Activity Report to LSC on key aspects of its workload. The report includes statistics for basic field services and Private Attorney Involvement programs financed with LSC funds, including the number of open and closed cases, types of cases, and the reasons for closing cases. For calendar year 1998, New Orleans Legal Assistance Corporation reported 6,058 closed cases and 3,937 open cases to LSC. The grantee kept track of client cases with the WNYLC TIME System, an automated management information system.

The grantee's annual closed case statistics are its primary workload indicators and performance measures. In contrast, the reported open cases are not a significant measure of a grantee's volume of work or productivity. Open cases are simply the cases that have not been closed as of the last day of the reporting period. These open cases will eventually be closed and reported in the Grant Activity Report. In fact, most will be reported as closed in the following year. Even though the number of open cases has limited utility as a productivity indicator, it is important that open cases be accurately reported. If the open case count is inaccurate, future reporting of closed cases, in all probability, also will be inaccurate. In addition, inaccurate reporting of open cases may indicate deficiencies in the underlying case management system used to produce the data for the Grant Activity Report. These deficiencies could result in the less effective management of legal services delivery.

## OBJECTIVES, SCOPE, AND METHODOLOGY

The primary objective of this review was to determine whether the grantee provided LSC with accurate case statistical data in its 1998 Grant Activity Report.

The Office of Inspector General performed this review from October 4-13, 1999, at the grantee's main office and at both of its branch offices. The OIG examined the grant proposal submitted to LSC by New Orleans Legal Assistance Corporation for 1998 and the grantee's 1998 Grant Activity Report. During the on-site visit, the OIG interviewed and collected information from the grantee's executive director, managing attorneys, staff attorneys, paralegals, intake staff, information system specialist, and other support staff.

The OIG also obtained and reviewed the data in the grantee's automated case management system to determine if the case statistical data reported to LSC in the Grant Activity Report was consistent with information in client case files and in compliance with applicable LSC reporting requirements.

The OIG selected a random sample of 85 closed cases and a second random sample of 85 open cases for detailed review. The sample cases were selected from the grantee's case management system. Actual overstatements of cases identified by the OIG were eliminated from the universe before making our projections to preclude double counting of errors. The observed error rate for closed cases was about 7 percent (6 errors in 85 cases). Using the binomial distribution, the 90 percent confidence interval was calculated, obtaining a lower and upper estimate of about 4 percent and 12 percent for the true mean number of errors. For open cases, the observed error rate was 12 percent with a lower and upper range of 7 percent to 17 percent.

We performed this audit in accordance with *Government Auditing Standards* (1994 revision) established by the Comptroller General of the United States and under authority of the Inspector General Act of 1978, as amended and Public Law 105-277, incorporating by reference Public Law 104-134, §509(g).

## **RESULTS OF AUDIT**

### **Case Service Reporting**

The grantee's 1998 Grant Activity Report overstated the number of cases closed during the year and the number remaining open at year-end. Closed cases were overstated because some cases were reported as closed in 1998 although legal activity had ceased in prior years. The grantee did not provide legal services for some of the cases reported to LSC and some case files were missing. Open cases were overstated because a computer malfunction resulted in reporting some closed cases as open at year-end. Additionally, some cases reported as open at the end of 1998 should have been closed. Also, some open cases should have been rejected and some were reported more than once.

### **Case Service Reporting Requirements**

LSC requires recipients to submit an annual Grant Activity Report summarizing the previous year's legal services activity wholly or partially supported with LSC funds. The information in the report includes total number of cases worked on, types of legal issues, number of open and closed cases, and the reasons cases were closed. The report also includes information on Private Attorney Involvement cases. The Case Service Reporting Handbook and Grant Activity Report instructions provide reporting criteria for cases. Reported cases must be for eligible clients and within the recipient's priorities. Eligibility is based on income and citizenship determinations and must be documented.

### **LSC Uses of Grant Activity Report**

LSC uses grantee case statistical information to support the Corporation's annual budget request and as a performance measure in the performance plan submitted in response to the Government Performance and Results Act. The compilation of program-wide data on open and closed cases is an integral part of the management oversight process and also allows LSC management to keep its Board of Directors and the Congress informed of significant program activities and performance. In response to the annual reporting requirement, the grantee submitted the following information to LSC:

Type of Legal Problem	Closed	Open
Consumer/Finance	762	870
Education	43	21
Employment	99	35
Family	2,381	1,959
Juvenile	15	8
Health	54	6
Housing	1,094	382
Income Maintenance	1,049	410
Individual Rights	147	44
Miscellaneous	414	202
<b>TOTALS</b>	<b><u>6,058</u></b>	<b><u>3,937</u></b>

### Examination of Reported Cases

The grantee should have reported an estimated 5,630 closed cases and an estimated 3,046 open cases in its 1998 Grant Activity Report. Our review of the sample of 85 closed cases revealed 6 case counting errors. Based on these errors, an estimated 428 cases were incorrectly reported as closed in 1998.

Cases reported open at the end of 1998 were overstated by the erroneous inclusion of 485 cases due to a computer malfunction. Our review of the sample of 85 opened cases revealed an additional 10 case counting errors, resulting in an estimated overstatement of 406 cases. Therefore, the open cases were overstated by an estimated 891 cases.

## CLOSED CASES

### Untimely Closure of Cases

Cases were reported as closed in 1998 even though legal activity on the cases had ceased before 1998. We reviewed 85 closed cases and determined that 3 should have been closed prior to 1998. The responsible case handlers confirmed that the 3 cases should have been closed in 1997 or earlier years.

### Legal Assistance Not Provided

The Grant Activity Report included cases for which no legal assistance was provided. Review of the documentation in the 85 closed case files sampled found that 2 cases did not involve the provision of legal services. The attorneys or paralegals responsible for these 2 cases confirmed that legal services were not provided.

### Missing Case File

Of the sample of 85 closed cases we selected for review, 1 case file could not be located by the grantee.

## OPEN CASES

### Computer Malfunction

Cases reported open at the end of 1998 were overstated by the erroneous inclusion of 485 cases. This error occurred because the grantee's computer counted cases closed on December 31, 1998 as both closed and open on that date. Legal services were no longer being provided to the clients and the cases were correctly reported as closed.

### Untimely Closure of Cases

Some reported open cases should have been closed because legal activity had ceased prior to the end of 1998. We reviewed 85 sample open cases and determined that 8 should have been closed. The attorney or paralegal responsible for each case confirmed that the cases should have been closed because legal services had been completed.

### **Rejected Cases**

We reviewed 85 open cases and determined that 1 was not a case and should have been rejected. The client was not eligible for and did not receive legal assistance. The attorney responsible for this case agreed that the case should have been rejected.

### **Duplicate Cases**

We determined that 1 duplicate open case was reported. A client made multiple requests for assistance for the same legal problem. Each request was treated as a separate case and reported to LSC even though the same legal problem was involved.

## **ADDITIONAL CASE MANAGEMENT ISSUE**

### **Private Attorney Involvement Oversight**

The grantee's staff did not always document its oversight of Private Attorney Involvement cases. In the sample of 85 open cases, 9 case files that were opened in 1997 or earlier years lacked documentation of any oversight of the attorneys who were assigned the cases under the grantee's Private Attorney Involvement program. The grantee did not have adequate procedures to sufficiently document the oversight of attorneys handling cases under its Private Attorney Involvement program.

## **CONCLUSIONS**

The grantee needs to improve the accuracy of the case statistics reported in the Grant Activity Report. Its 1998 report overstated both closed and open cases. Grantee management needs to improve supervisory review procedures to ensure cases are properly classified as open or closed. The grantee should also review the data supporting the Grant Activity Report to detect errors and correct them before the report is submitted to LSC. Additionally, the grantee needs to improve its oversight of the Private Attorney Involvement program to adequately document the status of private attorney cases.

## **RECOMMENDATIONS**

The OIG recommends that grantee management:

1. Instruct staff that instances in which legal services were not provided to the client should not be reported to LSC as cases.
2. Implement procedures requiring supervisors to periodically review a sample of closed cases and determine if legal services were provided to the client.
3. Instruct staff that cases should be closed in the year legal activity ceased.
4. Implement procedures to periodically review a sample of closed cases and determine if cases are being closed in a timely manner.
5. Implement procedures to periodically review a sample of open cases and determine if cases are being properly classified as active.
6. Adopt written internal procedures and forms to adequately document the oversight of its Private Attorney Involvement program.

## **SUMMARY OF GRANTEE COMMENTS AND OIG DECISIONS**

### **Grantee Comments**

The grantee agreed to implement the six recommendations in the draft report. The comments stated that Recommendations 1, 2, 3, and 5 had been implemented and that Recommendation 4 had been partially implemented. Recommendation 6 involved the adoption of written internal procedures and forms to adequately document the oversight of its Private Attorney Involvement program. According to the grantee "No LSC regulations or directives require that oversight of private attorneys assigned PAI cases be documented." Grantee management agreed that their oversight of PAI cases could be improved. The OIG discussed the comments with the Executive Director who stated that the grantee plans to adopt Recommendation 6.

### **OIG Decision**

We revised the statement on our sampling methodology on page 3 to clearly indicate the sample size selected and the evaluation of the errors found in the sample cases.

Please provide a corrective action plan for implementation of Recommendations 1 through 6. The corrective action plan should include a description of the action taken to implement the recommendations and the dates corrective action was completed, or will be completed for the recommendations not yet implemented. Please submit the corrective action plan to the OIG within 30 days of the date of this report.

**LISTING OF FINDINGS AND ASSOCIATED RECOMMENDATIONS**

Findings:

- 1: Closed cases were overstated (page 6)  
Recommendations #1 - 4
2. Open cases were overstated (page 6)  
Recommendation #5
3. Oversight of Private Attorney Involvement Program (page 7)  
Recommendation #6

# NEW ORLEANS LEGAL ASSISTANCE CORPORATION

144 Elk Place • Suite 1000  
New Orleans, Louisiana 70112-2635  
PHONE: (504) 529-1000 FAX: (504) 529-1008  
E-mail: [mamoreau@nolac.org](mailto:mamoreau@nolac.org)  
Website: [www.nolac.org](http://www.nolac.org)

December 14, 1999

Mr. Edouard R. Quatrevaux  
Inspector General  
Legal Services Corporation  
750 First St., NE, 11<sup>th</sup> Fl.  
Washington, D.C. 20002-4250

Dear Mr. Quatrevaux:

We were pleased that your second audit team found a low error rate (possibly as low as 2½ %) for our 1998 closed cases. With the help of your audit, we are confident that accuracy of our case statistics, already among the nation's best, will continue to improve.

Our comments on your draft audit report on our 1998 case statistical reporting are:

- You estimated a probable error rate of 7% for closed cases, but failed to give us credit for the undercounted 1998 closed cases. Your auditors verified that 3 of the 85 open cases sampled should have been closed in 1998, but were not. When credit is given for these cases, the estimated error rate for our 1998 closed cases would be halved to 3½% and could be as low as ¼%.

- Half of the errors in your closed case sample were for untimely closure, but had documented legal assistance on behalf of an eligible client by our program.

- Half of the closed case errors occurred in our volunteer attorney programs. Volunteer attorneys take our cases to help the poor, not to do paperwork for a government report. Eliminating the volunteer attorney closed case errors would reduce the estimated error rate for staff closed cases to about 4% or less.

- Given the above facts, statistical estimates would indicate that our closed cases may have been undercounted.

- We implemented procedures on recommendations #1, 2, 3 and 5 before your October 1999 visit which audited our 1998 case statistics and will continue to follow those procedures. As to recommendation #4, we designed a software feature and case review procedures to test closed cases for timely closure pursuant to LSC Program Letter 99-2 in June 1999. We plan to conduct improved testing in the future.

●Your report found that we did not document our oversight of 9 Private Attorney Involvement (PAI) cases out of the 85 open cases sampled. As you noted, this does not affect our case statistical reports. No LSC regulations or directives require that oversight of private attorneys assigned PAI cases be documented. PAI cases are handled by volunteer attorneys for free or a nominal fee. We agree that our oversight of PAI cases can be improved and will study ways to improve oversight. Here's what we have done for PAI oversight in the past: In our judicare programs, all referred cases are for a specific litigation task, i.e., obtain a divorce, custody or bankruptcy judgment. We do not pay the judicare attorneys until they submit a copy of the judgment as proof of their work. Attorneys who do not timely complete their cases are dropped from our program. All client grievances are reviewed by our staff. Our PAI advice clinic cases are reviewed at closure by one of our attorneys.

●Closed cases may be the primary outcome measure used by one of our funders, the Legal Services Corporation. It is not the primary outcome measure that we use. It is just one indicator. Our other indicators include, for example, results or benefits achieved for clients, and can be viewed in our annual reports on our Webpage, [www.nolac.org](http://www.nolac.org). As you know, the current LSC statistical rules result in an understatement of a program's work because they do not accurately measure the work involved in clients' cases that have multiple problems, multiple benefits achieved, appeals, high difficulty level, or which benefit many other clients.

We would like to thank the Inspector General's Office for its help in improving our case reporting system.

Sincerely,



Mark Moreau  
Executive Director

OIG STAFF RESPONSIBLE FOR THE AUDIT AND THE REPORT

Michael Griffith (Auditor-in-charge)

Abel Ortunio

Anthony Ramirez

David Young