



DEPARTMENT OF MANAGEMENT SERVICES

LONG-RANGE PROGRAM PLAN FISCAL YEARS 2007-2008 THROUGH 2011-2012

SEPTEMBER 29, 2006

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION	3
ORGANIZATIONAL CHART	4
AGENCY GOALS, OBJECTIVE AND SERVICE OUTCOMES WITH PERFORMANCE PROJECTION TABLES	5
LINKAGE OF AGENCY GOALS TO THE GOVERNOR’S PRIORITIES	10
TRENDS AND CONDITIONS STATEMENTS	11
INSURANCE BENEFITS ADMINISTRATION	11
HUMAN RESOURCE MANAGEMENT	13
RETIREMENT BENEFITS ADMINISTRATION	17
STATE PURCHASING	19
REAL ESTATE DEVELOPMENT AND MANAGEMENT	20
SPECIALIZED SERVICES	22
COUNCIL ON EFFICIENT GOVERNMENT/OFFICE OF EFFICIENT GOVERNMENT	25
ENTERPRISE INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY SERVICES	27
OFFICE OF SUPPLIER DIVERSITY	31
AMERICANS WITH DISABILITIES ACT WORKING GROUP	33
PUBLIC EMPLOYEES RELATIONS COMMISSION	35
FLORIDA COMMISSION ON HUMAN RELATIONS	37
AGENCY WORKFORCE PLAN (LRPP EXHIBIT I)	40
PERFORMANCE MEASURES AND STANDARDS (LRPP EXHIBIT II)	42
ASSESSMENT OF PERFORMANCE FOR APPROVED PERFORMANCE MEASURES (LRPP EXHIBIT III)	51
PERFORMANCE MEASURE VALIDITY AND RELIABILITY (LRPP EXHIBIT IV)	96
ASSOCIATED ACTIVITIES CONTRIBUTING TO PERFORMANCE MEASURES (LRPP EXHIBIT V)	224
AGENCY – LEVEL UNIT COST SUMMARY (LRPP EXHIBIT VI)	239
GLOSSARY OF TERMS AND ACRONYMS	241

VISION:

A TRUSTED RESOURCE FOR SERVICE EXCELLENCE

MISSION:

DELIVER QUALITY, INNOVATIVE, RESOURCE-SAVING SOLUTIONS TO CONTINUALLY IMPROVE CUSTOMER SERVICE

MOTTO:

WE SERVE THOSE WHO SERVE FLORIDA

CORE VALUES:

WE VALUE OUR EMPLOYEES, WE VALUE OUR CUSTOMERS AND WE VALUE SUCCESSFUL RESULTS

CHARACTER VALUES:

FAIRNESS, COOPERATION, RESPECT, COMMITMENT, EXCELLENCE, HONESTY, TEAMWORK

The Department of Management Services (DMS) is the administrative and operations arm of Florida's state government. DMS is dedicated to providing the best services possible in purchasing, human resource management, fleet management, facilities management, retirement benefits and insurance benefits. Our primary responsibility is to efficiently manage the "business costs" associated with state government. The services and tools provided by DMS assist state agencies with the routine daily operations of running their agencies, allowing them to focus on their core missions. We are committed to providing world-class, innovative solutions that benefit our employees and citizens, while saving valuable taxpayer dollars.

The Department strives to provide the best customer service and effective business solutions through technology, teamwork, and partnerships. The Department provides an assortment of services, reaching most of the state's population in one way or another. DMS services and programs are organized into the broad areas of Administration, Human Resource Support, Business Operations, and Enterprise Information Technology Services. In providing these services more effectively and more efficiently, the state is able to direct more tax dollars to the Governor's priorities, such as education, elder services and helping our most vulnerable. Therefore, the employees of the Department are committed to making these strategies successful. Through efficient implementation of government services, other state resources become available to be effectively utilized in serving the needs of the people of Florida.

Agency goals, Objectives and Service Outcomes with Performance Projection Tables

Human Resource Support

GOAL #1: To provide fair, uniform and efficient customer-focused human resource services based upon sound human resource policies, practices and strategies.

OBJECTIVE: To develop human resource policies, practices and strategies that reflect current trends and best practices, and address the needs of our customers and attain a 96% customer satisfaction rating.

OUTCOME: Overall customer satisfaction rating.

	Baseline/ Year	FY 2007-08	FY 2008-09	FY 2009-10	FY 2010-11	FY 2011-12
Division of Human Resource Management	96% 2000/2001	96%	96%	96%	96%	96%

GOAL #2: To provide user-friendly, reliable human resource services through People First! in the most efficient and cost effective manner.

OBJECTIVE: Monitor the Convergys contract performance metrics to ensure that 100% of the metrics are met in accordance with the contract.

OUTCOME: Percent of all contract performance standards met.

	Baseline/ Year	FY 2007-08	FY 2008-09	FY 2009-10	FY 2010-11	FY 2011-12
Division of Human Resource Management - People First	TBD 2005/2006	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

GOAL #3: To continue to develop and offer a high-quality, competitive portfolio of employee benefit products and services which will enable the State to attract and retain the finest workforce, while increasing customer satisfaction and providing benefit products and services in the most cost efficient manner.

OBJECTIVE: To obtain a 90% customer satisfaction rating from active and retired state employees.

OUTCOME: Percent of active and retired state employees satisfied.

	Baseline/ Year	FY 2007-08	FY 2008-09	FY 2009-10	FY 2010-11	FY 2011-12
Division of State Group Insurance	TBD (2005-2006)	90%	90%	90%	90%	90%

GOAL #4: To administer efficient state retirement programs utilizing best technology.

OBJECTIVE: Achieve a 100% timely processing of retired payrolls.

OUTCOME: Percent of retired payrolls processed timely.

	Baseline/ Year	FY 2007-08	FY 2008-09	FY 2009-10	FY 2010-11	FY 2011-12
Division of Retirement	100% (2000-2001)	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

Business Operations Support

GOAL #5: To promote certified supplier diversity spend.

OBJECTIVE: Increase minority business state contracting spend by 2 to 5% over the prior fiscal year.

OUTCOME: Percent change in spend with certified minority businesses compared to the prior fiscal year.

	Baseline/ Year	FY 2007-08	FY 2008-09	FY 2009-10	FY 2010-11	FY 2011-12
Office of Supplier Diversity	\$549,438,115 (2000-2001)	\$791,966,182 2% Difference	\$807,805,506 2% Difference	\$823,961,616 2% Difference	\$840,440,848 2% Difference	\$857,249,665 2% Difference

There has been a 28% increase between the baseline year FY 00-01(\$549,438,115) and FY 05-06 (\$761,213,170); 06-07 projects an increase of 2% growth from the current fiscal year.

GOAL #6: To provide best value purchasing.

OBJECTIVE: To use the combined purchasing power of the State of Florida to deliver the best total value in goods and services purchased by the State and eligible users, attaining at least 28% savings over retail or other reference price.

OUTCOME: Percent of state term contract savings.

	Baseline/ Year	FY 2007-08	FY 2008-09	FY 2009-10	FY 2010-11	FY 2011-12
Division of State Purchasing	23% (1996/97)	28%	28%	28%	28%	28%

GOAL #7: To enhance purchasing processes using MyFloridaMarketPlace (MFMP).

OBJECTIVE: To achieve an 80% customer satisfaction rating among MFMP purchasers.

OUTCOME: Percent of customers satisfied with purchasing functionality

	Baseline/ Year	FY 2007-08	FY 2008-09	FY 2009-10	FY 2010-11	FY 2011-12
Division of State Purchasing – MyFlorida MarketPlace	TBD (2006-2007)	82%	83%	84%	85%	86%

GOAL #8: To provide optimum Federal excess property to affected organizations.

OBJECTIVE: To provide the maximum amount of Federal excess/surplus property to eligible recipients without burdening state resources by attaining a 95% property distribution rate.

OUTCOME: Federal Property Distribution Rate.

	Baseline/ Year	FY 2007-08	FY 2008-09	FY 2009-10	FY 2010-11	FY 2011-12
Federal Property Assistance	86% (1999/00)	95%	95%	95%	95%	95%

GOAL #9: To provide efficient fleet management of aircraft and the Executive Aircraft Pool.

OBJECTIVE: To provide Executive Air Service in a manner that is preferred by statutory flyers by attaining a 90% customer satisfaction rating.

OUTCOME: Percent of priority flyers satisfied.

	Baseline/ Year	FY 2007-08	FY 2008-09	FY 2009-10	FY 2010-11	FY 2011-12
Aircraft Management	TBD (2006-2007)	91%	92%	93%	94%	95%

GOAL #10: To provide efficient fleet management of motor vehicles and watercraft.

OBJECTIVE: To process requests for approval for agencies to procure and dispose of motor vehicles and watercraft within 48 hours, 95% of the time.

OUTCOME: Percent of requests for approval processed for the acquisition and disposal of vehicles within 48 hours.

	Baseline/ Year	FY 2007-08	FY 2008-09	FY 2009-10	FY 2010-11	FY 2011-12
Motor Vehicle and Watercraft Management	TBD (2006-2007)	95%	95%	95%	95%	95%

GOAL #11: To provide effective management and oversight of private prisons.

OBJECTIVE: To provide effective management and oversight of the operational contracts between the Florida Department of Management Services, Bureau of Private Prison Monitoring, and the vendors who operate the private prisons, ensuring that the vendors meet the contractual requirements for inmate participation in behavioral, vocational, academic, and substance abuse programs.

OUTCOME: Percentage of inmates participating in behavioral, vocational, academic, and substance abuse programs.

	Baseline/ Year	FY 2007-08	FY 2008-09	FY 2009-10	FY 2010-11	FY 2011-12
Private Prison Monitoring	N/A	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

GOAL #12: To provide cost-effective, efficient Real Estate Development and Management Services to our customers in the DMS pool facilities.

OBJECTIVE: To maintain a competitive rental rate in our DMS pool facilities at 9% below private sector rates.

OUTCOME: Average Department of Management Services full service rent - composite cost per net square foot (actual) compared to Average Private Sector full service rent - composite cost per net square foot in markets where the Department manages office facilities.

	Baseline/ Year	FY 2007-08	FY 2008-09	FY 2009-10	FY 2010-11	FY 2011-12
Real Estate Development and Management	\$15.39/\$16.51 7% below (2000-2001)	\$16.62/\$18.11 9% below	\$16.95/\$18.47 9% below	\$17.29/\$18.84 9% below	\$17.64/\$19.22 9% below	\$17.99/\$19.60 9% below

Enterprise Information Technology Services

GOAL #13: To deliver and promote the development of high quality, innovative, cost-efficient information technology services, and in so doing provide support to state agencies and other end users in achieving their missions and goals.

OBJECTIVE: Leverage technology to gain efficiencies across the enterprise, simplify citizen’s electronic access and improve customer service and attain a 90% customer satisfaction rating.

OUTCOME: Percent of customers satisfied.

Baseline/ Year	FY 2007-08	FY 2008-09	FY 2009-10	FY 2010-11	FY 2011-12
86.90% (2001-2002)	85%	86%	87%	88%	89%

Americans With Disabilities Act Working Group

GOAL #14: To improve the quality of life for people with disabilities in Florida.

OBJECTIVE: To achieve 90% customer satisfaction for ADAWG services and programs.

OUTCOME: Percent of customers satisfied.

Baseline/ Year	FY 2007-08	FY 2008-09	FY 2009-10	FY 2010-11	FY 2011-12
TBD (2005-2006)	90%	90%	90%	90%	90%

Council on Efficient Government

GOAL #15: To support the Council on Efficient Government as an outsourcing center of excellence in order to deliver quality, innovative, resource-saving solutions.

To provide support to the Council in the review & evaluation of outsourcing business cases submitted by Agencies and conduct the reviews and evaluations within 30 days of submission to the Office.

OBJECTIVE:

OUTCOME: Percentage of agency business cases reviewed, evaluated and ready for Council presentation within 30 days of submittal.

Baseline/ Year	FY 2007-08	FY 2008-09	FY 2009-10	FY 2010-11	FY 2011-12
TBD (2006-2007)	91%	92%	93%	94%	95%

Commission on Human Relations

GOAL #16: To insure fair treatment of both complainants and respondents in instances of alleged discrimination and to promote mutual respect and greater harmony among diverse groups.

OBJECTIVE: Encourage fair treatment, equal access, and mutual respect.

OUTCOME: Percent of civil rights cases resolved within 180 days of filing.

Baseline/ Year	FY 2007-08	FY 2008-09	FY 2009-10	FY 2010-11	FY 2011-12
59% 2001-2002	85%	85%	85%	85%	85%

Public Employees Relations Commission

GOAL #17: To protect public labor and employment rights, and protect the public by preventing work stoppages.

OBJECTIVE: Resolve disputes about the composition of bargaining units and alleged unfair labor practices; and, administer the Career Service System appeals process with regard to discipline, veteran's preference, drug-free workplace, age discrimination and whistle-blower's act.

OUTCOME: Percent of timely labor and employment dispositions.

Baseline/ Year	FY 2007-08	FY 2008-09	FY 2009-10	FY 2010-11	FY 2011-12
92% 2001-2002	94%	94%	94%	94%	94%

LINKAGE OF AGENCY GOALS TO THE GOVERNOR'S PRIORITIES

As a part of the Governor's team of agencies, the Department of Management Services is committed to providing the best customer service, while developing and implementing key initiatives which focus on increasing citizen access to government, delivering cost effective products and services, promoting and supporting economic development in Florida and improving government productivity in partnership with other government entities and the private sector.

#1 – Improving Education

#2 – Strengthening Families

- Commission on Human Relations Goal #16: To insure fair treatment of both complainants and respondents in instances of alleged discrimination and to promote mutual respect and greater harmony among diverse groups.

#3 – Promoting Economic Diversity

- Office of Supplier Diversity Goal #5: To promote certified supplier diversity spend.
- Division of State Purchasing Goal #6: To provide best value purchasing.

#4 – Reduce Violent Crime and Illegal Drug Use

#5 – Create A Smaller, More Effective, More Efficient Government

- Division of Human Resource Management Goal #1: To provide fair, uniform and efficient customer-focused human resource services based upon sound human resource policies, practices and strategies.
- Division of Human Resource Management – People First Goal #2: To provide user-friendly, reliable human resource services through People First! in the most efficient and cost effective manner.
- Division of State Group Insurance Goal #3: To continue to develop and offer a high-quality, competitive portfolio of employee benefit products and services which will enable the State to attract and retain the finest workforce, while increasing customer satisfaction and providing benefit products and services in the most cost efficient manner.
- Division of Retirement Goal #4: To administer efficient state retirement programs utilizing best technology.
- Office of Supplier Diversity Goal #5: To promote certified supplier diversity spend.
- Division of State Purchasing Goal #6: To provide best value purchasing.
- Division of State Purchasing – MyFloridaMarketPlace Goal #7: To enhance purchasing processes using MyFloridaMarketPlace (MFMP).
- Federal Property Assistance Goal #8: To provide optimum Federal excess property to affected organizations.
- Aircraft Management Goal #9: To provide efficient fleet management of aircraft and the Executive Aircraft Pool.
- Motor Vehicle and Watercraft Management Goal #10: To provide efficient fleet management of motor vehicles and watercraft.
- Private Prison Monitoring Goal #11: To provide a cost-effective management and oversight of private prisons.

INSURANCE BENEFITS ADMINISTRATION

In accordance with Chapter 110.123, *Florida Statutes*, Insurance Benefits Administration offers and manages a comprehensive package of health and welfare insurance benefits, including a variety of health insurance options, flexible spending and health savings accounts, life insurance, vision insurance, dental insurance, and others. These benefits allow active and retired state employees and surviving spouses the option to choose pre-tax and post-tax benefit plans that best suit their individual needs. Specific administrative functions include, but are not limited to, client relations, benefit plan analysis, product development and procurement, contract management, compliance, fiscal control and management, and information technology support.

The priorities of the Insurance Benefits Administration program were selected based upon the initiatives set forth by the Executive Office of the Governor, the Secretary of the Department of Management Services, legislative mandates, the SWOT Analysis which is based upon the results of the Sterling Review, the availability of budgetary authority, and product development and procurements.

In order for the Department to attain its goal of assisting the State in attracting and retaining a high performance workforce, insurance benefit options must meet the needs of a mobile workforce and provide the flexibility needed to accommodate the demographic and social changes in the workforce. Therefore, it is the mission of Insurance Benefits Administration to continue to develop and offer a high-quality, competitive portfolio of employee benefit products and services which will enable the State to attract and retain the finest workforce. It is the intention of Insurance Benefits Administration to achieve this goal by building upon the redesigned health insurance benefit platform by implementing industry best measures that effectuate a slowing in rising health care costs; performing a life insurance plan benefit benchmarking analysis to establish a reference for comparison with other states and entities; redesigning the life insurance plan benefit, if appropriate, and offering a fully insured life insurance plan; designing and offering a fully insurance long-term care insurance plan; designing, or redesigning as appropriate, and offering fully insured dental insurance plans; designing and offering a fully insured, integrated short-term and long-term group disability insurance plan; and contracting for a Health Insurance Management Information System;

In meeting the needs of those having retired from the workforce, the Department continues to offer health care coverage to retirees at competitive premiums. For those Medicare-eligible, the prescription drug coverage is, on average, expected to pay out as much as the standard Medicare prescription drug coverage will pay and is considered Creditable Coverage.

Per the Governor's initiative, which resulted in legislative action, the agency added an innovative option to give active employees, retirees, or surviving spouses more access, choice, and flexibility within their healthcare plans. Introduction of the high deductible health plans (Health Investor Plan) in January 2006 offers lower insurance premiums and an optional Health Savings Account (HSA), with employer funded contributions for eligible employees. The plans provide the same, or better quality health care, as well as greater financial flexibility for meeting healthcare needs.

Chapter 110.123, *Florida Statutes*, was also amended by the 2006 Legislature to more clearly define age-based and gender-based wellness benefits for the state-contracted HMOs and to establish the Florida State Employee Wellness Council, a 9-member panel appointed by the Governor.

To achieve the ongoing objective of quality, choice, and affordability, while increasing customer satisfaction, Insurance Benefits Administration has established performance measures to evaluate its progress. An independent survey research entity is contracted annually to conduct a Customer Satisfaction Survey of the satisfaction level of active and retired state employees. The 2004-2005 survey reflects that 88% of our customers surveyed were "satisfied" or "very satisfied" with the insurance benefits program. The agency also measures its satisfaction of various contracted vendors through a self-reporting method to determine the vendors' compliance with contractually required performance standards. For FY 2004-2005 the aggregated results equated to a 92% compliance rating with a standard of 95%. To ensure resources are appropriately allocated in a manner that would produce cost effectiveness and efficiencies in services, the agency has a performance standard that measures its administrative cost per insurance enrollee. The approved standard is \$10.27 per insurance enrollee; however, the agency provided services for approximately \$8.01 per insurance enrollee for FY 2004-2005.

The agency plans to continue to operate under current policies in effect.

At this time, there are no changes that require legislative action. Over the past two sessions, the agency has reduced its workforce to a residual staff size of 31 FTE's. The Insurance Benefits Administration is currently in the process of developing its legislative budget issues for the 2007 Legislative Session.

Section 8 of the FY 2006-2007 General Appropriations Act requires the performance of a benchmarking analysis of the life insurance plan to establish a reference for comparison with other states and entities competing to attract and retain the finest workforce. The study is due to the Executive Office of the Governor and the Legislature by December 1, 2006.

HUMAN RESOURCE MANAGEMENT

Human Resource Management's policies and programs focus on developing and providing innovative world-class human resource services designed to recruit, retain, reward and recognize a high performance workforce.

In accordance with Section 20.04; Chapter 110 (excluding Sections 110.123 – 110.1239); Sections 112.011 – 112.046, Parts VI and VIII of Chapter 112, Florida Statutes, and Sections 215.94(5)(a)-(d) and 216.262, Florida Statutes, Human Resource Management develops and supports a human resource infrastructure for the State Personnel System agencies that is based upon sound human resource policies, practices and strategies. These 30 agencies are part of the Executive Branch of government and are comprised of state employees in the Career Service, Selected Exempt Service, and Senior Management Service. The State Personnel System agencies operate under a single set of employment laws, policies, and practices. The services provided by HRM ensure that the State fosters an equitable and lawful system of employment; ensures uniformity in the application of core policies; and remains a competitive employer. Specific functions of HRM include:

- Providing technical assistance and consultative services to help agencies administer their human resource programs;
- Reviewing and approving changes to agency human resource management programs for compliance with laws, statutes and rules;
- Developing personnel rules, manuals, guidelines and forms for agency managers and employees;
- Establishing and maintaining a classification and compensation program addressing all Career Service, Selected Exempt Service and Senior Management Service positions;
- Establishing and maintaining a personnel information system for authorized and established positions;
- Providing access to training and professional development opportunities for employees, supervisors and managers;
- Administering and promoting family friendly personnel programs such as:
 - Adoption Benefits Program (establish policies and procedures, determine applicant eligibility and award benefits)
 - State Employee Child Care Program (approve agency plans to provide workplace child care services for state employees)
 - Employee Telecommuting Program (coordinate and promote off-site work arrangements for state employees)
 - Family Supportive Work Program (establish personnel policies affecting employees' ability to both work and devote care and attention to their families i.e., flexible work schedules, job sharing, maternity or paternity leave, paid and unpaid family leave, etc.)
- Researching, compiling and analyzing workforce statistical information for use by human resource professionals, agency staff, the Legislature, other states and the public; and
- Implementing best practices, streamlining human resource processes, and eliminating inefficiencies in the delivery of services.

Human Resource Management receives input from our primary customers, the agency personnel officers and legislative staff, to determine key priorities. HRM conducts an annual customer satisfaction survey with the agency personnel officers to solicit feedback on what services are needed to address the concerns and suggestions expressed by state employees. In addition, monthly meetings are held with agency personnel officers to discuss issues and policy initiatives. This collaborative effort allows HRM to determine the direction and the projects needed to provide state-of-the-art business solutions for managing a dynamic workforce.

The successful completion of the key priorities will allow the State to become the employer of choice, while enabling state agencies and employees to deliver the Governor's priorities to the people of Florida. A summary of the key priorities is as follows:

- To benchmark the State's human resource programs and practices with public and private sector employers to ensure the State remains a competitive employer;
- To conduct a salary survey to determine how the State ranks in salaries and benefits with other public employers and to provide information to the State's budgetary leaders;

- To review all administrative rules to ensure compliance with state and federal laws; improve understanding and application of rules and policies; and provide clear direction for the functionality of the People First system;
- To develop a training program that addresses the needs of state managers and supervisors in effectively managing employees and utilizing the manager self-service tools;
- To implement an audit program that ensures compliance and consistency with state human resource policies and practices; and
- To streamline and improve work processes to increase productivity and efficiency while fully utilizing the power of technology.

These process improvement strategies, as well as policies designed to increase employee effectiveness, help support a smaller, more productive workforce. The Division strives to identify and incorporate enhancements to the human resource infrastructure to make managing the State's human resources easier and more efficient.

It is the Division of Human Resource Management's goal to make the State Personnel System the model human resource system for the public sector by continuously assessing and modifying the HR infrastructure to meet changing needs of the state's workforce. The key priorities were identified to accomplish this goal over the next five years and will be achieved by: developing partnerships with entities from the private and public sectors; continuing to research and analyze trends, innovations and best practices; and proposing legislative initiatives and/or implementing core policies to ensure the efficient management of the State's workforce.

To assess Human Resource Management's performance in developing policies and procedures and providing consultative services to agency personnel officers and practitioners, the outcome measure, "Percent of Customers Satisfied," was developed. This measure reflects the ultimate impact of the products and services provided and relates directly to the Division's mission "to develop and implement enhanced human resource policies, programs and systems that provide innovative statewide services and support to employees in the State Personnel System." A 96 percent overall customer satisfaction rating is projected for each year over the next five years and is representative of previous ratings received from customer agencies.

The 30 agencies which make up the State Personnel System are autonomous and diverse in their mission and goals. HRM's overall customer satisfaction rating is based on each agency's subjective level of satisfaction with HRM's services. Unpopular policy decisions, as well as, the small customer population can cause our customer satisfaction rating to suffer and affect the projected standard.

PEOPLE FIRST

People First strives to ensure excellence in human resource services through the development and delivery of a web-based personnel information system.

In accordance with Sections 110.116 and 215.94(5)(a)-(d), Florida Statutes, the Department of Management Services shall provide the State Personnel System with a personnel information system for all authorized and established positions. To meet this requirement, on August 21, 2002, the State outsourced personnel transactional services and contracted with Convergys Customer Management Group, Inc. (Convergys/service provider), to serve as the service provider. This outsourcing initiative, known as People First, transferred to the service provider personnel transactions such as the advertisement of vacancies, collection of timesheets, processing of new employee appointments, classification, orientation, leave use and accrual, payroll preparation, benefit enrollment, and maintenance of employee records. In addition, the service provider was also charged with assisting in recruitment and administering the record keeping activities associated with a responsible workforce, while providing the State agencies and employees the appropriate access to the information it maintains and manages.

Significant planning was, and continues to be done, to try to avoid problems and minimize disruptions to the end user of the system. Due to the complexity of the system and the necessary variances in policies and procedures between the agencies, issues arose that were not anticipated. A concentrated effort has been instituted to address these issues, and substantial progress has been made. Permanent corrections for problems have been developed and deployed or will be deployed within the next six to twelve months. Where problems have been identified, interim measures have been developed and instituted, which are, in most cases, transparent to the end user.

To assist developing the System, the Department has instituted several means to incorporate agency input on anticipated changes including agency Personnel Officer meetings and joint Agency/People First working committees, and issue resolution work groups to assist in the development and modification of business requirements for use in programming the People First system. These work groups have provided valuable input relative to flexible work schedules, personnel action requests (PAR), staffing and E-Learning, and will continue as an integral part of the People First evolution. In addition, a Change Review Board was established to provide guidance and input to the People First system, such as to evaluate the prioritized system modifications, training programs, and other key project decisions. The Change Review Board, comprised of representatives from the agencies, Convergys, Legislature, and executive, university and judicial entities, formed in September 27, 2005, continues to meet at regularly scheduled monthly meetings.

Changes have been made to the People First team to better manage the project and ensure optimal system utilization; including:

1. Convergys completed re-training of customer service center representatives.
2. The Department hired a full-time Project Director and created a dedicated People First team with functional leads.
The People First team:
 - a. Worked with Agency /Convergys personnel to identify system issues and improvements to gain more technological efficiencies and streamline transactional processes;
 - b. Utilized agency human resource professionals to serve as a source of frontline expertise so that issues can be expeditiously resolved;
 - c. Conducted “root cause” analyses based on problematic trends; and
 - d. Provided preventative communications to the agencies with emphasis on personnel policies and rules.
3. The People First team jointly reviewed contract performance metrics and the Department negotiated changes and development of new contract performance metrics, including increased performance credits for missing the metric(s) and a significant increase in the dollar cap amount for liquidated damages.
4. The Secretary of the Department of Management Services has implemented an active program of providing project status reports to Agency Heads, Chiefs of Staff and Chief Information Officers.

People First intends to spend the next several years, evolving the technological capability to be that of a “best in class” system, while enhancing the “user-friendliness” of the system. The long term future of the system must be studied and evaluated beginning in 2008, while there is three years left on the contract, and in light of activities such as the ASPIRE project, to determine how People First fits into the technological strategic plans of the State.

To assess the performance of People First!, the outcome measure, “Percent of All Contracted Performance Standards Met,” was developed. This measure provides an assessment of the service provider’s performance. The service provider contract stipulates acceptable performance standards and minimum service levels for 28 performance metrics including liquidated damages associated with missed metrics. Examples of the critical performance metrics included in the contract between Convergys and the Department are: customer satisfaction surveys, payroll and time and attendance accuracy, self-service availability, call and case quality and data and input quality.

As the contract manager, the Division of Human Resource Management manages the contract and oversees the performance of the service provider by assessing weekly and monthly service level reports to ensure compliance with the provisions, including agreed-upon performance standards and delivery of services to the users of the system. The “Percent of All Contracted Standards Met,” outcome measure reflects the ultimate impact of the products and services provided and relates directly to the Division’s mission “to develop and implement enhanced human resource policies, programs and systems that provide innovative statewide services and support to employees in the State Personnel System.” A 100 percent performance standard is projected for each year over the next five years to ensure optimal performance of the People First system.

The fiscal year 2006 – 2007 General Appropriations Act appropriated \$500,000 from the General Revenue Fund in Specific Appropriation 2907, to provide for the Department of Management Services to contract for an independent audit of the off-shoring of state employee personnel data. The GAA requires the Department to consult with the Auditor General, in a manner as prescribed by professional auditing standards, in defining the terms of the audit engagement.

Additionally, the fiscal year 2006 – 2007 General Appropriations Act appropriated \$333,000 from the General Revenue Fund in Specific Appropriation 2913A, to provide for the Department of Management Services to determine if the People First system is compliant with Section 508 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 to ensure access for persons with disabilities.

RETIREMENT BENEFITS ADMINISTRATION

The mission of the Division of Retirement is to deliver a high quality, innovative and cost-effective retirement system.

In accordance with chapters 121, 122, 175, 185 and 238, Florida Statutes, as well as sections 112.05, 112.363, 215.28, and 250.22, Florida Statutes, the Division of Retirement administers the state retirement plans, including the Florida Retirement System (FRS), the fourth largest public state retirement system in the nation, comprised of more than 950,000 active and retired employees of 910 state, county, district school board, community college, city, and special district agencies. The Division also administers the State University System Optional Retirement Program, the Senior Management Service Optional Annuity Program, the Retiree Health Insurance Subsidy Program, and the Municipal Police and Firefighters' Premium Tax Program. Additionally, the Division provides oversight of the actuarially sound funding of 520 local government retirement systems, pursuant to Part VII, Chapter 112, Florida Statutes.

The Division of Retirement's core function is to administer state-wide retirement programs. The Division's key priority is to meet its statutory obligations in the most efficient and effective manner possible. The Division's continuing commitment to quality customer service is reflected in the recurrent high satisfaction ratings reported by its customers—the members, retirees and surviving beneficiaries, and employing agencies of Florida's state-administered retirement programs. Over the past several years, the Division has achieved an increase in the percentage of members satisfied with the Division's retirement services, improving its FY 1998-99 satisfaction level of 93.7% to 95.9% in FY 2004-05. The Division sustains one of the lowest administrative costs per member, less than \$21 annually, among all large public pension plans in the nation.

The Division is focused on good business management practices and responsible community involvement. We nurture our employees to be among the best in State government. To continue meaningful training for management and staff is a high priority along with actively listening to our employees and providing them feedback on their performance. Educating our customers and protecting our customers' vital information electronically is paramount to building a trusting relationship with the Division that must encompass their lifetime participation in the FRS, often spanning 30 years or more.

An emphasis on continuous improvement, quality customer care and service, a fully automated electronic information system, employee involvement and solidarity among its management will assure the agency achieves all its priorities.

Finding ways to best serve our customers is always a central focus. In January 2006 the Division implemented toll-free long distance telephone service for all our customers. The use of this service provides the customer easier access to retirement services and a more rewarding and cost effective means of communicating with the Division. Continuing our annual customer surveys and updating them relative to changing conditions will assure the Division stays focused on providing quality and meaningful customer service. Continual enhancements to the Division's website assure our customers have the latest information available in understanding their retirement plans and in planning for their retirement. Future enhancements will be focused on providing web-based training for customers and in finding more creative ways to serve our increasing customer base through the use of technology.

Our customers are best served by a well-informed, well-trained and motivated management and staff. This past year, over 100 training courses were taken by our Division personnel. The Division takes advantage of the in-house computer training provided by the Department of Management Services at their facility here in Tallahassee. Additionally the Division plans to implement more web-based training for our employees as the opportunity becomes available. Training received by Division staff covered the areas of computers, safety and security, customer service and many other areas specific to the type of work performed by the Division. Work process improvements will be further achieved by networking with other State Retirement Systems through national organizations like the National Association of State Retirement Administrators (NASRA) and the National Council on Teacher Retirement (NCTR). An association with these types of organizations provides the opportunity to compare statistical data and business practices against which to benchmark our own performance and operations. The Division is also reviewing and developing additional internal employee and organizational performance measures to assist management and our employees in providing the highest degree of customer service.

The Division's proprietary Integrated Retirement Information System (IRIS) has effectively and efficiently served our Division and its membership for the past five years. Although substantial enhancements have been made over the years,

the system is aging and there is a need to look towards updating the electronic imaging and workflow systems and to migrate the software architecture to a more current standard. This major refurbishment may be facilitated by the re-bid beginning in FY 2006-2007 of the Division's very successful outsourcing of all its information technology support services begun in 2001.

Growing concerns by our customers in regard to their personal information maintained in the Florida Retirement System (FRS) is continually being addressed. This past year the Division incorporated additional security measures to protect our customers' information. Our customers now see that their Social Security numbers are partially masked when viewing their personal information on our website and also in our written correspondence sent to the customer. Our future customer newsletters will regularly address the importance of protecting personal information and Division employees now receive a monthly security tip to maintain awareness of the importance of protecting our customers' and their own vital information.

Natural disasters and security threats are an important concern in regard to our operations. The ability to assure continuing the distribution of retirement benefits has been addressed and plans established to continue operations in the event normal business is severely disrupted. In FY 2005-2006, critical computer server equipment was relocated to the State's facilities at the Shared Resource Center (SRC) here in Tallahassee. This move will provide a more secure and weather resistant environment to safeguard this equipment. Other plans being formulated will continue to strengthen the Division's disaster recovery and data back up systems.

The outcome measures of the Division of Retirement reflect its mission to deliver a high quality, innovative and cost-effective retirement system. The services leading to these outcomes require a focus on quality customer service, cost conscientiousness and efficient operations. The services provided by the Division to the 950,000 active and retired FRS members and their 910 employing agencies cover the lifetime employment of the FRS member, often spanning 30 years or more, and lasting until the death of the member and their beneficiary. All of the services provided by the Division, from enrolling members, managing and auditing employer contributions, keeping detailed records on every member, calculating estimates and final retirement benefits, analyzing and supporting legislation, publishing materials, maintaining a sophisticated and fully automated electronic retirement system and effectively educating and communicating with thousands of participants and other interested parties every year, culminate in providing a monthly retirement benefit to more than 252,000 retired members or their beneficiaries.

All the Division's outcome projections are aggressive and challenging, but reflective of the level of effort employed by Division management and staff. Member satisfaction surveys, various efficiency ratings and cost effectiveness measures all show high achievement which the Division expects to sustain through coming years. All the different services provided the FRS membership culminate in assuring a retirement benefit is paid accurately and timely once the member leaves active service. This outcome is immutable. The goal is to deliver their earned monthly retirement benefit, in a timely manner, 100% of the time. To the individual recipient living on a fixed income, this is the only acceptable outcome and for the Division to accomplish this takes the lifetime delivery of high quality customer service, capable employees and management and a constant focus on fulfilling the Division's mission.

STATE PURCHASING

The mission of State Purchasing is to provide excellent purchasing services in order to deliver innovative, resource-saving solutions.

Governed by Chapters 112 part III, 119.07, 120.57, 283, 287, 413.031, 413.036, 413.037, 812.081, and 946.515, Florida Statutes, State Purchasing uses the combined purchasing power of the State of Florida to deliver the best value in goods and services for the State and eligible users. Our goal is to develop and implement sound procurement practices in accordance with executive policy and legislative mandates. State Purchasing is dedicated to build strong relationships with our key constituents – other agencies, local government, and vendors. State Purchasing provides professional leadership and guidance in understanding and using the best purchasing and contracting practices.

State Purchasing promotes fair and open contracts in the State's procurement process. Sources of supply are solicited, and contracts for the purchase, lease or acquisition of commodities and services are scheduled and implemented. Additionally, State Purchasing promotes efficiency, economy and conservation of energy through vehicle, natural gas, fuel oil, recycled products and other environmentally relevant contracting efforts.

In order to assist the Governor in the achievement of building economic opportunity for all, State Purchasing will continue to provide outreach and registration for vendors to broaden contracting opportunities to a more diverse vendor population. State Purchasing will continue to coordinate vendor participation at the annual Florida Government Conference with other state agencies, universities, cities and counties.

Many factors affect State Purchasing's ability to meet performance standards for our outcome measure, percent of state term contract savings (e.g., market conditions, competition, and state agencies' usage of state term contracts). However, over the next five years, State Purchasing anticipates that strategic sourcing efforts will provide significant cost savings of up to \$500 million annually to the State through use of state contracts and agreements.

MYFLORIDAMARKETPLACE

To further its mission, State Purchasing has implemented a new statewide electronic procurement system, known as MyFloridaMarketPlace. MyFloridaMarketPlace will help the State better direct, coordinate, evaluate, and resource its procurement process. By aggregating spending on products and services, the State will be better positioned to negotiate contracts with suppliers based on economies of scale. As a result, buyers will benefit from increased competition among the State's vendors. In addition to generating savings via the reduced cost of goods and services, MyFloridaMarketPlace will generate process efficiencies from reduced paperwork. For example the system provides:

- State of the art tools: Electronic, Internet-based transactions provide a consistent and more efficient way of doing business with the State - less paperwork and manual steps.

The outcome measure for State Purchasing is 28% average savings off MSRP or other referenced prices by using state term contracts. It pays to have a purchasing program when it saves resources. The bottom line in purchasing is reduction of purchase prices. And, purchasing savings have a "multiplier effect" on budgets. For instance, a 28% reduction in prices is equivalent to a 38% increase in procurement budgets if full price were to be paid ($\$1.38 \times (1-.28) = \1.00). 28% was chosen as historically appropriate.

REAL ESTATE DEVELOPMENT AND MANAGEMENT

The Division of Real Estate Development and Management's primary responsibility is to deliver quality facilities for the public to access state services and for state agencies to efficiently and effectively focus on conducting their core business activities and tasks. The Division delivers its services by efficiently capitalizing on the benefits associated with long-range real estate ownership as well as through negotiated lease agreements with private property owners. This includes the development and management of state-owned buildings to provide best value rental rates for state agencies. Primary responsibilities cover Fixed Capital Outlay Planning and Appropriations Management, Operations and Maintenance of the Florida Facilities Pool buildings, Real Property Management of both public and private office space leasing, Parking Services, and Project Management Oversight of construction projects appropriated to DMS as well as for other state agencies through Client Agency Agreements. The program operates under the following Florida Statute Chapters 215, 216, 252, 255, 272, 281, 287, and 288.

The delivery of the Division's activities are primarily directed by Chapters 255 and 272, Florida Statutes, financed through the Bonded Building Program and supported by agency rental fees paid into the Supervision Trust Fund (to maintain the buildings) and the Architects Incidental Trust Fund (to support Project Management Oversight services). As a result, priorities are focused on providing efficient and effective building management services for 7.8 million gross square feet of space of DMS managed buildings, which includes the allocates of 23,046 parking spaces statewide.

The Workspace Management Initiative focuses on (1) improving space quality for employees, (2) promoting optimum use of office space, and (3) controlling cost associated with space use in state-owned buildings. Over the past three fiscal years, the Workspace Management Initiative has resulted in a cost avoidance of \$9,764,685, by reducing the costs associated with 916,953 square feet of leased space. Centralized Leasing has provided the ability to efficiently and competitively procure private sector leases through invitations to bid, requests for proposals and invitations to negotiate. The competitive solicitation process has allowed agencies the ability to obtain beneficial lease terms from landlords, and also allows landlords to negotiate more security in their leases.

Fixed Capital Outlay (FCO) Appropriations Management is a priority of DMS. This includes implementing appropriations, managing encumbered funds, assuring contract compliance, certifying the budget releases and project budget management. The Facilities Accountability Communication Tool (FACT) supports this core responsibility of assuring that the funds appropriated are accounted for from their release to the completion of each construction project. The FCO planning process performs a review, analyzes and prioritizes the needed renovations and repairs for the state-owned facilities within the Florida Facilities Pool. This task is conducted on an annual basis with additional assessment if needed as a result of unforeseen conditions or events such as hurricanes.

Authorized in 255 F.S., the Division serves as the Owner-Representative on behalf of the State in FCO project management oversight. The Division acts in the public interest to ensure that the value received is equal to the funds expended and that the State's safety and construction standards are maintained. A development strategy is implemented to establish new energy efficient state-owned facilities that consolidate agency's workforce such as the future Headquarters for the Department of Revenue at the Capital Circle Office Center in Tallahassee. The 2005 Legislature provided \$1 million for the initial planning and design phase of the project and further funded an additional \$96 million to construct approximately 550,000 GSF of office space on Parcel 2 at Capital Circle Office Center.

A master transition plan will be developed and implemented with occupancy of the new facilities to take place through the elimination of vacated state-owned space as well as from privately leased buildings. Among the projects to be accomplished within this plan includes the transition of information technology systems and centers location through agency spaces to the Shared Resource Center and the connectivity of the current Central Energy Plan to the newly constructed buildings. In a process that often involves substantial tax dollars, project management oversight tasks performed over the next five years will ensure the public's interest is equitable and executed as intended by the Legislature.

A formal disposition strategy is currently being developed to reduce the number of economically and functionally obsolete facilities managed by DMS, to increase available revenues from the sale, reduce operational maintenance costs as well as capital costs due to inefficient spaces, place the properties back on the tax roles and reduce the list of building deficiencies to be corrected.

A requirement of Real Estate Development is to review all State agencies' FCO Capital Improvement Plans. FCO project management oversight requires professional level staffing in specific skilled areas to assure the process of implementing the intent of the Legislature. Licensed and professional experts to perform the required tasks are the cost factors of this service. Without this, taxpayers and the Legislature would not be assured that the appropriated funds are expended in accordance with State law.

Interaction with state agencies allows DMS to understand customer needs and address long range plans to meet the diverse and changing facility needs of the state. The Capital Improvement Program includes plans for renovations to existing buildings and provides the Legislative Budget Request (LBR) to proactively maintain state-owned facilities in the Bonded Building Program. In addition, this planning activity addresses corrections of deficiencies that exist due to wear and damage, regulatory changes, advancements in technology and upgraded service standards for our customers.

As a result of the attacks of 2001, a new exception to the public records law was established, which exempts public building plans depicting the interior or structural elements of a facility. The 2004 Legislature extended this exemption to certain private property documents within the control of public entities in Florida. The 2007 Legislature will need to extend the currently expiring public records exemption of the public's building plans to maintain their current security status. Legislative staff has discussed an extension of the exemption with DMS and the extension of related and potentially new task are expected.

The major cost factors associated with this service area includes utilities, expenses and salaries. \$16.2 million is funded to pay for the utilities associated with the operations and maintenance of the 7.8 million gross square feet within the Florida Facilities Pool. Due to accelerating energy costs worldwide, energy efficiency initiatives have been implemented to assist with containing future energy cost of the properties within the Florida Facilities Pool. Over the next five years, this effort will be focused on new construction planned for the Capital Circle Office Center parcel 2, which will be constructed following the Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design national standards.

For the fiscal year 06/07, \$12.4 million is funded for expenses and contracted services, which are primarily used to pay for contractual obligations related to the operations and maintenance of the Florida Facilities Pool. These obligations include contracts for outsourced operation and maintenance services, custodial services, landscaping, elevator maintenance, HVAC maintenance, etc. It is expected that the State will continue to utilize the private workforce for specific needs to maintain the real estate managed by DMS.

For the fiscal year 06/07, \$12.7 million is funded for the salaries associated with 305.5 FTE to provide internal oversight of the public's building investment and to produce best value results for the tenants occupying DMS managed facilities.

Based on the summary findings of a Sterling site visit, systematic customer contact standards are needed for all customer interfaces. The successful implementation of the Division's outcome measures is dependent on keeping the focus on providing direct customer service, with individuals who provide an expected output on a regular basis. To secure future successes of the organization's outcomes, an opportunity exists to put into place steps for developing and retaining the program's experienced individuals and further enhancing the team environment over the next five years.

As a result of Governor Bush signed Executive Order 04-118 and in support of the Workspace Management Initiative, DMS established Legislative Budget Requests (LBR) designed to reduce the cost of providing workspace for state agencies, this includes space efficiency projects, defined projects in Florida Facilities Pool buildings and Tenant Improvement projects to address agency requests. Additionally, the Order required executive agencies under the Governor and requested all other agencies to enter into an inter-agency agreement with the Department of Management Services to procure and manage all leases of 5,000 square feet or more. The Executive Order also directed each agency to immediately assess current private sector leases and implement strategies to improve space use and lease terms.

DMS will be annually publishing a report that lists, by agency, all leases that are due to expire within 24 months. The annual report must include the following information for each lease: location; size of leased space; current cost per leased square foot; lease expiration date; and a determination of whether sufficient state-owned office space will be available at the expiration of the lease to house affected employees. The report must also include a list of amendments and supplements to and waivers of terms and conditions in the lease agreements that have been approved pursuant to s. 255.255(2)(a) during that previous 12 months and an associated comprehensive analysis, including financial implications, showing that any amendment, supplement, or waiver is in the state's long-term best interest.

SPECIALIZED SERVICES

EXECUTIVE AIRCRAFT

The mission of Executive Aircraft is to deliver safe and efficient executive on-demand air travel for the Governor, Cabinet, and other state officials to enable the Division of Specialized Services to provide exceptional customer service.

In accordance with Chapter 287.161, F.S., Executive Aircraft is responsible for the management of state-owned and operated aircraft including operational and safety standards and assignment, use, and reporting policies and procedures. The service operates an Executive Aircraft pool, which consists of one Cessna Citation Bravo, one King Air 300, and one King Air 350, from a central aviation facility in Tallahassee. Executive Aircraft provides on-demand executive air transportation to the Governor, Cabinet Officers, and other high level officials and employees on a priority first call, first serve basis.

Executive Aircraft is supported by an aircraft maintenance facility and aircraft mechanics that are required to provide timely and quality repairs and service to the pool aircraft in Executive Aircraft.

The two outcome measures currently approved for this program area are the comparison of private charter costs to our state owned aircraft cost and a benchmark of flight hours flown in a fiscal year. If there were a significant weather event or other major disruption to the airport facility, these outcome measures would likely not be met given our expectations of repair and/or purchase. Otherwise, we would expect that the trend in both would remain constant.

FLEET MANAGEMENT

The mission Fleet Management is to deliver safe and efficient vehicles and watercraft including acquisition, tracking, and disposal to state agencies to enable the Division of Specialized Services to provide exceptional customer service.

In accordance with Chapter 287, Part II, F.S., Fleet Management manages the acquisition, operation, maintenance, and disposal of the state's fleet of motor vehicles and watercraft. The state's fleet includes approximately 25,000 units, including automobiles & light trucks, medium and heavy trucks, construction & industrial equipment, tractors & mowers, and small utility, motorcycles & ATVs. Responsibilities of this program area include developing policies and practices for effective and efficient acquisition, assignment, use, maintenance and disposal of vehicles and watercraft. In addition, Fleet Management determines motor vehicles and watercraft to be included on state contracts; develops technical bid specifications; and assists in evaluating the contracts.

This service also approves the purchase of vehicles and watercraft, develops equipment purchase approval guidelines, develops fleet replacement criteria, and administers the state's federally mandated alternative fueled vehicles program. In addition, Fleet Management provides an Equipment Management Information System and reporting system that provides the management and cost information required to effectively and efficiently manage the state's fleet and provides accountability of equipment use and expenditures.

The service also manages the disposal of used and surplus state vehicles and watercraft. This area also administers the rental vehicle contract.

There are two currently approved outcome measures in this program area. We track how many commercial miles are driven through our rental car contract and we compare the state contract daily vehicle rental rate against a private provider daily vehicle rental rate. Should there be a major event such as a significant recession or other budgetary issue from the outside, we would probably not be able to sustain the required numbers. Otherwise, we believe that this current method will remain constant in the five year plan. We hope to add a new measure this year that deals with customer satisfaction through our turn around time for the acquisition and disposal of vehicles through agency requests.

Through the Department of Transportation, an outside fleet consulting firm is currently being contracted to conduct an objective analysis of the State's fleet. The analysis and findings as reported by the fleet consulting firm may be used as baseline data for future improvements to this area.

FEDERAL PROPERTY ASSISTANCE

The mission of Federal Property Assistance is to deliver as much federal surplus property as possible to Florida non-profits, political subdivisions and law enforcement to enable the Division of Specialized Services to provide exceptional customer service.

Pursuant to Chapter 217.03, F.S., and EO #77-36, 40 USC 203.10 USC 2573 (A), Federal Statutes, Federal Property Assistance is responsible for acquiring and distributing federally owned tangible personal property declared excess/surplus to the needs of the federal government and allocated to the State of Florida for the benefit of the citizens of Florida through public agencies and private/nonprofit health and education organizations. Federal Property Assistance reviews available assets physically on-site at military and Federal civilian agency holding depots. The program also utilizes web-accessible surplus/excess databases of the U.S. General Services Administration (USGSA) and the U.S. Defense Logistics Agency. Acquisition of federal surplus equipment and supplies by eligible organizations results in major cost avoidance in asset procurement, which translates into tax dollar savings.

Federal Property Assistance is also responsible for acquiring and distributing U.S. Department of Defense owned tangible personal property declared excess to the needs of the military and approved for the State of Florida for the benefit of state and local law enforcement agencies. Federal Property Assistance has created state/local government partnerships to review available assets physically on-site at military holding depots and to transport those approved by the U.S. Department of Defense for Florida law enforcement agencies to the distribution center in Florida. The program also enables agencies to have equipment they may otherwise not have the resources to purchase.

The 1122 Counter Drug equipment procurement program is being transferred to the Florida Sheriffs Association. We will retain audit and oversight authority as we did when the Orange County Sheriffs Office operated the program from its inception.

There are currently two approved measures for this program area. We measure the distribution rate of equipment (how much equipment is transferred to assist relative to how much we receive), and the number of property orders processed through the system. These two measures would not be met in the event of extreme military conflict or extreme economic turns. Otherwise, we would expect to maintain fairly constant measures in this area.

PRIVATE PRISON MONITORING

The mission of Private Prison Monitoring is to provide effective oversight and management of the contracts administered by the program and to provide exceptional customer service.

This program area is governed by Chapter 957, Florida Statutes. Pursuant to Section 957.07(1), Florida Statutes, a cost savings of at least 7% is to be achieved of the private facility over the public provision of a similar state facility. For each facility, the Department has entered into an "Operations and Management Contract" with a private vendor to operate the facility for an agreed daily per-diem. The contracted per-diem rates include cost for the following operating expenditures: personnel, general operating expenditures, operating equipment, food services, medical services, maintenance and repair, educational programs, substance abuse programs, sales tax, salary and expenses of a DMS employed Contract Monitor position, property taxes or grants to the counties that have private prisons, and corporate taxes.

Funding to pay the Debt Service and operations per diem to vendors facilities is appropriated in the Department of Correction's annual budget. The Debt Service of the two subleased facilities is appropriated in the Department of Juvenile Justice's budget. Funding of employee salaries is appropriated in the Department of Management Services' budget.

The "Criminal Justice Estimating Conference" projects the number of beds that the Florida Prison System will need over the next five (5) years. During the 2005 legislative session, the Legislature directed the DMS to issue an invitation to negotiate to current facility vendors for a contract for 854 additional beds for expansion at existing private facilities.

The 2005 legislative session also directed DMS to add 220 more beds into the new facility at Graceville that had previously been set at 1,280 beds. The Graceville Correctional Facility will house 1,500 adult male inmates, medium/close custody level, and will be operational in September 2007.

The Bureau currently has eleven (11) FTE's which includes a Contract Manager located on-site at each facility. In September 2007, the new Graceville Correctional Facility will be operational. Legislative action is required to appropriate funds for one (1) FTE to function as the Contract Manager for the Graceville Correctional Facility.

The 2005 legislative session directed DMS to procure with an outside vendor to provide a study to determine the cost savings issue surrounding the private prison/public prison per diems on two specific contract re-bids on existing facilities.

OFFICE OF EFFICIENT GOVERNMENT

The mission of the Office of Efficient Government is to support the Council on Efficient Government as an outsourcing center of excellence in order to deliver quality, innovative, resource-saving solutions.

In accordance with the Florida Efficient Government Act of 2006, Chapter 2006-224, Laws of Florida, the Council on Efficient Government is tasked with the authority to review, evaluate, and issue advisory reports on business cases submitted to the council as specified in Section 287.0573, Florida Statutes. The Council is tasked with the following duties:

- Employ a standard process for reviewing business cases.
- Review and evaluate business cases to outsource as requested by the Governor or the agency head whose agency is proposing to outsource or as required by this act or by law.
- No later than 30 days prior to the agency's issuance of a solicitation of \$10 million or more, the Council must provide to the agency conducting the procurement, the Governor, and the President of the Senate, and the Speaker of the House of Representatives an advisory report for each business case reviewed and evaluated by the council. The report must contain all versions of the business case, an evaluation of the business case, any relevant recommendations, and sufficient information to assist the agency proposing to outsource in determining whether the proposal should be included in the legislative budget request.
- Recommend and implement standard processes for state agency and council review and evaluate state agency business cases to outsource, including templates for use by state agencies in submitting business cases to the council.
- Develop standards and best-practice procedures for use by state agencies in evaluating business cases to outsource.
- Recommend standards, processes, and guidelines for use by state agencies in developing business cases to outsource.
- Incorporate any lessons learned from outsourcing services and activities into council standards, procedures, and guidelines, as appropriate, and identify and disseminate to agencies information regarding best practices in outsourcing efforts.
- Develop, in consultation with the Agency for Workforce Innovation, guidelines for assisting state employees whose jobs are eliminated as a result of outsourcing.
- Identify and report annually to the Legislature on:
 - a. Innovative methods of delivering government services which would improve the efficiency, effectiveness, or competition in the delivery of government services, including, but not limited to, enterprise-wide proposals.
 - b. Outsourcing efforts of each state agency which shall include, but not be limited to, the number of outsourcing business cases and solicitations, the number and dollar value of outsourcing contracts, an explanation of agency progress on achieving the cost-benefit analysis schedule as required by s. 287.0574(4)(h), descriptions of performance results as applicable, any contract violations or project slippages, and the status of extensions, renewals, and amendments of outsourcing contracts.

The Office of Efficient Government was created pursuant to the provisions of the Florida Efficient Government Act of 2006, Chapter 2006-224, Laws of Florida; to support the Council on Efficient Government in carrying out the responsibilities of this act.

The office is responsible for assisting the Council in the development of a standard process for reviewing business cases; reviewing and evaluating agency submitted business cases to outsource; assisting in the development of standard processes for state agency and council review and evaluate state agency business cases to outsource, including templates for use by state agencies in submitting business cases to the Council; Assisting in the development of standards and best-practice procedures for use by state agencies in evaluating business cases to outsource; compilation of an advisory report for each business case reviewed and evaluated by the Council; compilation of an annual report to the Legislature concerning Innovative methods of delivering government services which would improve the efficiency, effectiveness, or competition in the delivery of government services and the outsourcing efforts of each state agency; facilitating the submission all required reports to the Governor, Legislature and Agencies; and working with agencies in their efforts to comply with the Council's policies and procedures.

The office is charged with the responsibility of implementing the department's program to train state agency employees who are involved in managing outsourcings as Project Management Professionals, as certified by the Project Management Institute.

The priorities of the Office were selected based upon the requirements of the Council as provided for in the provisions of the Florida Efficient Government Act of 2006, Chapter 2006-224, Laws of Florida.

The Office of Efficient Government is focusing on three key initiatives necessary to implement the provisions of the Florida Efficient Government Act of 2006, Chapter 2006-224, Laws of Florida.

The first key initiative is to get the Office fully staffed with qualified and trained professionals who are skilled and able to assist the Council in carrying out its responsibilities. The Department is currently in the process of selecting an Executive Director to lead the Office. Once an Executive Director is on board, staff will be recruited and selected using a variety of sources.

The second key initiative is the assisting the Council in the development of the various policies, procedures, processes, standards and templates for use by the Council and agencies in the review and evaluation of outsourcing business cases. Once the Council has these tools in place, the Office will conduct outreach activities including presentations, training, and workshops before key agency personnel and leadership groups.

The third key initiative is to develop a reservoir of state personnel certified as project management professionals and contract negotiators available to assist state agencies with their competitive solicitations/procurements. This will be accomplished through the Department of Management Services certification process for both programs. In the case of the certified project management professional program, the department will work in conjunction with state agency leadership to identify suitable candidates.

The Office of Efficient Government is a newly created entity whose baseline data will be established this fiscal year, therefore information concerning demand and fiscal implications are not available at this time. Any increased demand and the associated fiscal implications will be documented and used to develop the 5 year Workforce Plan.

ENTERPRISE INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY SERVICES

The Enterprise Information Technology Services (EITS) program provides telecommunications and information technology (IT) services to support state agencies and other public entities that serve the citizens of Florida. Chapter 282, Florida Statutes, provides a statutory framework of the primary responsibilities of EITS as a state service provider focusing on:

- Designing and implementing advanced, bundled telecommunications systems and IT services to meet and support the needs of state agencies, universities, local governments, and other qualifying entities;
- Establishing technical standards to ensure the interconnectivity of IT and telecommunications systems provided;
- Developing policies and guidelines for its customers to obtain IT and telecommunications equipment and services;
- Reviewing the IT and communications needs of state government to guide development of an Enterprise Network;
- Managing the Office of Information Security to support agencies in the protection of their data and resources.

Specifically, Chapter 282.103, Florida Statutes, defines the responsibilities for designing and operating the state communications network SUNCOM provided for state agencies, state universities, political subdivisions, educational institutions and libraries, and qualifying non-profit organizations. Chapter 282.20, F.S., outlines its role as manager for data services and operations at the Shared Resource Center, a state data processing facility. Chapter 282.1095 and 282.111, F.S, mandate responsibility for planning, designing, and managing the statewide law enforcement radio system and establishing an interoperability network. Chapter 282.111, F.S., authorizes and directs the agency to develop and maintain a statewide system of regional law enforcement communications. Chapter 282.318, F.S., outlines responsibilities of the Office of Information Security (OIS).

In addition, under non-282 Florida Statutes, the EITS assumes responsibility for management of public safety initiatives to protect Florida's citizens in the area of communications. Under Chapter 252 relating to Emergency Management, EITS supports coordination of emergency communications at the state Emergency Operations Center and provides personnel to serve on emergency assessment teams. EITS is tasked with responsibility for statewide coordination of 911 under the Florida Emergency Telephone Act (Chapter 365.171, F.S.), and for oversight and administration of the Wireless 911 Board (Chapter 365.172., F.S). Chapter 401.015, F.S., tasks DMS-EITS with development and oversight of the statewide system of regional emergency medical services (EMS) communications.

EITS strategic planning is driven by changing technologies and satisfying the requirements of its customers, in addition to ensuring public safety communications systems that will adequately protect Florida's citizens. As a communications and information technology service provider for its customers (state agencies, local governments, educational institutions, public safety agencies, and non-profit organizations), the EITS establishes priorities that will ensure that State of Florida entities have access to the most efficient, cost effective, and secure communications systems and services available. In setting its priorities for state communications, the EITS mission is to focus on providing the technical expertise for the management of communications and information technology services by coordinating volume purchasing and establishing contracts with outsourced providers at reduced rates for its customers, continuously analyzing systems and equipment in light of a changing industry and its customer requirements, establishing standards and policies for enterprise-wide interconnectivity and shared use among all customers, and ensuring security measures are in place to protect the State's IT systems and resources. In the area of public safety, EITS priorities are responsive to state, federal, and local agency requirements to facilitate the coordination and advancement of radio interoperability and emergency 911 communications.

In the next five years, the continued quality delivery of services for its customers will remain a top priority for the EITS, whether that delivery involves state business or public safety. The EITS represents the state as a technical agent in the volume purchase of communications and information technology services and therefore strives to obtain the lowest cost and the highest quality product for all its customers. How EITS sets its priorities for determining a schedule of procurements or in establishing contracts for the provision of services is based on the needs assessment and demand from its many state and local government customers.

Secondly, the EITS will continue to remain highly focused on Florida's citizens and whether an appropriate and secure communications infrastructure is in place at all times providing citizens with access to government information and assistance in their daily lives, as well with the assurance of safety through better communications for law enforcement and

emergency personnel. As a primary provider of communications and information technology services for state entities, the EITS will continue to set its priorities in seeking the most cost effective and quality solutions that allow these government entities to function in the best interest of those Florida citizens it serves daily.

My FloridaNet: The EITS is currently working on a monumental transition to improve service delivery of advanced network services for the next generation of government services. The current networking infrastructures lack sufficient functionality to meet our customer requirements for increased networked applications critical in today's working environment. As a solution, the EITS is focusing on MyFloridaNet, the next phase of SUNCOM communications services designed to utilize local service provider infrastructure and maximize a potential for statewide communications access to all of Florida's constituents, including State and non-State facilities. By deploying more advanced services, the State will establish a scalable networking platform capable of handling the ever increasing communications requirements of its customers. As a new multi-purpose communications network, MyFloridaNet will replace some of its existing data services, paving the way for an improved array of services at a lower price.

Public Safety and Radio Interoperability: The EITS successfully joined in a public-private partnership to complete the Statewide Law Enforcement Radio System (SLERS), a state of the art shared 800 MHz radio communications system that provides an enterprise solution facilitating communications among 17 state law enforcement entities. This digital system serves over 6500 users with 14,000 radios in patrol cars, boats, motorcycles, and aircraft wherever they are in the state. With the provision of SLERS, the State achieves effective interagency communications, as well as coordinated communications with local public safety entities, without frequency congestion. The EITS will continue this important priority of maintaining SLERS to meet the public safety communications requirements of state and local governments. With the Federal Communications Commission 2005 mandate for 800 MHz re-banding, the EITS will now focus on coordinating the transition of Florida's radio systems under the new federal guidelines.

In addition, as delegated manager of the Florida Interoperability Network project, EITS will continue to work on the established goals for statewide radio interoperability to enable emergency personnel on disparate radio systems and frequencies to communicate. Through administration of federal domestic security grants, EITS is facilitating the implementation of network connections between Florida dispatch centers, installation of an interoperability tool to connect users on any radio system to any other radio system, and the build-out of nine mutual aid channels throughout the state. The mutual aid build-out will substantially increase geographic coverage in emergency situations, ensuring that wherever they go, Florida's emergency responders will have radio communications capability. This capability will be in addition to the two 800 MHz channels already provided by the SLERS.

Shared Resource Center Utilization: EITS supports and maintains the Shared Resource Center (SRC), a state-of-the-art data center. The SRC provides customers with a solid IT infrastructure to support their applications. Although currently hosting data systems for numerous state agencies, the SRC is presently under-utilized with space available for housing and supporting additional IT systems and equipment. In an effort to maximize the use of this unique facility, EITS, in conjunction with the Governor's Office of Planning and Budgeting, has recently begun a campaign to promote the use of the SRC by encouraging other agencies to re-evaluate their current "data center" facilities with particular attention paid to redundancy and sustainability concerns relative to maintaining operations throughout unexpected and lengthy events affecting power, AC, etc., as well as the overall structure of their current facility.

Data Center Optimization Workgroup: A Data Center Optimization Workgroup consisting of appropriate personnel from state agencies that currently operate and maintain distinct data centers has been established in order to explore the potential for savings to the State via consolidation. Subgroups of the larger workgroup have been set up to evaluate this potential for the various IT platform bases employed within these data centers (i.e., IBM Mainframe Platform Subgroup, Windows Server Subgroup, Unix Server Subgroup, etc.). As an example, six state agencies, (DMS, DOT, HSMV, DCA, DOC, and DFS) currently operate and maintain separate and distinct IBM mainframe platforms. These agencies are all participants in the IBM Mainframe Platform Subgroup, working together to explore the potential for cost savings via consolidation of two or more of these platforms.

Information Services Restructuring: To enable EITS to provide a more cost effective business model, several information services have been reviewed and consequently restructured. Applications management has been consolidated into one unit which provides internal support for the EITS applications. The Windows platform of services has been streamlined. They offer only those services which our customers have requested and which provide a sound financial business offering. The Services Desk will be migrating over the next fiscal year to an internal-only service. The few

external customers of the Services Desk will migrate to their own stand-alone services prior to the beginning of fiscal year 2007-2008.

The outcome measures of EITS are based on its mission, as a state service provider, to focus on its customers in providing the most efficient, cost effective, and secure communications and information technology (IT) systems and services. In turn, the EITS customer base, including state agencies, local governments, educational institutions, and non-profit organizations, provide routine as well as critical services to Florida's citizens that affect their lives daily. The EITS program serves a vital support role for ensuring that the State's communications and IT infrastructure and services are tailored to the tasks of the state and local entities it supports and that the services provided by EITS meet their daily requirements, remain fully operational, and are highly secure.

To gauge how effectively EITS is handling its responsibilities as a service provider, the EITS has developed a "Percent of Customers Satisfied" measure through distribution of a survey to Telecommunications, Wireless, and Information Services customers. The EITS customer survey questions focus on EITS performance in providing services by meeting customer requirements; providing access to information; utilizing reliable, secure and friendly products; protecting data and information; and responding to problems or outages with timely support and resolution. A minimum of 86 percent overall customer satisfaction rating is projected for each year over the next five years. This realistic projection takes into consideration that certain factors in the world of communications and technology are vulnerable to unforeseen technical difficulties rather than human error. Also, properly maintaining a secure shared network and data center and the affiliated services requires that EITS develop policies and procedures for the overall benefit to its customers. This enterprise perspective creates certain instances wherein customers may not favor necessary requirements or restrictions, and this dissatisfaction may be reflected in answers to survey questions.

Under Florida Statutes, the EITS is associated with the following councils and/or boards and is tasked with providing certain documents for state planning:

Chief Information Officers Council: The Chief Information Officers Council was established under Chapter 282.315, F.S., to facilitate the sharing and coordination of information technology resources management issues and initiatives among the agencies.

Digital Divide Council: The Digital Divide Council is responsible for the planning and implementation of programs that are aimed at increasing citizen access to information technology resources. The former State Technology Office under Chapter 445.049, F.S., provided administrative support for the Digital Divide Council until July 1, 2005; however, this function is no longer funded under the current EITS budget.

Joint Task Force on State Agency Law Enforcement Communications: This Joint Task Force, established in Chapter 282.1095, F.S., is to advise the EITS of the member-agency needs for the planning, designing, and establishment of the statewide radio communications system to serve law enforcement units of state agencies and local public safety agencies through a mutual aid channel or as third party subscribers.

Florida Interoperability Network Comprehensive Management Plan: This plan for all public safety agencies statewide is maintained by the Florida Executive Interoperable Technologies Committee (FEITC) and DMS-EITS, in conjunction with the Florida Department of Law Enforcement and the Department of Community Affairs, Emergency Management.

Florida Law Enforcement Communications Plan: The EITS maintains this plan in conjunction with its responsibility for a statewide system of regional law enforcement communications under Chapter 282.111, F.S.

Florida-Region 9 Plan for Public Safety Radio Communications: The EITS coordinates and maintains this plan based on the frequency allocation responsibility delegated in Chapter 282.111(2) (c), F.S.

Wireless 911 Board: The Wireless 911 Board, with oversight by the EITS, was established to administer the E911 fee under Chapter 365.172(8), F.S, and to distribute funds to counties and service providers to improve the public health, safety, and welfare through the development of wireless emergency telephone assistance. The Board submits an annual report to the Governor and Legislature. EITS is currently working on a proviso Wireless Board report for reducing the wireless E911 fee. This report will be submitted to the Governor and Legislature by September 30, 2006.

911 Emergency Telephone Number Plan: In conjunction with its responsibility for the coordination of 911 systems statewide as delegated in Chapter 365.171, F.S., EITS maintains responsibility for updating this plan for the State of Florida.

ESF 2 Communications Emergency Recovery Plan: EITS annually reviews and updates this communications plan prior to hurricane season to provide emergency preparedness support for state and local agencies.

Emergency Medical Communications (EMS) Communications Plan: Under Chapter 401.015, F.S., EITS maintains this plan to establish and regulate EMS radio communications for licensed EMS agencies and hospital emergency departments.

Information Technology Security Strategic Plan: Chapter 282.318, F.S., tasks the Office of Information Security with developing a strategic plan for information technology security to be submitted to the Governor and Legislature by March 1, 2007.

Shared Resource Center Business Plan: This proviso operational business plan to report on SRC services, cost allocations, infrastructure and utilization is to be submitted to the Governor and Legislature by October 1, 2006.

SUNCOM Portfolio of Services: The EITS provides this electronic document on the state communications system for describing available services, policies and procedures, as mandated in Chapter 282.102(1), F.S.

OFFICE OF SUPPLIER DIVERSITY

The Office of Supplier Diversity (OSD) provides leadership and guidance on certification and the registration of minority vendors and as well as in providing assistance in the utilization of Minority/Women-owned Business Enterprises (M/WBE) that provide goods and services to state agencies and universities. The services of the office are provided for and implemented in accordance with the Governor's Executive Order 99-281, commonly known as the One Florida Initiative, and Chapter 255, s.255.102, Contractors Utilization of Minority Business Enterprises; Chapter 288, Part IV, s.288.703, Definitions; s.288.7031, Application of Definitions; s.288.706, Minority Business Loan Mobilization Program; and primarily Chapter 287, , with specific reference to s.287.0943, Certification of Minority Business, s.287.0931, Statewide and Inter-local Agreements...; s.287.094, Minority Business Enterprise Programs...; s.287.09451, Powers and Duties ... it is in the interest of the public welfare to meaningfully assist minority business enterprises that are vital to the overall economy of this state.

The office is responsible for measuring the amount of spending by state agencies with certified minority businesses and conducting compliance audits of certified minority businesses. It provides outreach to state agencies, organizations and vendors in all matters relating to state contracting opportunities. The office is charged with the responsibility of implementing the Minority Business Loan Mobilization Program and the Governor's Mentor Protégé Program. It serves as a liaison between state agencies and minority vendors by reviewing state agency 90 day spending plans and informing vendors about contracting opportunities. Also the office reviews contract documents to insure that the language is not prohibitive to minority participation and to insure that minority vendors will have a fair opportunity to compete.

The priorities are guided by the mission of the agency to provide quality customer service and to support the compelling interest of the legislature through management of the Governor's Equity in Contracting Plan, which is intended to achieve optimum diversity in agency spending; and in keeping with the Governor's One Florida Initiative and the Secretary's priority of improved customer service these priorities complement these objectives. In lieu of the ruling affecting the constitutionality of Chapter 287.09451 and its impact on the legality of base operations, extending the provisions of Executive Order 99-281 is critical in order for the state of Florida to achieve its diversity objectives.

The OSD will establish improved systems of recordkeeping and reporting; increased outreach and matchmaking activities through the development of stronger partnerships with both public sector and private entities; ensure that the staff is provide opportunities for training and are provided the necessary tools to achieve optimum performance; explore the establishment of enabling legislation that extends diversity objectives for the inclusion of all state agencies in the state's diversity initiatives.

The OSD has established the following priorities for the next five years and will endeavor to:

1. Increase the amount of dollars expended by state agencies with certified minority/women business enterprises by 10%;
2. Increase the number of Certified/registered MWBE's in the MyFloridaMarketPlace database by 25% over the next five years.
3. Increase efficient services delivery through enhanced matchmaking and trained staff to reduce the time to certify MWBEs from an average of 25 days to 15 days or less.
4. Ensure efficient and effective customer service delivery;
5. To increase the accessibility in real-time to accurate state-level spending with Certified MBEs through improved record-keeping and reporting systems.

The OSD is a highly paper intensive operation that is moving to incorporate new information technologies beginning with an electronic file management system. Further, in order to achieve the states goal of optimum MWBE participation in state purchasing there is a need to create opportunities for the inclusion of all state agencies in the state's diversity initiatives.

As the OSD explores race and gender neutral alternatives for increasing Minority/Women business participation in state spending, legislative action will be necessary to reconcile different policy approaches of the Executive Order 99-281 and Chapter 287. While this may not constitute a major change in programs or services rendered it will increase the effectiveness of the operations of the OSD and the state's ability to achieve its diversity goals.

The following Council exists under the OSD:

- **Small and Minority Business Advisory Council:** The purpose of the advisory council is to propose uniform criteria and procedures by which participating entities and organizations can qualify businesses to participate in procurement or contracting programs as certified minority /women owned business enterprises in accordance with the certification criteria established by law.

AMERICANS WITH DISABILITIES ACT WORKING GROUP

The Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) Working Group (ADAWG) was recreated by Executive Order (03-137) and is maintained to encourage a cooperative effort of compliance with the ADA between all customers including state and local governments, the education community, the business community, the private sector, and the community of people with disabilities. ADAWG is charged with providing information, referrals, education, and recommendations for compliance and implementation of the ADA in order to increase the independence and quality of life for citizens of Florida with disabilities. Additionally, the ADA Working Group houses and oversees the Clearinghouse on Disability Information and the Real Choice Partnership Project.

The Clearinghouse on Disability Information Program was recreated by Executive Order 03-137 as a commitment to the concepts, duties, responsibilities and functions of the information and referral services created by House Bill 1519 in the legislative session of 2001, building upon the leadership and activities of the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) Working Group. The purpose of the Clearinghouse is to eliminate the confusing and expensive process of calling various state departments and agencies to acquire information on disabilities and services. The goal is to make information on all resources for persons with disabilities easily available and readily accessible. An additional standard of service is to make sure callers obtain a realistic expectation of the limitation of services as they exist currently in state government, as mandated by the Executive Order.

In September of 2001, the ADA Working Group received a three-year, two million dollar grant from the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services (CMS) to implement and administer Florida's Real Choice Partnership Project (RCP). This grant was extended through September 30, 2006. Florida's work through the Real Choice Partnership Project has received statewide and national recognition in several areas that address trends and conditions of persons with disabilities in the state.

Based upon information gathered at our quarterly Board meetings, and inquiries and complaints by our customers via the Clearinghouse on Disability Information, ADAWG has chosen its priority activities and areas of focus on employment, public accommodations, transportation, state and local government, telecommunication, and accessible electronic information technology. ADAWG also tracks all federal and state court decisions affecting the structure, enforcement, or any other aspect of the ADA, as well as legislation at the federal and state level which impact the lives of persons with disabilities residing in the State of Florida.

The ADA Working Group plans to continue to accelerate ADA compliance in Florida by:

- Reestablishing quarterly ADA Coordinator networking meetings for state ADA Coordinators, and the creation of a certification process to improve classification status and importance of their role in the state workforce;
- Continuing to submit recommendations regarding necessary changes to statutes, administrative rules, policies, and/or procedures of the state in order to remove any conflicts with the ADA, remove any negative or derogatory references towards people with disabilities, and establish a coordinated system to receive requests for alternative formats, production, and dispersion in a cost-effective, simplified manner;
- Continuing complaint resolution activities;
- Continuing educational seminars on the ADA and related topics throughout the State of Florida;
- Continuing the provision of a biennial statewide training by offering continued education credits to licensed professional in the areas of building construction, rehabilitation counseling, educators and law.
- Expanding the knowledge of the Clearinghouse as a place to turn through a formal marketing plan.
- Researching and acquiring additional grants to assist the state with ADA compliance.

The Real Choice Partnership Project Federal Grant expires in September 2006; this will affect ADAWG as the Grant staff will no longer be available to collaborate with us, offer valuable input, and assistance. The grant staff served as back-up to the ADA Administrator on ADA technical assistance calls, case analysis, etc. As the result of losing two staff, the program is shifting some areas of expertise into the Clearinghouse to serve as the back-up to the ADAWG part of the programs. This requires additional training for the Clearinghouse staff and development of training skills for ADAWG's educational efforts.

Since implementation of the Clearinghouse in 2001, the demand for services continues to escalate at more than a 100% increase each year. The number of callers assisted began at 900 for the first year and the program is currently fielding

more than 33,000 calls the fourth year. It is not evident that the demand for disability information has reached its capacity or leveled off.

Another trend revealed this year is reflected in the quickly increasing numbers of calls related to service animal owners being denied access into government settings, recreational settings and places of business. Despite the passage of the Service Animal Law during the 2005 legislative session, the complaints have escalated to the point where an effort to train law enforcement officers is being formally planned and implemented.

New program trends include an increasing number of calls from outside of Florida seeking information about moving to Florida in order to access Home and Community Based Medicaid Waiver services despite the growing waiting lists.

A new group of people with disabilities is emerging and expanding as armed forces personnel return home from the Middle East. Many of their needs are quite extensive as the result of becoming a person with a disability. Recent Veteran Administration's reports reveal the majority of injured veterans returning home have severe disabilities, including loss of limbs, hearing, vision, paralysis, Post Traumatic Stress Syndrome, etc. Access to basic information about resources is the primary request, followed by benefit information, veteran's preference in employment and how to seek a job as a person with a disability.

Florida's disability population is one of the fastest growing segments in the nation. Florida has a significantly higher number of people with disabilities as compared to other states due to our large elderly population. Florida is also a favorite retirement choice for veterans (disabled and nondisabled) migrating from the North. Based upon the 2000 census, Florida's total population was 15,982,378 and people with disabilities make up 22.2% of the total population, or 3,548,088. Florida's population increases approximately 2.2% per year. As a result, ADAWG expects service demands to increase approximately 20% each year.

ADAWG's Clearinghouse on Disability Information compiles data regarding the phone calls, emails, letters, etc. that come into the program. Customers often must provide confidential medical information about themselves in order for staff to assist them. ADAWG seeks exemption from the Sunshine Law based upon the sensitive nature of the data and information stored within our database.

ADAWG seeks to accomplish the following in legislation: removal of the conflict between the ADA and state statute on gasoline assistance services; fine tune the new service animal law based on individual stories of how the statute may be too limiting or needs further clarification; pursue a formally funded nursing home transition program for people with disabilities who desire to live in the community and whose treating physician recommend community placement, thus decreasing the overall costs to the state; create a policy where each state department must submit a legislative budget request line item for ADA compliance efforts; improve shelter accessibility and accommodations for evacuees with disabilities; increase the development of affordable and accessible housing; and place ADAWG in statute.

Additionally, DMS will be seeking funds from other state agencies in order to create an FTE for ADAWG that would continue the level of technical assistance on A-eIT that was provided by ADAWG.

Due to the excellent reputation of ADAWG within the disability community, as well as within state government, the Working Group has been appointed to serve, or asked to participate on the following committees and task forces:

- Department of Health's Special Needs Hurricane Shelters Committee;
- Interagency Service Committee for Youth and Young Adults with Disabilities;
- Department of Elder Affairs' Aging and Disability Resource Centers Advisory Council;
- Able Trust's "Disability Mentoring Day";
- Policy Committee for Volunteer Florida's Inclusion Council;
- Department of Children and Families' Mental Health Working Group's Recovery and Resiliency Task Force;
- Florida Supreme Court's Courthouse Accessibility Subcommittee

PUBLIC EMPLOYEES RELATIONS COMMISSION

The mission of the Public Employees Relations Commission is to adjudicate and facilitate mediation of labor and employment disputes. Pursuant to Article I, § 6, and Article III, § 14, of the Florida Constitution, Chapter 120, Sections 110.227, 112.0455, 295.07-11, and, principally, Chapter 447, Part II, Florida Statutes, the Public Employees Relations Commission (PERC) handles all cases involving public sector employment and labor law including certification and registration of unions, unfair labor practices, career service matters, drug-free workplace issues and veterans preference cases. Florida Statutes, § 187.201(21), provides that it is a state goal that government economically and effectively provide the amount and quantity of services required by the public.

The Public Employees Relations Commission was established in 1975 to promote harmonious management/employee relations. This is achieved by expeditiously resolving local and state government employment and labor law controversies in a fair and economical manner and by preventing work stoppages.

PERC is a quasi-judicial tribunal with the primary function of mediating and resolving labor/employment disputes among hundreds of thousands of state and local government employees, job applicants, and their public employers. The authority for quasi-judicial tribunals is contained in Article V, § 1, Fla. Const.

Specifically, in regulating collective bargaining, PERC acts as the impartial to mediate impasses and disputes, monitors those disputes possessing the potential to become strikes, prevents strikes and imposes punishment on strikers, if necessary. PERC ensures that public sector unions provide pertinent financial and officer disclosure through its licensing desk. It decides disputes concerning bargaining unit configuration/modification and alleged unfair labor practices involving state and local governments pursuant to legislative instructions and case precedent. PERC also issues declaratory statements to avoid future labor disputes and conducts elections throughout Florida for state and local government employees voting for establishing or maintaining union representation. These functions are constitutionally required. Art. I, § 6, Fla. Const.: Dade County CTA v. Legislature, 269 So.2d 684 (Fla. 1972).

PERC also acts as the neutral to mediate and, if necessary, decide career service disputes between state employees covered by civil service, and their employers. This function is constitutionally required. Art. III, § 14, Florida Constitution. In 1997, a blue-ribbon Legislative committee that would be recognized by this Administration determined that the Commission was a cost efficient means of providing this required due-process function. Also, in 2001 the Legislature thoroughly reviewed PERC and its various jurisdictions and made significant changes. (SB 466 – “Service First”)

PERC also mediates and, if necessary, decides employment disputes regarding drug testing, whistle-blower and forced retirement for state employees. It also decides veterans’ employment disputes for both state and local governments. Federal and state constitutional due process of law requires that a neutral adjudicate these disputes.

The Commission is in the process of upgrading technological hardware and software to improve monitoring of caseload for staff and legislatively imposed reporting requirements, as well as archival of data. In addition, a project plan is being prepared for new web based options to increase the use of the internet to conduct business. This plan will allow for a simpler and more efficient means of accessing the Commission by allowing citizens to view case data and related electronic documents, PERC forms, publications and newsletters and to allow electronic submission of case filings.

As with any quasi-judicial agency, it is difficult to predict with any degree of certainty the future demand for PERC’s services, since the advocates practicing before it control demand. For the three-year period between 1996 and 1999, PERC had 1,334, 1,341, and 1,307 filings, respectively. Case filings were reduced in FY 1999-00 to 1,210 filings. This trend was repeated in FY 2000-01, and FY 2001-02, during which 1,229 cases and 1,150 cases were filed, respectively. In Fiscal Year 2005-06 case filings decreased to 1,101.

While career service case filings decreased over the previous 3-year period, they appear to be stabilizing when compared to last year’s data. The reduction in career service cases may be largely attributable to the major reforms in this area that were made through the Service First legislation in 2001. Significantly, this legislation removed attorney’s fees and costs from being assessed when an employee is wrongfully disciplined, thereby eliminating the possibility for legal

representation based upon a contingency fee arrangement. Some of the historical decrease is also a consequence of changes in what is considered to be inputs (filings) as defined in 1999 for performance based program budgeting.¹

The significant 2001 legislative revisions of Chapter 447, Part II, and Section 110.227, Florida Statutes, and the reorganization of State agencies occurring between 2000 and 2002, makes precise forecasting for the FY 2006-07 virtually impossible. It is very likely the past years will not provide a reliable base line due to the aforementioned legislative actions. Also, it should be recognized that labor activity has been affected by a number of factors, including the abolishment of the State Board of Regents, which had a number of certified bargaining agents throughout the statewide university system. Upon the implementation of the eleven separate boards of trustees as independent public employers on January 7, 2003, significant labor activity occurred at those institutions and will continue to do so over the next several years. Thus, we would generally predict an increase in labor cases over the next five years. The labor cases are publicly visible and thoroughly litigated. While case filings have decreased, the actual amount of work performed by the diminished PERC staff has not, due to the processing of more difficult cases.

Data for Fiscal Year 2006-07 has been completed at the present time; case filings during this fiscal year are 955 which is a decrease of approximately 146 cases.² This is a decrease in case filings of approximately 13%. This may or may not be statistically significant and, thus, it is assumed that filings will remain essentially the same, if no other factors were to be considered. However, due to the factors addressed above, it is anticipated that there will be an increase in labor filings of approximately 3% for each of the next 5 years. This 3% increase in case filings (inputs) will be reflected in a 3% increase in outputs (disposition of cases) over this 5-year period. Thus, case outputs are projected as follows.

2006-2007 = 997
2007-2008 = 1,027
2008-2009 = 1,058
2009-2010 = 1,090
2010-2011 = 1,123

¹ In creating the measures and standards for performance based program budgeting, PERC eliminated the counting of special master cases, as these cases are largely privatized. Thus, we have corrected this document to delete these cases from the FY 1996-97, FY 1997-98, and FY 1998-99 totals.

² This projection is based upon case filings in June 2006 to predict filings for June 2007.

FLORIDA COMMISSION ON HUMAN RELATIONS

The mission of the Florida Commission on Human Relations is to prevent unlawful discrimination by ensuring the people of Florida are treated fairly and are given equal access to opportunities in employment, housing and certain public accommodations; and to promote mutual respect among groups through education, partnerships and community outreach.

The Florida Commission on Human Relations (FCHR) was established in 1969. FCHR has the fiduciary responsibility of carrying out the mission as set forth in Chapter 760, Florida Statutes within the limitations provided by the law. The Administrative Rules for FCHR can be found in 60Y of the Administrative Code.

Throughout its thirty-five year history, FCHR has endeavored to serve the people of Florida by assuring equal protection against discrimination in employment, housing and certain public accommodations. FCHR accomplishes its mission by enforcing Florida's civil rights laws against discrimination; serving as a resource through public education and training for businesses, state agencies, associations and community groups and partnering with organizations to proactively address current human and civil rights issues in the state.

Diversity and cultural tolerance must be recognized and embraced as hallmarks of our communities if Florida is to become a center for culture, innovation and entrepreneurial activity. According to the New Cornerstone study published by The Florida Chamber Foundation, communities that have been most successful at generating innovations and producing new business activity have nurtured and invested in diversity.

In addition to becoming a more culturally diverse state, Florida will continue to become complex in industry and technology. New industries and technologies have affected an expanding business environment to complement Florida's traditional focus on tourism and agriculture. The growth of high-tech businesses clustered around Florida's major universities is just one element in this growth. Another is the growth of web-related technical firms spurred by the increasing use of the Internet to conduct business.

Overall, to achieve Florida's business goals and challenges, including a smaller, more effective and efficient government, FCHR is continuing to address the current inventory of cases and upgrade FCHR's technological hardware, software and computer systems/networks, most of which is complete. FCHR is also continuing to focus on staff development as well as the reengineering of their communications and outreach units. FCHR is striving to continue to build strong community partnerships among diverse groups and have a voice in the state on pressing human and civil rights issues.

Because of the implementation of the new electronic case management system and the internal reorganization of staff, the percent of cases resolved within 180 days has increased from 59% (FY 2000-01) to 86% (FY 2005-2006).

For over 15 years, FCHR has been using a nationwide computer system administered by the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission. This system is neither user-friendly nor does it allow states to customize applications to meet their demands. In Fiscal Year 01-02, the Legislature appropriated budget to allow the FCHR to build Phase I of a Web-based system consisting of the case-management system, online technical and administrative assistance and other attributes to help increase FCHR's ability to serve the public.

With the case-management system now in place, FCHR is currently moving forward with creating a web-based system that will have direct relevance to employers. The system will provide a best practices database accessible through the Internet that will enable employers to review examples and procedures and reduce discriminatory activities.

FCHR is continuing to focus time and resources on the staff development of investigators which will sharpen their investigative skills and techniques, writing quality and understanding of the law. As a result, the overall quality of services provided to the people of Florida will continue to improve.

In order to become even more effective in investigating and resolving allegations of discrimination, FCHR will continue to enhance its on-site investigations. On-site investigations are essential to the investigative process. Investigators travel to various locations as they investigate cases to meet face-to-face with the parties associated with a discrimination case and evaluate first-hand the conditions under which the alleged discrimination occurred. These opportunities enable staff to conduct a more prompt, thorough and efficient investigation.

FCHR believes that the best form of enforcement is education and public awareness. During this past fiscal year, FCHR has participated in multiple educational forums and community/outreach events and will continue to have a presence across the state in the human and civil rights arena. FCHR will continue to work with employers in a cooperative spirit to demonstrate that fair and equal treatment of employees is essential to a productive workforce. While cultural diversity in communities is positive, it can also create problems as people of differing ethnic groups, races and religions may view each other with suspicion and misunderstanding. This can lead to fear and often to anger, which can result in harmful actions. Thus, the challenge and opportunity is to use limited resources to defuse potential discriminatory situations by proactively working with community groups to educate Floridians on the positive values associated with equal treatment for all.

FCHR initiatives focus on partnerships with communities, organizations, businesses, education groups, advocacy groups and local, state, and federal governments. A primary initiative is to bring the operations of FCHR closer to the people of Florida as part of an outreach program that coincides with FCHR meetings held across Florida. Educational workshops and other events presented in conjunction with FCHR meetings give residents an opportunity for face-to-face interaction with FCHR.

During the year, FCHR underscored its commitment to “Building Inclusive Communities” by taking its services directly to the people. FCHR worked with business and community leaders and hosted forums to facilitate discussion on cultural tolerance and pressing human rights issues such as hate crimes and human trafficking. FCHR will continue to provide education to public and private sector entities through its dynamic and comprehensive training program which include the following topics: Diversity and Cultural Competency; Sexual Harassment; Best Business Practices; FCHR’s Complaint Process; Hate Crime Education/Prevention and Human Trafficking and current human relations issues.

FCHR is continuing to focus on youth-based programs as a proactive strategy to ensure the development of socially responsible leaders in every community. FCHR is taking a proactive role in being alert to situations before they materialize as discriminatory events. This will be accomplished through a variety of mechanisms, some of which are linked to the proposed web-based system. Working with libraries and community groups throughout Florida, FCHR will publicize our web-based system and its capabilities to provide educational information to employers, employees and housing providers. Working with colleges and universities in Florida, FCHR will conduct random sampling to identify potential problem areas and to ascertain how the public views the work of the FCHR. Working with employers and community groups, FCHR will conduct a series of workshops and forums in key areas of the State to focus on efforts to reduce inter-group tensions and promote positive relations throughout Florida communities.

FCHR is also hosting its first annual Employment Law Conference to educate employers, lawyers, university personnel and others on Florida’s discrimination laws and best practices.

FCHR is also revamping its communications unit to ensure that the public is fully aware of the legal protections that are in place in Florida as well as the services that FCHR provides. Audio and video public service announcements are currently being developed in the areas of housing and employment discrimination. FCHR is also working on the development of a promotional DVD which will be distributed statewide. FCHR is also making its presence known with print, radio and television media outlets statewide on pressing human and civil rights issues.

The primary goal of the FCHR is to ensure fair treatment of both complainants and respondents to instances of alleged discrimination and to promote mutual respect and cultural tolerance among diverse groups. During Fiscal Year 05-06, 86% of civil rights cases were closed within 180 days.

FCHR recognizes that the State of Florida will continue to become increasingly diverse and complex over the next 25 years. According to the United States Census Bureau, the Hispanic population of Florida will more than double between 2000 and 2025, from 2.4 million to 4.9 million. During this same timeframe, Florida’s minority population will increase from 5 million to 9.1 million, becoming 55 percent of the total population.

FCHR is undertaking a salary survey in order to provide a comprehensive report comparing salaries of investigative, attorney and community assistance specialist positions at FCHR with those of similar state and local agencies. The purpose of the report is to show that FCHR has lost many valuable and dedicated staff members to other public and private entities and ask the Florida Legislature for an increase in salaries during the upcoming 2007 session. FCHR

believes that it must be competitive in order to recruit and retain a high quality workforce and provide optimal services to the people of Florida.

The following Taskforces and Surveys are currently being undertaken by the FCHR:

Taskforces:

- a. Hate Crimes Working Group

Studies:

- a. Salary survey
- b. Trends in civil rights in Florida

LRPP EXHIBIT I: AGENCY WORKFORCE PLAN

LRPP Exhibit I: Agency Workforce Plan

Fiscal Years	Total FTE Reductions	Description of Reduction Issue	Positions per Issue	Impact of Reduction
FY 2007 -2008		State Employee Leasing Program (one FTE reduction due to retirement)	1	No impact. Positions are to be deleted as vacancies occur.
	1			
FY 2008-2009		There are no additional reductions currently planned for FY 2008-2009, however, DMS is continuing to review programs and will make the determination if additional services could be more effectively outsourced or privatized.		
Total*	1			

*to equal remainder of target

FTE Reduction History

FY 1999 - 2000	56.50
FY 2000 - 2001	49.00
FY 2001 - 2002	205.25
FY 2002 - 2003	85.00
FY 2003 - 2004	118.75
FY 2004 - 2005	195.50
FY 2005 - 2006	140.50
FY 2006 - 2007	48.00
	<u>898.50 FTE</u>

LRPP EXHIBIT II - PERFORMANCE MEASURES AND STANDARDS

LRPP Exhibit II - Performance Measures and Standards

Department: DEPARTMENT OF MANAGEMENT SERVICES	Department No.: 72
--	---------------------------

Program: Administration Program	Code: 72010000
Service/Budget Entity: Executive Direction and Support Services	Code: 72010100

	Approved Prior Year Standards FY 2005-06	Prior Year Actual FY 2005-06	Approved Standards for FY 2006-07	Requested FY 2007-08 Standard
Approved Performance Measures for FY 2006-07				
Administrative costs as a percent of total agency costs	1.43%	1.28%	1.43%	1.04%
Administrative positions as a percent of total agency positions	6.51%	7.66%	6.51%	7.94%

Program: Administration Program	Code: 72010000
Service/Budget Entity: State Employee Leasing	Code: 72010300

	Approved Prior Year Standards FY 2005-06	Prior Year Actual FY 2005-06	Approved Standards for FY 2006-07	Requested FY 2007-08 Standard
Approved Performance Measures for FY 2006-07				
Number of employees in the State Employee Leasing Service	7	7	7	6

Business Operations Support	Code: 72400000
Service/Budget Entity: Facilities Management	Code: 72400100

	Approved Prior Year Standards FY 2005-06	Prior Year Actual FY 2005-06	Approved Standards for FY 2006-07	Requested FY 2007-08 Standard
Approved Performance Measures for FY 2006-07				
Average Department of Management Services full service rent-composite cost per net square foot (actual) compared to Average Private Sector full service rent-composite cost per net square foot in markets where the Department manages office facilities	\$15.84/\$18.00	\$15.84/\$17.40	\$15.48/\$18.00	\$16.62/\$18.11

LRPP Exhibit II - Performance Measures and Standards

Department: DEPARTMENT OF MANAGEMENT SERVICES		Department No.: 72	
DMS average operations and maintenance cost per square foot maintained	\$5.12	\$4.88	\$5.22
Number of maintained square feet (private contract and agency)	7,511,769	7,382,292	7,382,292
Number of leases managed	1,605	1,410	1,527
Net square feet of state-owned office space occupied by state agencies	8,795,004	8,482,861	8,482,861
Net square feet of private sector office space occupied by state agencies	8,859,062	7,999,922	8,175,856
Number of facilities secured	20	19	20
			19

Business Operations Support	Code: 72400000
Service/Budget Entity: Building Construction	Code: 72400200

	Approved Prior Year Standards FY 2005-06	Prior Year Actual FY 2005-06	Approved Standards for FY 2006-07	Requested FY 2007-08 Standard
Approved Performance Measures for FY 2006-07				
Gross square foot construction cost of office facilities for the Department of Management Services compared to gross square foot construction cost of office facilities for private industry average	\$80.69/\$98.81	\$80.69/\$98.81	\$112.87/\$125.02	\$120.91/\$133.93
Dollar volume of fixed capital outlay project starts	\$14 Million	\$28,542,602	\$25 Million	\$116,827,210

Business Operations Support	Code: 72600000
Service/Budget Entity: Aircraft Management	Code: 72600100

	Approved Prior Year Standards FY 2005-06	Prior Year Actual FY 2005-06	Approved Standards for FY 2006-07	Requested FY 2007-08 Standard
Approved Performance Measures for FY 2006-07				
Cost per flight hour - State vs. Private Provider	\$1,800/\$1,860	\$2,549/\$3,380	\$2,549/\$2,666	\$2,600/\$3,400
Number of flight hours	1,250	947	1,250	1,100

LRPP Exhibit II - Performance Measures and Standards

Department: DEPARTMENT OF MANAGEMENT SERVICES **Department No.: 72**

Business Operations Support Code: 72600000
 Service/Budget Entity: Federal Property Assistance Code: 72600200

Approved Performance Measures for FY 2006-07	Approved Prior Year Standards FY 2005-06	Prior Year Actual FY 2005-06	Approved Standards for FY 2006-07	Requested FY 2007-08 Standard
Federal property distribution rate	95%	95%	95%	95%
Number of federal property orders processed	1,350	940	1,500	1,100

Business Operations Support Code: 72600000
 Service/Budget Entity: Motor Vehicle and Watercraft Management Code: 72600300

Approved Performance Measures for FY 2006-07	Approved Prior Year Standards FY 2005-06	Prior Year Actual FY 2005-06	Approved Standards for FY 2006-07	Requested FY 2007-08 Standard
Miles of commercial rental vehicle contract service provided	38,275,000	44,207,179	37,385,837	39,000,000
State contract daily vehicle rental rate vs. Private provider daily vehicle rental rate	\$30.00/\$50.00	\$25.71/\$53.56	\$24.40/\$47.42	\$28.35/\$52.28

Business Operations Support Code: 72600000
 Service/Budget Entity: Purchasing Oversight Code: 72600400

Approved Performance Measures for FY 2006-07	Approved Prior Year Standards FY 2005-06	Prior Year Actual FY 2005-06	Approved Standards for FY 2006-07	Requested FY 2007-08 Standard
Percent of state term contract savings	28%	32%	28%	28%
Number of state contracts and agreements executed	1,085	113	220	113/Delete
Dollars expended by State Agencies using the State Term Contracts and Negotiated Agreements	\$432,145,935	643,595,948	\$432,145,935	432,145,935
Number of Private Prison Contracts Monitored	7	7	7	7

LRPP Exhibit II - Performance Measures and Standards

Department: DEPARTMENT OF MANAGEMENT SERVICES **Department No.: 72**

Office of Supplier Diversity	Code: 72600000
Service/Budget Entity: Office of Supplier Diversity	Code: 72600500

Approved Performance Measures for FY 2006-07	Approved Prior Year Standards FY 2005-06	Prior Year Actual FY 2005-06	Approved Standards for FY 2006-07	Requested FY 2007-08 Standard
Average minority certification process time (in days)	15	16.5	15	15
Number of businesses certified and registered	1,800	2,505	1,500	1,800
Number of businesses reviewed and audited	100	100	100	100

Human Resource Support	Code: 72750000
Service/Budget Entity: Human Resource Management	Code: 72750100

Approved Performance Measures for FY 2006-07	Approved Prior Year Standards FY 2005-06	Prior Year Actual FY 2005-06	Approved Standards for FY 2006-07	Requested FY 2007-08 Standard
Total state cost per position in the state agencies	\$388.73	\$388.73	\$392.82	TBD
Number of state agencies with established training plans	27	19	30	30
Percent of all contracted performance standards met (Outsourced HR)	100%	92.65%	100%	100%
Overall customer satisfaction rating	96%	96%	96%	96%
Percent of agencies at or above EEO gender parity with available labor market	87%	84%	87%	87%
Percent of agencies at or above EEO minority parity with available labor market	77%	65%	77%	77%
Number of positions in the state agencies supported by the HR automated system	139,022	155,674	140,000	140,000
Number of responses to technical assistance requests	25,000	29,982	25,000	25,000
Percent of dollars saved by eliminating and reducing expenses	19.25%	0%	19.25%	0%

LRPP Exhibit II - Performance Measures and Standards

Department: DEPARTMENT OF MANAGEMENT SERVICES **Department No.: 72**

Human Resource Support Code: 72750000
 Service/Budget Entity: Insurance Benefits Administration Code: 72750200

Approved Performance Measures for FY 2006-07	Approved Prior Year Standards FY 2005-06	Prior Year Actual FY 2005-06	Approved Standards for FY 2006-07	Requested FY 2007-08 Standard
Percent of all contracted performance standards met	95%	95.19%	95%	95%
State Employees' Preferred Provider Organization Plan - per member/per year cost - (State) compared to the per member/per year cost - (National Benchmark)	\$7,494/\$7,653	\$6,854/\$8,372	\$7,494/\$7,653	\$8,742/\$10,854
DMS administrative cost per insurance enrollee	\$10.27	\$8.56	\$10.27	\$10.27
State Employees' Preferred Provider Organization Plan - vendor's administrative cost per insurance enrollee	\$348.76	\$344.91	\$348.76	\$348.76
Percent of insurance benefits administration customers satisfied	90%	TBD	90%	90%
Number of Enrollees (Total)	518,682	534,680	518,682	518,682

Human Resource Support Code: 72750000
 Service/Budget Entity: Retirement Benefits Management Code: 72750300

Approved Performance Measures for FY 2006-07	Approved Prior Year Standards FY 2005-06	Prior Year Actual FY 2005-06	Approved Standards for FY 2006-07	Requested FY 2007-08 Standard
Percent of members satisfied with retirement services	93.50%	TBD	93.50%	TBD
Percent of retired payrolls processed timely	100%	100%	100%	100%
Percent of service retirees added to the next payroll after receipt of all documents	99%	99%	99%	99%
Percent of monthly payrolls from FRS Employers processed within 5 days	99%	99.87%	99%	99%
Turn around times for benefit calculations - Information Requests (calendar days)	14	21.42	14	20

LRPP Exhibit II - Performance Measures and Standards

Department: DEPARTMENT OF MANAGEMENT SERVICES		Department No.: 72	
Percent of participating agencies satisfied with retirement services	98%	TBD	98%
Percent of agency payroll transactions correctly reported	98%	98.34%	98%
Administrative cost per active and retired member	\$22	TBD	\$21
Percent of local retirement systems annually reviewed which are funded on a sound actuarial basis	97%	91%	97%
Number of local pension plan valuations and impact statements reviewed	400	667	400
Number of FRS members	913,000	948,757	993,000
			1,074,000

Program: Public Employees Relations Commission Code: 72920000
 Service/Budget Entity: Public Employees Relations Code: 72920100

Approved Performance Measures for FY 2006-07	Approved Prior Year Standards FY 2005-06	Prior Year Actual FY 2005-06	Approved Standards for FY 2006-07	Requested FY 2007-08 Standard
Percent of timely labor dispositions	98%	98%	98%	98%
Percent of timely employment dispositions	90%	90%	90%	90%
Percent of dispositions not appealed	90%	97%	90%	90%
Percent of appealed dispositions affirmed	90%	93%	90%	90%
Number of labor dispositions	801	653	903	688
Number of employment dispositions	417	323	412	339

Program: Commission on Human Relations Code: 72950000
 Service/Budget Entity: Human Relations Code: 72950100

Approved Performance Measures for FY 2006-07	Approved Prior Year Standards FY 2005-06	Prior Year Actual FY 2005-06	Approved Standards for FY 2006-07	Requested FY 2007-08 Standard
Percent of civil rights cases resolved within 180 days of filing	75%	86%	75%	85%
Number of inquiries and investigations	10,000	13,717	10,000	10,000

LRPP Exhibit II - Performance Measures and Standards

Department: DEPARTMENT OF MANAGEMENT SERVICES **Department No.: 72**

Enterprise Information Technology Services Code: 72900000
 Service/Budget Entity: Telecommunications Services Code: 72900100

Approved Performance Measures for FY 2006-07	Approved Prior Year Standards FY 2005-06	Prior Year Actual FY 2005-06	Approved Standards for FY 2006-07	Requested FY 2007-08 Standard
Aggregated discount from commercially available rates for voice and data services	40%	50%	40%	40%
Percent of telecommunications customers satisfied	86%	84.20%	90%	86%
Total revenue for voice service	\$72.5 Million	\$77,094,601	\$80 Million	\$80,000,000
Total revenue for data service	\$65.9 Million	\$66,183,805	\$65.5 Million	\$65,500,000

Enterprise Information Technology Services Code: 72900000
 Service/Budget Entity: Wireless Services Code: 72900200

Approved Performance Measures for FY 2006-07	Approved Prior Year Standards FY 2005-06	Prior Year Actual FY 2005-06	Approved Standards for FY 2006-07	Requested FY 2007-08 Standard
Percent of wireless customers satisfied	80%	100%	84%	100%
Percent of state covered by the Joint Task Force Radio System	100%	100%	100%	100%
Percent of all 800 MHz law enforcement radio system contracted performance standards met	98.75%	99.10%	98.75%	98.75%
Number of engineering projects and approvals handled for state and local governments	230	300	240	240

LRPP Exhibit II - Performance Measures and Standards

Department: DEPARTMENT OF MANAGEMENT SERVICES **Department No.: 72**

Enterprise Information Technology Services Code: 72900000
 Service/Budget Entity: Information Services Code: 72900300

Approved Performance Measures for FY 2006-07	Approved Prior Year Standards FY 2005-06	Prior Year Actual FY 2005-06	Approved Standards for FY 2006-07	Requested FY 2007-08 Standard
Percent of information services customers satisfied	90%	90%	90%	90%
Percent utilization by the Unisys System as used for capacity planning and technology refresh, employing 80% maximum utilization standard	30%	60%	60%	60%
Percent utilization by the IBM System as used for capacity planning and technology refresh, employing 80% maximum utilization standard	78%	75%	78%	60%
Number of customers served	100	58	169	64
Percent of customers satisfied	80%	84%	84%	84%
Percent of scheduled information technology production jobs completed	99.90%	99.90%	99.90%	99.90%
Percent of information management center's data processing requests completed by due date	90%	100%	98.5%	98.5%
System design and programming hourly cost	\$75	\$54.40	\$70	\$70
Percent of Scheduled Hours Computer and Network is Available	99.95%	99.95%	99.95%	99.95%
Cost per MIP (millions of instructions per second)	\$8,111	\$13,579	\$8,111	\$13,500
Cost per CPU (Billing charge to users of computer)	<\$0.001	\$9,197	<\$0.001	\$9,000
First Contact Resolution Rate	95%	31.25%	95%	45%
Cost per Help Desk case	\$8.50	\$23.49	\$13.25	\$30.00
Number of service requests completed on time	984	1,361	984	400
Number of scheduled production jobs completed	100,000	116,679	100,000	100,000
Scheduled Hours Computer and Network is Available	8,112	8,112	8,110	8,110
Number of Help Desk calls resolved within 3 Hours	2,500	6,420	9,000	7,500
Percent of agency service level agreements met	95%	N/A	95%	95%

**LRPP EXHIBIT III – ASSESSMENT OF PERFORMANCE FOR APPROVED
PERFORMANCE MEASURES**

LRPP Exhibit III: PERFORMANCE MEASURE ASSESSMENT

Department: Department of Management Services

Program: Administration

Service/Budget Entity: Executive Direction and Administration

Measure: Administrative positions as a percent of total agency positions

Action:

- | | |
|--|--|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Performance Assessment of <u>Outcome</u> Measure | <input type="checkbox"/> Revision of Measure |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Performance Assessment of <u>Output</u> Measure | <input type="checkbox"/> Deletion of Measure |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Adjustment of GAA Performance Standards | |

Approved Standard	Actual Performance Results	Difference (Over/Under)	Percentage Difference
6.51%	7.66%	1.15% over	18%

Factors Accounting for the Difference:

Internal Factors (check all that apply):

- | | |
|--|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Personnel Factors | <input type="checkbox"/> Staff Capacity |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Competing Priorities | <input type="checkbox"/> Level of Training |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Previous Estimate Incorrect | <input type="checkbox"/> Other (Identify) |

Explanation:

Even though our number of administrative FTE are almost 8% of the total agency FTE count, our administrative costs are only 1.28% of total agency costs for FY 05-06 and have been well under 2% for several years. The Standard of 6.51% for administrative FTE has not changed since the 03-04 FY and has not received any significant review for several years. Due to the intricate issues the Department is involved in, it is imperative that an adequate level of administration personnel be maintained. This is being accomplished at a very low overhead cost for the agency at 1.28%

External Factors (check all that apply):

- | | |
|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Resources Unavailable | <input type="checkbox"/> Technological Problems |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Legal/Legislative Change | <input type="checkbox"/> Natural Disaster |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Target Population Change | <input type="checkbox"/> Other (Identify) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> This Program/Service Cannot Fix The Problem | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Current Laws Are Working Against The Agency Mission | |

Explanation:

Management Efforts to Address Differences/Problems (check all that apply):

- | | |
|------------------------------------|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Training | <input type="checkbox"/> Technology |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Personnel | <input type="checkbox"/> Other (Identify) |

Recommendations:

LRPP Exhibit III: PERFORMANCE MEASURE ASSESSMENT

Department: Management Services

Program: Facilities

Service/Budget Entity: Real Estate Development and Management
(Facilities Management)

Measure: Average Department of Management Services full service rent – composite cost per net square foot (actual) compared to average private sector full service rent – composite cost per net square foot in markets where the Department manages office facilities

Action:

- | | |
|--|--|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Performance Assessment of <u>Outcome</u> Measure | <input type="checkbox"/> Revision of Measure |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Performance Assessment of <u>Output</u> Measure | <input type="checkbox"/> Deletion of Measure |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Adjustment of GAA Performance Standards | |

Approved Standard	Actual Performance Results	Difference (Over/Under)	Percentage Difference
\$15.84 / \$18.00	\$15.84 / \$17.40	\$0.00 / (\$0.60)	0.0% / (3.3%)

Factors Accounting for the Difference:

Internal Factors (check all that apply):

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Personnel Factors | <input type="checkbox"/> Staff Capacity |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Competing Priorities | <input type="checkbox"/> Level of Training |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Previous Estimate Incorrect | <input type="checkbox"/> Other (Identify) |

Explanation:

The actual performance results for the Department of Management Services full service rent (actual) is the same as the approved standard.

The (\$0.60) difference between the approved standard and the actual performance results for the average private sector full service rent – composite cost per net square foot in markets where the Department manages office facilities is due to the fact that the FY 05/06 standard was based on 03/04 actual results and indexed based on the estimated inflation rate. The increase was not as much as estimated.

External Factors (check all that apply):

- | | |
|--|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Resources Unavailable | <input type="checkbox"/> Technological Problems |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Legal/Legislative Change | <input type="checkbox"/> Natural Disaster |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Target Population Change | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other – Not applicable |
| <input type="checkbox"/> This Program/Service Cannot Fix The Problem | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Current Laws Are Working Against The Agency Mission | |

Explanation:

No external factors influenced the difference between the FY 05/06 Standard and the actual results.

Management Efforts to Address Differences/Problems (check all that apply):

- Training
- Personnel

- Technology
- Other – Not applicable

Recommendations:

Not applicable due to the nature of the discrepancy.

Office of Policy and Budget – July 2006

LRPP Exhibit III: PERFORMANCE MEASURE ASSESSMENT

Department: Management Services

Program: Facilities

Service/Budget Entity: Real Estate Development and Management
(Facilities Management)

Measure: Number maintained square feet (private contract and agency)

Action:

- Performance Assessment of Outcome Measure
- Performance Assessment of Output Measure
- Adjustment of GAA Performance Standards
- Revision of Measure
- Deletion of Measure

Approved Standard	Actual Performance Results	Difference (Over/Under)	Percentage Difference
7,511,769	7,382,292	(129,477)	(1.7%)

Factors Accounting for the Difference:

Internal Factors (check all that apply):

- Personnel Factors
- Competing Priorities
- Previous Estimate Incorrect
- Staff Capacity
- Level of Training
- Other (Identify)

Explanation:

This difference can be attributed to the disposition of the following DMS facilities: Chevron, Clemons, Johns and 319 W. Madison Street Buildings in Tallahassee and the McCarty Building in Winter Park.

External Factors (check all that apply):

- Resources Unavailable
- Legal/Legislative Change
- Target Population Change
- This Program/Service Cannot Fix The Problem
- Current Laws Are Working Against The Agency Mission
- Technological Problems
- Natural Disaster
- Other – Not applicable

Explanation:

No external factors influenced the difference between the FY 05/06 Standard and the actual results.

Management Efforts to Address Differences/Problems (check all that apply):

- Training
- Personnel
- Technology
- Other – Not applicable

Recommendations:

Not applicable due to the nature of the discrepancy.

LRPP Exhibit III: PERFORMANCE MEASURE ASSESSMENT

Department: Management Services

Program: Facilities

Service/Budget Entity: Real Estate Development and Management
(Facilities Management)

Measure: Number of Leases Managed

Action:

- Performance Assessment of Outcome Measure
- Performance Assessment of Output Measure
- Adjustment of GAA Performance Standards
- Revision of Measure
- Deletion of Measure

Approved Standard	Actual Performance Results	Difference (Over/Under)	Percentage Difference
1,605	1,410	(195)	(12.1%)

Factors Accounting for the Difference:

Internal Factors (check all that apply):

- Personnel Factors
- Competing Priorities
- Previous Estimate Incorrect
- Staff Capacity
- Level of Training
- Other (Identify)

Explanation:

This measure represents the total number of active real property leases managed by Real Estate Development and Management. This includes leases with private sector vendors as well as leases for space within DMS pool facilities. The standard was based on historical data. The difference can be attributed to the decreasing size of state government and more efficient space utilization, thereby resulting in fewer real property leases.

External Factors (check all that apply):

- Resources Unavailable
- Legal/Legislative Change
- Target Population Change
- Technological Problems
- Natural Disaster
- Other Decreasing size of state government and more efficient space utilization

- This Program/Service Cannot Fix The Problem
- Current Laws Are Working Against The Agency Mission

Explanation:

This measure represents the total number of active real property leases managed by Real Estate Development and Management. This includes leases with private sector vendors as well as leases for space within DMS pool facilities.

The standard was based on historical data. The difference can be attributed to the decreasing size of state government and more efficient space utilization, thereby resulting in fewer real property leases.

Management Efforts to Address Differences/Problems (check all that apply):

- Training
- Personnel

- Technology
- Other Account for diminishing size of State government workforce.

Recommendations:

N/A

Office of Policy and Budget – July 2006

LRPP Exhibit III: PERFORMANCE MEASURE ASSESSMENT

Department: Management Services

Program: Facilities

Service/Budget Entity: Real Estate Development and Management
(Facilities Management)

Measure: Net square feet of state-owned office space occupied by state Agencies

Action:

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Performance Assessment of <u>Outcome</u> Measure | <input type="checkbox"/> Revision of Measure |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Performance Assessment of <u>Output</u> Measure | <input type="checkbox"/> Deletion of Measure |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Adjustment of GAA Performance Standards | |

Approved Standard	Actual Performance Results	Difference (Over/Under)	Percentage Difference
8,795,004	8,482,861	(312,143)	(3.5%)

Factors Accounting for the Difference:

Internal Factors (check all that apply):

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Personnel Factors | <input type="checkbox"/> Staff Capacity |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Competing Priorities | <input type="checkbox"/> Level of Training |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Previous Estimate Incorrect | <input type="checkbox"/> Other (Identify) |

Explanation:

The decrease from the 05/06 standard is due to two primary factors. The first being the DMS space portion of the figure used to be based on available office space as opposed to occupied office space. This was corrected beginning last year to account for only occupied office space. The second factor being the disposition of the Chevron, Clemons, Johns and 319 West Madison Street buildings in Tallahassee and the McCarty Building in Winter Park by the Department of Management Services.

External Factors (check all that apply):

- | | |
|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Resources Unavailable | <input type="checkbox"/> Technological Problems |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Legal/Legislative Change | <input type="checkbox"/> Natural Disaster |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Target Population Change | <input type="checkbox"/> Other |
| <input type="checkbox"/> This Program/Service Cannot Fix The Problem | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Current Laws Are Working Against The Agency Mission | |

Explanation:

Not applicable

Management Efforts to Address Differences/Problems (check all that apply):

- Training
- Personnel

- Technology
- Other – Account for building disposition plans

Recommendations:

N/A

Office of Policy and Budget – July 2006

LRPP Exhibit III: PERFORMANCE MEASURE ASSESSMENT

Department: Management Services

Program: Facilities

Service/Budget Entity: Real Estate Development and Management
(Facilities Management)

Measure: Net square feet of private sector office space occupied by state Agencies

Action:

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Performance Assessment of <u>Outcome</u> Measure | <input type="checkbox"/> Revision of Measure |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Performance Assessment of <u>Output</u> Measure | <input type="checkbox"/> Deletion of Measure |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Adjustment of GAA Performance Standards | |

Approved Standard	Actual Performance Results	Difference (Over/Under)	Percentage Difference
8,859,062	7,999,922	(859,140)	(9.7%)

Factors Accounting for the Difference:

Internal Factors (check all that apply):

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Personnel Factors | <input type="checkbox"/> Staff Capacity |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Competing Priorities | <input type="checkbox"/> Level of Training |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Previous Estimate Incorrect | <input type="checkbox"/> Other (Identify) |

Explanation:

The difference can be attributed to the decreasing size of state government and more efficient space utilization, thereby resulting in less space need as well as the fact that the FY 05/06 standard was based on 03/04 actual results and the reduction has been greater than estimated.

External Factors (check all that apply):

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Resources Unavailable | <input type="checkbox"/> Technological Problems |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Legal/Legislative Change | <input type="checkbox"/> Natural Disaster |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Target Population Change | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other – Decreasing size of state government and more efficient space utilization |

- This Program/Service Cannot Fix The Problem
- Current Laws Are Working Against The Agency Mission

Explanation:

The difference can be attributed to the decreasing size of state government and more efficient space utilization, thereby resulting in less space need as well as

the fact that the FY 05/06 standard was based on 03/04 actual results and the reduction has been greater than estimated.

Management Efforts to Address Differences/Problems (check all that apply):

- Training
- Personnel

- Technology
- Other – Account for diminishing size of state state government workforce and more efficient space utilization

Recommendations:

N/A

Office of Policy and Budget – July 2006

LRPP Exhibit III: PERFORMANCE MEASURE ASSESSMENT

Department: Management Services

Program: Facilities

Service/Budget Entity: Real Estate Development and Management
(Facilities Management)

Measure: Number of facilities secured

Action:

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Performance Assessment of <u>Outcome</u> Measure | <input type="checkbox"/> Revision of Measure |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Performance Assessment of <u>Output</u> Measure | <input type="checkbox"/> Deletion of Measure |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Adjustment of GAA Performance Standards | |

Approved Standard	Actual Performance Results	Difference (Over/Under)	Percentage Difference
20	19	(1)	(5.0%)

Factors Accounting for the Difference:

Internal Factors (check all that apply):

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Personnel Factors | <input type="checkbox"/> Staff Capacity |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Competing Priorities | <input type="checkbox"/> Level of Training |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Previous Estimate Incorrect | <input type="checkbox"/> Other (Identify) |

Explanation:

The McCarty Building in Winter Park was disposed of during the 05/06 fiscal year.

External Factors (check all that apply):

- | | |
|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Resources Unavailable | <input type="checkbox"/> Technological Problems |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Legal/Legislative Change | <input type="checkbox"/> Natural Disaster |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Target Population Change | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other – N/A |
| <input type="checkbox"/> This Program/Service Cannot Fix The Problem | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Current Laws Are Working Against The Agency Mission | |

Explanation:

N/A

Management Efforts to Address Differences/Problems (check all that apply):

- | | |
|------------------------------------|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Training | <input type="checkbox"/> Technology |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Personnel | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other – N/A |

Recommendations:

N/A

LRPP Exhibit III: PERFORMANCE MEASURE ASSESSMENT

Department: Department of Management Services
Program: Business Operations Support
Service/Budget Entity: Division of Fleet Management
Measure: Cost Per Flight Hour – State vs. Private Sector

Action:
 Performance Assessment of Outcome Measure Revision of Measure
 Performance Assessment of Output Measure Deletion of Measure
 Adjustment of GAA Performance Standards

Approved Standard	Actual Performance Results	Difference (Over/Under)	Percentage Difference
\$1,800/\$1,860	\$2,549/\$3,380	\$749/\$1,520	29%/45%

Factors Accounting for the Difference:

Internal Factors (check all that apply):

- Personnel Factors
- Competing Priorities
- Previous Estimate Incorrect
- Other (Identify)
- Staff Capacity
- Level of Training

Explanation: Operated with one less aircraft, prior to replacing two oldest aircraft.

External Factors (check all that apply):

- Resources Unavailable
- Technological
- Legal/Legislative Change
- Natural Disaster
- Target Population Change
- Other (Identify)
- Fuel/Aircraft
- This Program/Service Cannot Fix The Problem
- Current Laws Are Working Against The Agency Mission

Explanation: Fuel costs and necessity of replacing two oldest aircraft which would be cost prohibitive to upgrade for safety.

Management Efforts to Address Differences/Problems (check all that apply):

- Training
- Technology
- Personnel
- Other (Identify) Standard Revision

Recommendations: Revise standard to include rising fuel costs, salary equitability and life cycling of aircraft.

LRPP Exhibit III: PERFORMANCE MEASURE ASSESSMENT

Department: Management Services
Program: Support
Service/Budget Entity: Aircraft Management
Measure: Number of Flight Hours

Action:

- | | |
|--|--|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Performance Assessment of <u>Outcome</u> Measure | <input type="checkbox"/> Revision of Measure |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Performance Assessment of <u>Output</u> Measure | <input type="checkbox"/> Deletion of Measure |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Adjustment of GAA Performance Standards | |

Approved Standard	Actual Performance Results	Difference (Over/Under)	Percentage Difference
1,250	947	(303)	(24%)

Factors Accounting for the Difference:

Internal Factors (check all that apply):

- | | |
|--|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Personnel Factors | <input type="checkbox"/> Staff Capacity |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Competing Priorities | <input type="checkbox"/> Level of Training |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Previous Estimate Incorrect | <input type="checkbox"/> Other (Identify) |

Explanation:

External Factors (check all that apply):

- | | |
|--|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Resources Unavailable | <input type="checkbox"/> Technological Problems |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Legal/Legislative Change | <input type="checkbox"/> Natural Disaster |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Target Population Change | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other (Identify) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> This Program/Service Cannot Fix The Problem | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Current Laws Are Working Against The Agency Mission | |

Explanation: Two of the aircraft were down for over two weeks for mechanical issues. This would account for a great portion of the difference as one of the two week periods was during the legislative session when we typically utilize the aircraft more. Further, as this is a general election year (last half of fiscal year); various candidates for different offices utilized more commercial and or private carriers for their campaigns. We do not anticipate that the flight hours will remain near this number. We will reevaluate next year.

Management Efforts to Address Differences/Problems (check all that apply):

- | | |
|------------------------------------|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Training | <input type="checkbox"/> Technology |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Personnel | <input type="checkbox"/> Other (Identify) |

Recommendations:

None. Reassess next year.

LRPP Exhibit III: PERFORMANCE MEASURE ASSESSMENT

Department: Management Services
Program: Support
Service/Budget Entity: Federal Property Assistance
Measure: Number of Federal Property Orders Processed

Action:

- Performance Assessment of Outcome Measure
- Performance Assessment of Output Measure
- Adjustment of GAA Performance Standards
- Revision of Measure
- Deletion of Measure

Approved Standard	Actual Performance Results	Difference (Over/Under)	Percentage Difference
1,350	940	(410)	(30%)

Factors Accounting for the Difference:

Internal Factors (check all that apply):

- Personnel Factors
- Competing Priorities
- Previous Estimate Incorrect
- Staff Capacity
- Level of Training
- Other (Identify)

Explanation: A reduction in staff at the beginning of the fiscal year cost us one of our two drivers. This reduced our capability to pick up property by half. This combined with the increased distances we have to travel to pick up the available property further reduced our ability to bring property in. The remaining driver was out of work for two months due to illness which effectively stopped all pick ups or deliveries for 1/6th of the year.

External Factors (check all that apply):

- Resources Unavailable
- Legal/Legislative Change
- Target Population Change
- This Program/Service Cannot Fix The Problem
- Current Laws Are Working Against The Agency Mission
- Technological Problems
- Natural Disaster
- Other (Identify)

Explanation: The Federal Government has changed its stocking policy (i.e.- Right Part, Right Time, Right Place vs. Stockpiles available upon demand). This creates less surplus. DRMS has incrementally reduced personnel and DRMOs (where we pick up our equipment) over the past year via a process called A76. This process has reduced the number of DRMOs from 68 to 18 world wide. This reduction in personnel and facilities has lead to widespread distribution directly to public sales, thereby bypassing the regulatory donation process. Additionally, large lots of some items, such as furniture, are automatically sent to scrap regardless of condition to facilitate the move.

Management Efforts to Address Differences/Problems (check all that apply):

Training

Technology

Personnel

Other (Identify)

Recommendations:

Office of Policy and Budget – July 2006

LRPP Exhibit III: PERFORMANCE MEASURE ASSESSMENT

Department: Department of Management Services
Program: Support
Service/Budget Entity: Purchasing Oversight
Measure: Number of state contracts and agreements executed

Action:

- Performance Assessment of Outcome Measure
- Performance Assessment of Output Measure
- Adjustment of GAA Performance Standards
- Revision of Measure
- Deletion of Measure

Approved Standard	Actual Performance Results	Difference (Over/Under)	Percentage Difference
220	113	107	51%

Factors Accounting for the Difference:

Internal Factors (check all that apply):

- Personnel Factors
- Competing Priorities
- Previous Estimate Incorrect
- Other (Identify)
- Staff Capacity
- Level of Training

Explanation:

When contracts or agreements expire, they are only renewed if they meet required sales volume. In addition contracts that are of similar properties are now combined for more efficient contract management

External Factors (check all that apply):

- Resources Unavailable
- Legal/Legislative Change
- Target Population Change
- This Program/Service Cannot Fix The Problem
- Current Laws Are Working Against The Agency Mission
- Technological Problems
- Natural Disaster
- Other (Identify)

Explanation:

Same as internal factors

Management Efforts to Address Differences/Problems (check all that apply):

- Training
- Personnel
- Technology
- Other (Identify)

Recommendations:

This unit cost output identifies the number of state term contract and agreements executed. Management would like to replace this performance measure with another unit cost output measure more meaningful to the cost efficiency provided by the Activity. The unit cost output measure would be State dollars spent on state term contract captured in MyFloridaMarketPlace. Actual for FY 05-06: \$643,595,948 and Standard for FY 06-07: \$ 432,145,935

Office of Policy and Budget – July 2006

LRPP Exhibit III: PERFORMANCE MEASURE ASSESSMENT

Department: Department of Management Services

Program: Office of Supplier Diversity

Service/Budget Entity: Minority Business Program

Measure: Average minority certification process time (in days)

Action:

- Performance Assessment of Outcome Measure
- Performance Assessment of Output Measure
- Adjustment of GAA Performance Standards
- Revision of Measure
- Deletion of Measure

Approved Standard	Actual Performance Results	Difference (Over/Under)	Percentage Difference
15	16.5	1.5	.09

Factors Accounting for the Difference:

Internal Factors (check all that apply):

- Personnel Factors
- Competing Priorities
- Previous Estimate Incorrect
- Staff Capacity
- Level of Training
- Other (Identify)

Explanation: During FY '05-'06 the OSD lost approximately 1/2 of the man hours of its key certification staff members due to illness and an abbreviated work schedule; This accounted for a reduction of approximately 8% of the staff output to meeting this measure.

External Factors (check all that apply):

- Resources Unavailable
- Legal/Legislative Change
- Target Population Change
- This Program/Service Cannot Fix The Problem
- Current Laws Are Working Against The Agency Mission
- Technological Problems
- Natural Disaster
- Other (Identify)

Explanation:

Management Efforts to Address Differences/Problems (check all that apply):

- Training
- Personnel
- Technology
- Other (Identify)

Recommendations: It is recommended that as the office moves towards greater utilization of automated systems, through the implementation of Filenet and other electronic improvements to file management, this deficit will be eliminated.

LRPP Exhibit III: PERFORMANCE MEASURE ASSESSMENT

Department: Management Services

Program: Workforce

Service/Budget Entity: Human Resource Management

Measure: Number of State Agencies with Established Training Plans

Action:

- | | |
|--|--|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Performance Assessment of <u>Outcome</u> Measure | <input type="checkbox"/> Revision of Measure |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Performance Assessment of <u>Output</u> Measure | <input type="checkbox"/> Deletion of Measure |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Adjustment of GAA Performance Standards | |

Approved Standard	Actual Performance Results	Difference (Over/Under)	Percentage Difference
27	19	(8)	(30%)

Factors Accounting for the Difference:

Internal Factors (check all that apply):

- | | |
|--|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Personnel Factors | <input type="checkbox"/> Staff Capacity |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Competing Priorities | <input type="checkbox"/> Level of Training |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Previous Estimate Incorrect | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Other (Identify) | |

Explanation:

External Factors (check all that apply):

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Resources Unavailable | <input type="checkbox"/> Technological Problems |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Legal/Legislative Change | <input type="checkbox"/> Natural Disaster |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Target Population Change | <input type="checkbox"/> Other (Identify) |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> This Program/Service Cannot Fix The Problem | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Current Laws Are Working Against The Agency Mission | |

Explanation:

Section 110.235, Florida Statutes, requires state agencies to establish training programs that provide a framework to develop human resources through empowerment, training and rewards for productivity enhancements; to continuously improve the quality of services; and to satisfy the expectations of the public. Each year, agencies are required to provide to the Division of Human Resource Management an evaluation of the implemented training and the progress made in the area of training. Through its review of the information provided, the Division is able to assess whether the agency training programs encompass the elements to support an efficient and effective workforce that provides quality services to Florida's citizens. Only 19 out of 30 agencies reported having an established training plan for fiscal year 2005 – 2006.

Management Efforts to Address Differences/Problems (check all that apply):

Training

Technology

Personnel

Other (Identify)

Recommendations:

Office of Policy and Budget – July 2006

LRPP Exhibit III: PERFORMANCE MEASURE ASSESSMENT

Department: Management Services

Program: Workforce

Service/Budget Entity: Human Resource Management

Measure: Percent of All Contracted Performance Standards Met (Outsourced HR)

Action:

- Performance Assessment of Outcome Measure
- Performance Assessment of Output Measure
- Adjustment of GAA Performance Standards
- Revision of Measure
- Deletion of Measure

Approved Standard	Actual Performance Results	Difference (Over/Under)	Percentage Difference
100%	92.65%	(7.35%)	(7.35%)

Factors Accounting for the Difference:

Internal Factors (check all that apply):

- Personnel Factors
- Competing Priorities
- Previous Estimate Incorrect
- Other (Identify)
- Staff Capacity
- Level of Training

Explanation:

In support of the People First project, the Department of Management Services contracted with Convergys Customer Management Group, Inc. (Convergys/service provider) on August 21, 2002. This contract provides the State Personnel System with a personnel information system (HR automated system) and an enterprise-wide suite of human resource services including payroll preparation, benefits, staffing and human resource administration. The service provider contract stipulates acceptable performance standards and minimum service levels. Examples of performance metrics included in the contract are: customer satisfaction, payroll preparation, self-service availability, forced disconnects, and benefits eligibility. As the contract manager, the Division of Human Resource Management manages the contract and oversees the performance of the service provider to ensure compliance with the provisions. This performance measure provides an assessment of the service provider's performance. For fiscal year 2005-06, the service provider met 315 of the 340 performance metrics achieving 92.65% of the standard (as measured on a monthly basis). The service provider has implemented and/or changed processes to improve performance.

External Factors (check all that apply):

- Resources Unavailable
- Legal/Legislative Change
- Target Population Change
- Technological Problems
- Natural Disaster
- Other (Identify)

- This Program/Service Cannot Fix The Problem
- Current Laws Are Working Against The Agency Mission

Explanation:

Management Efforts to Address Differences/Problems (check all that apply):

- Training
- Personnel
- Technology
- Other (Identify)

Recommendations:

LRPP Exhibit III: PERFORMANCE MEASURE ASSESSMENT

Department: Management Services

Program: Workforce

Service/Budget Entity: Human Resource Management

Measure: Percent of Agencies at or above EEO Gender Parity with Available Labor Market

Action:

- Performance Assessment of Outcome Measure
- Performance Assessment of Output Measure
- Adjustment of GAA Performance Standards
- Revision of Measure
- Deletion of Measure

Approved Standard	Actual Performance Results	Difference (Over/Under)	Percentage Difference
87%	84%	(3%)	(3%)

Factors Accounting for the Difference:

Internal Factors (check all that apply):

- Personnel Factors
- Competing Priorities
- Previous Estimate Incorrect
- Other (Identify)
- Staff Capacity
- Level of Training

Explanation:

External Factors (check all that apply):

- Resources Unavailable
- Legal/Legislative Change
- Target Population Change
- This Program/Service Cannot Fix The Problem
- Current Laws Are Working Against The Agency Mission
- Technological Problems
- Natural Disaster
- Other (Identify)

Explanation: This measure provides information on gender representation in the executive branch agencies as compared to the available labor market. The Division of Human Resource Management provides agencies with a fair and equitable employment infrastructure that includes core human resource policies, strategies and practices for agencies to follow in recruiting, selecting, and managing their human resources. However, the Division does not have the authority to make hiring decisions within the state agencies. For fiscal year 2005-2006, 26 out of 31 agencies are at or above EEO gender parity with the available labor market.

Management Efforts to Address Differences/Problems (check all that apply):

- Training
- Personnel
- Technology
- Other (Identify)

Recommendations:

LRPP Exhibit III: PERFORMANCE MEASURE ASSESSMENT

Department: Management Services

Program: Workforce

Service/Budget Entity: Human Resource Management

Measure: Percent of Agencies at or above EEO Minority Parity with Available Labor Market

Action:

- Performance Assessment of Outcome Measure
- Performance Assessment of Output Measure
- Adjustment of GAA Performance Standards
- Revision of Measure
- Deletion of Measure

Approved Standard	Actual Performance Results	Difference (Over/Under)	Percentage Difference
77%	65%	(12%)	(12%)

Factors Accounting for the Difference:

Internal Factors (check all that apply):

- Personnel Factors
- Competing Priorities
- Previous Estimate Incorrect
- Other (Identify)
- Staff Capacity
- Level of Training

Explanation:

External Factors (check all that apply):

- Resources Unavailable
- Legal/Legislative Change
- Target Population Change
- This Program/Service Cannot Fix The Problem
- Current Laws Are Working Against The Agency Mission
- Technological Problems
- Natural Disaster
- Other (Identify)

Explanation: This measure provides information on minority representation in the executive branch agencies as compared to the available labor market. The Division of Human Resource Management provides agencies with a fair and equitable employment infrastructure that includes core human resource policies, strategies and practices for agencies to follow in recruiting, selecting, and managing their human resources. However, the Division does not have the authority to make hiring decisions within the state agencies. For fiscal year 2005-2006, 20 out of 31 agencies are at or above EEO minority parity with the available labor market.

Management Efforts to Address Differences/Problems (check all that apply):

- Training
- Personnel
- Technology
- Other (Identify)

Recommendations:

LRPP Exhibit III: PERFORMANCE MEASURE ASSESSMENT

Department: Management Services

Program: Workforce

Service/Budget Entity: Human Resource Management

Measure: Percent of Dollars Saved by Eliminating and Reducing Expenses

Action:

- Performance Assessment of Outcome Measure
- Performance Assessment of Output Measure
- Adjustment of GAA Performance Standards

- Revision of Measure
- Deletion of Measure

Approved Standard	Actual Performance Results	Difference	Percentage Difference
19.25%	0%	(19.25)	100%

Factors Accounting for the Difference:

Internal Factors (check all that apply):

- Personnel Factors
- Competing Priorities
- Previous Estimate Incorrect
- Other (Identify)
- Staff Capacity
- Level of Training

Explanation:

External Factors (check all that apply):

- Resources Unavailable
- Legal/Legislative Change
- Target Population Change
- This Program/Service Cannot Fix The Problem
- Current Laws Are Working Against The Agency Mission
- Technological Problems
- Natural Disaster
- Other (Identify)

Explanation: As required by s. 110.1245, F.S., the Savings Sharing Program, agencies were surveyed to ascertain the number of cost saving proposals received; the number of dollars and awards given to employees or groups of employees for adopted proposals and the cost savings realized from adopted proposals. This measure is provided to capture the savings generated by the agencies that are shared with employees as a means to retain, reward, and recognize high performing employees. Only one agency, the Department of Transportation, reported receiving 3 proposals, which were still under evaluation at the time of the survey. Due to limited agency participation, the percent of dollars saved from eliminating and reducing expenses failed to meet the approved performance standard for fiscal year 2005-2006.

The 2005 Legislature repealed s. 216.262(1)(c)3.a. and b., F.S., which allowed agencies to retain up to 20% of its salary dollars for eliminating authorized positions and utilizing those savings to reward the residual workforce with permanent salary increases. The repeal of this provision directly affects the methodology used to capture and report this performance measure.

Management Efforts to Address Differences/Problems (check all that apply):

Training

Technology

Personnel

Other (Identify)

Recommendations:

Office of Policy and Budget – July 2006

LRPP Exhibit III: PERFORMANCE MEASURE ASSESSMENT

Department: Department of Management Services

Program: Workforce

Service/Budget Entity: Retirement Benefits Administration

Measure: Turn Around Times for Benefit Calculations – Information Request (Calendar Days)

Action:

- Performance Assessment of Outcome Measure
- Performance Assessment of Output Measure
- Adjustment of GAA Performance Standards
- Revision of Measure
- Deletion of Measure

Approved Standard	Actual Performance Results	Difference (Over/Under)	Percentage Difference
14	21.42	7.42	65.36%

Factors Accounting for the Difference:

Internal Factors (check all that apply):

- Personnel Factors
- Competing Priorities
- Previous Estimate Incorrect
- Staff Capacity
- Level of Training
- Other (Identify)

Explanation:

External Factors (check all that apply):

- Resources Unavailable
- Legal/Legislative Change
- Target Population Change
- This Program/Service Cannot Fix The Problem
- Current Laws Are Working Against The Agency Mission
- Technological Problems
- Natural Disaster
- Other (Identify)

Explanation:

Management Efforts to Address Differences/Problems (check all that apply):

- Training
- Personnel
- Technology
- Other (Identify)

Recommendations: Management will continue training new staff to build the expertise and efficiency needed to improve response time. Although the standard was not met, a 67% improvement in 2005-06 was shown from 2004-05 by reducing the number of response days by 10.

The previously established standard of 14 days was based on utilizing a complete and experienced staff to perform this work for an entire year. Turnover in personnel and the continued training of new personnel, as well as the increase

of incoming work result in the need for a new standard. The Division of Retirement proposes a standard of 20 days for 2006-07 and 2007-08.

Office of Policy and Budget – July 2006

LRPP Exhibit III: PERFORMANCE MEASURE ASSESSMENT

Department: Department of Management Services

Program: Workforce

Service/Budget Entity: Retirement Benefits Administration

Measure: Percent of local retirement systems annually reviewed which are funded on a sound actuarial basis

Action:

- Performance Assessment of Outcome Measure
- Performance Assessment of Output Measure
- Adjustment of GAA Performance Standards
- Revision of Measure
- Deletion of Measure

Approved Standard	Actual Performance Results	Difference (Over/Under)	Percentage Difference
97%	91%	(6%)	(6%)

Factors Accounting for the Difference:

Internal Factors (check all that apply):

- Personnel Factors
- Competing Priorities
- Previous Estimate Incorrect
- Staff Capacity
- Level of Training
- Other (Identify)

Explanation:

External Factors (check all that apply):

- Resources Unavailable
- Legal/Legislative Change
- Target Population Change
- This Program/Service Cannot Fix The Problem
- Current Laws Are Working Against The Agency Mission
- Technological Problems
- Natural Disaster
- Other (Identify)

Explanation: Under part VII of Chapter 112, the department reviews each local retirement plan triennially to ensure that it is being properly funded on an actuarially sound basis. The responsibility for achieving and maintaining compliance, however, rests with the local board of trustees. When a plan is not state accepted, it is because the plan has materially failed to satisfy the statutory or rule requirements in its submissions to our office. Therefore, the number of plans that are not state accepted each year will vary based on factors beyond the control of the department. Further, some plans have valuations prepared annually, while others have valuations prepared once every three years. When a plan with more frequent valuations is not state accepted, this performance measure will be negatively impacted. This year, the plans that were not state accepted all had annual valuations prepared, thus inflating the number of valuations not state accepted when compared to the total number of valuations reviewed.

Management Efforts to Address Differences/Problems (check all that apply):

Training

Technology

Personnel

Other (Identify)

Recommendations:

Office of Policy and Budget – July 2006

LRPP Exhibit III: PERFORMANCE MEASURE ASSESSMENT

Department: Department of Management Services
Program: Public Employees Relations Commission
Service/Budget Entity: Public Employees Relations Commission
Measure: Number of Labor Dispositions

Action:

- Performance Assessment of Outcome Measure
- Performance Assessment of Output Measure
- Adjustment of GAA Performance Standards
- Revision of Measure
- Deletion of Measure

Approved Standard	Actual Performance Results	Difference (Over/Under)	Percentage Difference
801	653	148 (Under)	19%

Factors Accounting for the Difference:

Internal Factors (check all that apply):

- Personnel Factors
- Competing Priorities
- Previous Estimate Incorrect
- Other (Identify)
- Staff Capacity
- Level of Training

Explanation:

External Factors (check all that apply):

- Resources Unavailable
- Legal/Legislative Change
- Target Population Change
- This Program/Service Cannot Fix The Problem
- Current Laws Are Working Against The Agency Mission
- Technological Problems
- Natural Disaster
- Other (Identify)

Explanation: PERC is a dispute resolution vehicle. The decrease in cases filed does not reflect negatively upon performance. Rather it is caused by dynamics beyond PERC's control such as the Service First legislation and cooperation between labor and management.

Management Efforts to Address Differences/Problems (check all that apply):

- Training
- Personnel
- Technology
- Other (Identify)

Recommendations: As stated above, the decline in cases does not manifest a performance problem. Rather, it represents a fluctuation in labor and employment relations that may very well change in the future with changes in Administration and/or law.

LRPP Exhibit III: PERFORMANCE MEASURE ASSESSMENT

Department: Department of Management Services
Program: Public Employees Relations Commission
Service/Budget Entity: Public Employees Relations Commission
Measure: Number of Employment Dispositions

Action:

- Performance Assessment of Outcome Measure
- Performance Assessment of Output Measure
- Adjustment of GAA Performance Standards
- Revision of Measure
- Deletion of Measure

Approved Standard	Actual Performance Results	Difference (Over/Under)	Percentage Difference
417	323	94 (Under)	23%

Factors Accounting for the Difference:

Internal Factors (check all that apply):

- Personnel Factors
- Competing Priorities
- Previous Estimate Incorrect
- Other (Identify)
- Staff Capacity
- Level of Training

Explanation:

External Factors (check all that apply):

- Resources Unavailable
- Legal/Legislative Change
- Target Population Change
- This Program/Service Cannot Fix The Problem
- Current Laws Are Working Against The Agency Mission
- Technological Problems
- Natural Disaster
- Other (Identify)

Explanation: Legislative changes (Service First) decreased the pool of employees eligible to file appeals and also significantly changed the procedures for filing career service appeals. This factor impacted the Commission's ability to meet the standard because of a decrease in filings which, in turn, decreased the number of employment dispositions. It should be noted that this reduction is entirely attributable to a decrease in the number of case filings.

Management Efforts to Address Differences/Problems (check all that apply):

- Training
- Personnel
- Technology
- Other (Identify) – Continue stringent monitoring of case management to assure all cases are handled timely.

Recommendations: N/A

LRPP Exhibit III: PERFORMANCE MEASURE ASSESSMENT

Department: Department of Management Services
Program: Enterprise Information Technology Services
Service/Budget Entity: Telecommunications
Measure: Percent of Telecommunications Customers Satisfied

Action:

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Performance Assessment of <u>Outcome</u> Measure | <input type="checkbox"/> Revision of Measure |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Performance Assessment of <u>Output</u> Measure | <input type="checkbox"/> Deletion of Measure |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Adjustment of GAA Performance Standards | |

Approved Standard	Actual Performance Results	Difference (Over/Under)	Percentage Difference
86%	84.2%	(1.8%)	2.1%

Factors Accounting for the Difference:

Internal Factors (check all that apply):

- | | |
|--|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Personnel Factors | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Staff Capacity |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Competing Priorities | <input type="checkbox"/> Level of Training |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Previous Estimate Incorrect | <input type="checkbox"/> Other (Identify) |

Explanation:

External Factors (check all that apply):

- | | |
|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Resources Unavailable | <input type="checkbox"/> Technological Problems |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Legal/Legislative Change | <input type="checkbox"/> Natural Disaster |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Target Population Change | <input type="checkbox"/> Other (Identify) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> This Program/Service Cannot Fix The Problem | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Current Laws Are Working Against The Agency Mission | |

Explanation:

Management Efforts to Address Differences/Problems (check all that apply):

- | | |
|--|---|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Training | <input type="checkbox"/> Technology |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Personnel | <input type="checkbox"/> Other (Identify) |

Recommendations:

Problem Resolution team is training weekly under new leadership. This factor is 10% points below other measures. Training along.

LRPP Exhibit III: PERFORMANCE MEASURE ASSESSMENT

Department: Department of Management Services

Program: Enterprise Information Technology Services

Service/Budget Entity: Information Services

Measure: Percent utilization by the IBM System as used for capacity planning and technology refresh, employing 80% maximum utilization standard

Action:

- Performance Assessment of Outcome Measure
- Performance Assessment of Output Measure
- Adjustment of GAA Performance Standards
- Revision of Measure
- Deletion of Measure

Approved Standard	Actual Performance Results	Difference (Over/Under)	Percentage Difference
78%	75%	(3%)	3.85%

Factors Accounting for the Difference:

Internal Factors (check all that apply):

- Personnel Factors
- Competing Priorities
- Previous Estimate Incorrect
- Staff Capacity
- Level of Training
- Other (Identify)

Explanation:

External Factors (check all that apply):

- Resources Unavailable
- Legal/Legislative Change
- Target Population Change
- This Program/Service Cannot Fix The Problem
- Current Laws Are Working Against The Agency Mission
- Technological Problems
- Natural Disaster
- Other (Identify)

Explanation:

Due to the fact that DFS/WC came off the IBM Mainframe, we downsized our current mainframe to a smaller mainframe to accommodate our remaining customers.

Management Efforts to Address Differences/Problems (check all that apply):

- Training
- Personnel
- Technology
- Other (Identify)

Recommendations:

LRPP Exhibit III: PERFORMANCE MEASURE ASSESSMENT

Department: Department of Management Services
Program: Enterprise Information Technology Services
Service/Budget Entity: Information Services
Measure: Number of customers served

Action:

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Performance Assessment of <u>Outcome</u> Measure | <input type="checkbox"/> Revision of Measure |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Performance Assessment of <u>Output</u> Measure | <input type="checkbox"/> Deletion of Measure |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Adjustment of GAA Performance Standards | |

Approved Standard	Actual Performance Results	Difference (Over/Under)	Percentage Difference
100	58	(42%)	42%

Factors Accounting for the Difference:

Internal Factors (check all that apply):

- | | |
|--|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Personnel Factors | <input type="checkbox"/> Staff Capacity |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Competing Priorities | <input type="checkbox"/> Level of Training |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Previous Estimate Incorrect | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other (Identify) |

Explanation: Change in Methodology – previous standard was number of invoices generated, which would have more than 1 invoice per customer (or agency). New methodology states the “number of customers serviced” is based on the number of EITS billable customers. While customers (agencies) may have multiple accounts, they are only counted once for this measure.

External Factors (check all that apply):

- | | |
|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Resources Unavailable | <input type="checkbox"/> Technological Problems |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Legal/Legislative Change | <input type="checkbox"/> Natural Disaster |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Target Population Change | <input type="checkbox"/> Other (Identify) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> This Program/Service Cannot Fix The Problem | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Current Laws Are Working Against The Agency Mission | |

Explanation:

Management Efforts to Address Differences/Problems (check all that apply):

- | | |
|------------------------------------|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Training | <input type="checkbox"/> Technology |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Personnel | <input type="checkbox"/> Other (Identify) |

Recommendations:

LRPP Exhibit III: PERFORMANCE MEASURE ASSESSMENT

Department: Department of Management Services
Program: Enterprise Information Technology Services
Service/Budget Entity: Information Services
Measure: Cost per MIPS

Action:

- | | |
|--|--|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Performance Assessment of <u>Outcome</u> Measure | <input type="checkbox"/> Revision of Measure |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Performance Assessment of <u>Output</u> Measure | <input type="checkbox"/> Deletion of Measure |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Adjustment of GAA Performance Standards | |

Approved Standard	Actual Performance Results	Difference (Over/Under)	Percentage Difference
\$8,111	\$13,579	\$5,468	67%

Factors Accounting for the Difference:

Internal Factors (check all that apply):

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Personnel Factors | <input type="checkbox"/> Staff Capacity |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Competing Priorities | <input type="checkbox"/> Level of Training |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Previous Estimate Incorrect | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other (Identify) |

Explanation:

The cost per MIP of IBM mainframe operations has increased due to: increases in the cost of operations and the reduction in the size of the mainframe. The previous estimate of cost is not consistent with the direction of industry cost for this platform.

External Factors (check all that apply):

- | | |
|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Resources Unavailable | <input type="checkbox"/> Technological Problems |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Legal/Legislative Change | <input type="checkbox"/> Natural Disaster |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Target Population Change | <input type="checkbox"/> Other (Identify) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> This Program/Service Cannot Fix The Problem | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Current Laws Are Working Against The Agency Mission | |

Explanation:

There has been a loss of customers to other platforms and an inability to optimize IBM mainframe operations by consolidating like operations in other departments.

Management Efforts to Address Differences/Problems (check all that apply):

- | | |
|------------------------------------|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Training | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Technology |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Personnel | <input type="checkbox"/> Other (Identify) |

Recommendations:

EITS is looking to reduce software costs by eliminating duplicate software functions (will require customer changes), as well as continuing to remove obsolete technologies being supported.

Office of Policy and Budget – July 2006

LRPP Exhibit III: PERFORMANCE MEASURE ASSESSMENT

Department: Department of Management Services
Program: Enterprise Information Technology Services
Service/Budget Entity: Information Services
Measure: Cost per CPU

Action:

- | | |
|--|--|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Performance Assessment of <u>Outcome</u> Measure | <input type="checkbox"/> Revision of Measure |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Performance Assessment of <u>Output</u> Measure | <input type="checkbox"/> Deletion of Measure |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Adjustment of GAA Performance Standards | |

Approved Standard	Actual Performance Results	Difference (Over/Under)	Percentage Difference
<0.001	\$9197	\$9196.999	9196999%

Factors Accounting for the Difference:

Internal Factors (check all that apply):

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Personnel Factors | <input type="checkbox"/> Staff Capacity |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Competing Priorities | <input type="checkbox"/> Level of Training |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Previous Estimate Incorrect | <input type="checkbox"/> Other (Identify) |

Explanation:

The cost per CPU was provided as a measure without appropriate guidance for implementation. EITS assumed this to be the cost of CPU's for non-mainframe servers and calculated a cost based on the number of CPU's supporting Windows and UNIX services. The previous estimate of cost is not consistent with this method of calculation.

External Factors (check all that apply):

- | | |
|--|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Resources Unavailable | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Technological Problems |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Legal/Legislative Change | <input type="checkbox"/> Natural Disaster |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Target Population Change | <input type="checkbox"/> Other (Identify) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> This Program/Service Cannot Fix The Problem | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Current Laws Are Working Against The Agency Mission | |

Explanation:

This measure is not indicative of the efficiency of operations for services provided. Improvements in efficiency, such as consolidating older servers on newer faster processors, will mostly result in the cost per CPU increasing.

Management Efforts to Address Differences/Problems (check all that apply):

- | | |
|------------------------------------|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Training | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Technology |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Personnel | <input type="checkbox"/> Other (Identify) |

Recommendations:

EITS is actively consolidating older, slower servers on to faster servers. This will reduce the number of CPUs, improve reliability, and reduce the cost of operations.

Office of Policy and Budget – July 2006

LRPP Exhibit III: PERFORMANCE MEASURE ASSESSMENT

Department: Department of Management Services
Program: Enterprise Information Technology Services
Service/Budget Entity: Information Services
Measure: First Contact Resolution Rate

Action:

- | | |
|--|--|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Performance Assessment of <u>Outcome</u> Measure | <input type="checkbox"/> Revision of Measure |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Performance Assessment of <u>Output</u> Measure | <input type="checkbox"/> Deletion of Measure |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Adjustment of GAA Performance Standards | |

Approved Standard	Actual Performance Results	Difference (Over/Under)	Percentage Difference
95%	31.25%	(63.75%)	67.10%

Factors Accounting for the Difference:

Internal Factors (check all that apply):

- | | |
|--|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Personnel Factors | <input type="checkbox"/> Staff Capacity |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Competing Priorities | <input type="checkbox"/> Level of Training |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Previous Estimate Incorrect | <input type="checkbox"/> Other (Identify) |

Explanation:

The Services Desk (formerly the ETSD) operated through the entire fiscal year of 2005/2006 with a reduced level of staffing, which accommodated financial priorities of the program area. By doing so, the focus of the operation was altered to maintain the support of the contact volumes removing focus on First Contact Resolution.

External Factors (check all that apply):

- | | |
|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Resources Unavailable | <input type="checkbox"/> Technological Problems |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Legal/Legislative Change | <input type="checkbox"/> Natural Disaster |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Target Population Change | <input type="checkbox"/> Other (Identify) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> This Program/Service Cannot Fix The Problem | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Current Laws Are Working Against The Agency Mission | |

Explanation:

Management Efforts to Address Differences/Problems (check all that apply):

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Training | <input type="checkbox"/> Technology |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Personnel | <input type="checkbox"/> Other (Identify) |

Recommendations:
Staffing the Services Desk at the recommended levels will provide an opportunity to redirect the focus of the operation to achieving the performance standards established.

Office of Policy and Budget – July 2006

LRPP Exhibit III: PERFORMANCE MEASURE ASSESSMENT

Department: Department of Management Services
Program: Enterprise Information Technology Services
Service/Budget Entity: Information Services
Measure: Cost per help desk case

Action:

- | | |
|--|--|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Performance Assessment of <u>Outcome</u> Measure | <input type="checkbox"/> Revision of Measure |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Performance Assessment of <u>Output</u> Measure | <input type="checkbox"/> Deletion of Measure |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Adjustment of GAA Performance Standards | |

Approved Standard	Actual Performance Results	Difference (Over/Under)	Percentage Difference
\$8.50	\$23.49	\$14.99	63.8%

Factors Accounting for the Difference:

Internal Factors (check all that apply):

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Personnel Factors | <input type="checkbox"/> Staff Capacity |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Competing Priorities | <input type="checkbox"/> Level of Training |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Previous Estimate Incorrect | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other (Identify) |

Explanation:

The Services Desk is a cost recoverable operation within the Department of Management Services; as such all costs associated with the operation are factored into the per case cost. Certain costs are fixed and recurring based on support infrastructure required for operations.

External Factors (check all that apply):

- | | |
|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Resources Unavailable | <input type="checkbox"/> Technological Problems |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Legal/Legislative Change | <input type="checkbox"/> Natural Disaster |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Target Population Change | <input type="checkbox"/> Other (Identify) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> This Program/Service Cannot Fix The Problem | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Current Laws Are Working Against The Agency Mission | |

Explanation:

Beginning with the termination of the outsourcing contract (ITN006), this function has been slowly transitioning from an enterprise service that provides services to other agencies, to a service that only supports DMS activities. This change has resulted in a lower volume of cases than the infrastructure was built to support.

Management Efforts to Address Differences/Problems (check all that apply):

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Training | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Technology |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Personnel | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other (Identify) |

Recommendations:

The Services Desk should be considered for Contact Center consolidations throughout the department increasing utilization and reducing operational costs. Also, efforts should be made to redeploy the supporting infrastructure to reduce operational costs.

Office of Policy and Budget – July 2006

LRPP Exhibit III: PERFORMANCE MEASURE ASSESSMENT

Department: Department of Management Services
Program: Enterprise Information Technology Services
Service/Budget Entity: Information Services
Measure: Percent of agency service level agreements met

Action:

- | | |
|--|--|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Performance Assessment of <u>Outcome</u> Measure | <input type="checkbox"/> Revision of Measure |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Performance Assessment of <u>Output</u> Measure | <input type="checkbox"/> Deletion of Measure |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Adjustment of GAA Performance Standards | |

Approved Standard	Actual Performance Results	Difference (Over/Under)	Percentage Difference
95%	N/A	N/A	N/A

Factors Accounting for the Difference:

Internal Factors (check all that apply):

- | | |
|--|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Personnel Factors | <input type="checkbox"/> Staff Capacity |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Competing Priorities | <input type="checkbox"/> Level of Training |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Previous Estimate Incorrect | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other (Identify) |

Explanation:

Due to the termination of the ITN-006 outsourcing contract, migration of service delivery from the STO, and a subsequent redefinition of services, data required to report compliance with existing SLA does not exist. Procedures and reports are being instituted to address this problem for future reporting.

External Factors (check all that apply):

- | | |
|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Resources Unavailable | <input type="checkbox"/> Technological Problems |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Legal/Legislative Change | <input type="checkbox"/> Natural Disaster |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Target Population Change | <input type="checkbox"/> Other (Identify) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> This Program/Service Cannot Fix The Problem | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Current Laws Are Working Against The Agency Mission | |

Explanation:

Management Efforts to Address Differences/Problems (check all that apply):

- | | |
|------------------------------------|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Training | <input type="checkbox"/> Technology |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Personnel | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other (Identify) |

Recommendations:

Procedures and reports are being instituted to address this problem for future reporting.

LRPP EXHIBIT IV – PERFORMANCE MEASURE VALIDITY AND RELIABILITY

LRPP EXHIBIT IV: Performance Measure Validity and Reliability

Department: Department of Management Services

Program: Administration

Service/Budget Entity: Executive Direction and Support Services

Measure: Administrative costs as a percent of total agency costs

Action (check one):

- Requesting revision to approved performance measure.
- Change in data sources or measurement methodologies.
- Requesting new measure.
- Backup for performance measure.

Data Sources and Methodology:

The administrative costs as a percent of total agency costs is calculated by dividing the approved budget for Executive Direction and Support Services budget entity by the total agency's approved budget. This data is collected from the General Appropriations Act (GAA) and LAS/PBS for "actual and LBR" data.

Validity:

This measure is appropriate because it is an indicator of the efficiency of the Department's administration and support services. This measure is valid because the data is obtained from the General Appropriations Act (GAA) and LAS/PBS. The working documents and methodology related to this measure can be found at: G:\PLANNING\zAdministration Measures\ADMINISTRATION – Admin cost as a percent of total agency cost.

Reliability:

This measure is reliable because the same sources of information are used from year to year. In addition, the Department has established various internal controls to ensure the accuracy of the data.

Office of Policy and Budget – July, 2006

LRPP EXHIBIT IV: Performance Measure Validity and Reliability

Department: Department of Management Services

Program: Administration

Service/Budget Entity: Executive Direction and Support Services

Measure: Administrative positions as a percent of total agency positions

Action (check one):

- Requesting revision to approved performance measure.
- Change in data sources or measurement methodologies.
- Requesting new measure.
- Backup for performance measure.

Data Sources and Methodology:

The administrative positions as a percent of total agency positions is calculated by dividing the positions for Executive Direction and Support Services budget entity by the total agency's positions. This data is collected from the General Appropriations Act (GAA) and LAS/PBS for "actual and LBR" data.

Validity:

This measure is appropriate because it is an indicator of the efficiency of the Department's administration and support services. This measure is valid because the data is obtained from the General Appropriations Act (GAA) and LAS/PBS. The working documents and methodology related to this measure can be found at: G:\PLANNING\zAdministration Measures\ADMINISTRATION – Admin cost as a percent of total agency cost.

Reliability:

This measure is reliable because the same sources of information are used from year to year. In addition, the Department has established various internal controls to ensure the accuracy of the data.

Office of Policy and Budget – July, 2006

LRPP EXHIBIT IV: Performance Measure Validity and Reliability

Department: Management Services

Program: Facilities Program

Service/Budget Entity: Real Estate Development and Management
(Facilities Management)

Measure: Department of Management Services' average operations and maintenance cost per square foot maintained

Action (check one):

- Requesting revision to approved performance measure.
- Change in data sources or measurement methodologies.
- Requesting new measure.
- Backup for performance measure.

Data Sources and Methodology:

The data source for the Department's average operations and maintenance cost per square foot maintained is the June 30, 2006 Schedule of Allotment Balances, from the State's accounting system (FLAIR).

This indicator includes the total costs associated with the day-to-day operation of a facility. It includes maintenance and repair, janitorial and housekeeping, utility and indirect costs (i.e., landscaping and grounds, roadways and parking facilities).

The Department's total operations and maintenance cost is divided by the maintained square footage of the Department's facilities to arrive at an average cost per square foot maintained.

Validity:

The purpose of this measure is to capture the Department's operations and maintenance cost for use in trend analysis and for comparison to the private sector (industry average). This will allow us to see if our costs are competitive with the private sector and help us make future decisions on the provision of these services. It includes the total costs associated with the day-to-day operations of a facility. It also includes maintenance and repair costs, janitorial and housekeeping, utility and indirect costs (i.e., landscaping and grounds, roadways and parking facilities).

Reliability:

The reliability of the Department's cost data is high. The data source for this information is the June 30, 2006 Schedule of Allotment Balances, obtained from the State's Accounting System (FLAIR). The collection method is consistent and

considers all costs relevant to the measure. The potential for duplicating the data with the same result is high. This is due to the fact that this measure is inclusive of all operations and maintenance costs and lends itself easily for comparison to private sector costs. This measure is a simple and easily understood measure that should be easily interpreted and accepted by the general public.

Office of Policy and Budget – July, 2006

LRPP EXHIBIT IV: Performance Measure Validity and Reliability

Department: Management Services

Program: Facilities Program

Service/Budget Entity: Real Estate Development and Management
(Facilities Management)

Measure: Net square feet of private sector office space occupied by state agencies

Action (check one):

- Requesting revision to approved performance measure.
- Change in data sources or measurement methodologies.
- Requesting new measure.
- Backup for performance measure.

Data Sources and Methodology:

The data source for Net square feet of state-owned office space occupied by state agencies is the Facilities Accountability Tool (FACT); a database maintained within this Service. This indicator does not measure program output, but was established to show the growth and percentage of state-owned office space as it related to the amount of private sector leased office space occupied by state agencies.

Validity:

The purpose of this measure is to capture the net square feet of private sector office space occupied by state agencies to show the trend of private sector office space being occupied by state agencies. This measure is valid and appropriate because it serves as an indicator of the total amount of office space being leased by state agencies from the private sector.

Reliability:

The reliability of this data is high because the same data source and methodology are used from year to year. The results for this will be consistent as long as the methodology is constant.

Office of Policy and Budget – July, 2006

LRPP EXHIBIT IV: Performance Measure Validity and Reliability

Department: Management Services

Program: Facilities Program

Service/Budget Entity: Real Estate Development and Management
(Facilities Management)

Measure: Net square feet of state-owned office space occupied by state agencies

Action (check one):

- Requesting revision to approved performance measure.
- Change in data sources or measurement methodologies.
- Requesting new measure.
- Backup for performance measure.

Data Sources and Methodology:

The data source for Net square feet of state-owned office space occupied by state agencies is the Facilities Accountability Tool (FACT); a database maintained within this Service. This indicator does not measure program output, but was established to show the growth and percentage of state-owned office space as it related to the amount of private sector leased office space occupied by state agencies.

The data related to DMS was obtained from the June 30, 2006 report, obtained from the Service's leasing section. This report is based on information obtained from FACT, a database maintained within this service and details the amount of space DMS office space occupied as of June 30, 2006. The data related to office space owned by other state agencies was obtained from the State Facilities Inventory Section. This report is also based on information from FACT, a database maintained within this Service.

Validity:

The purpose of this measure is to capture the net square feet of state-owned office space occupied by state agencies to show the growth and percentage of state-owned office space as it related to the amount of private sector leased office space occupied by state agencies. This measure is valid and appropriate because it serves as an indicator in helping establish a proper balance between state-owned and state leased office space as well as providing an indicator of the total amount of state-owned office space on an annual basis.

Reliability:

The reliability of this data is high because the same data sources and methodology are used from year to year. The results for this will be consistent as long and the methodology is constant.

LRPP EXHIBIT IV: Performance Measure Validity and Reliability

Department: Management Services

Program: Facilities Program

Service/Budget Entity: Real Estate Development and Management
(Facilities Management)

Measure: Number of facilities secured

Action (check one):

- Requesting revision to approved performance measure.
- Change in data sources or measurement methodologies.
- Requesting new measure.
- Backup for performance measure.

Data Sources and Methodology:

The data source Number of facilities secured is the actual number of facilities where DMS provides security services as of June 30, 2006. These security services are provided through manned and/or systems integration. These facilities include: James, Peterson, Ft. Myers, Grizzle, Ft. Pierce, Sebring, R.A. Gray, Hurston, Alachua, Rohde, Opa-Locka, Gore, Dimick, Trammell, Hargrett, Jacksonville, Daytona Beach, Marathon and North Broward buildings.

Validity:

The purpose of this measure is to capture the actual number of facilities where DMS provides security services. This can be used to compare to future numbers. This measure is valid and appropriate because it serves as an indicator of the workload of this activity and for comparison to future years.

Reliability:

The reliability of this data is high because the same data source and methodology are used from year to year. The results for this will be consistent as long and the methodology is constant.

Office of Policy and Budget – July, 2006

LRPP EXHIBIT IV: Performance Measure Validity and Reliability

Department: Management Services

Program: Facilities Program

Service/Budget Entity: Real Estate Development and Management
(Facilities Management)

Measure: Number of leases managed

Action (check one):

- Requesting revision to approved performance measure.
- Change in data sources or measurement methodologies.
- Requesting new measure.
- Backup for performance measure.

Data Sources and Methodology:

The data source for the Number of leases managed is information provided by the leasing section, located within DMS in the Facilities Program. This information is based on report obtained from the Facilities Accountability Tool (FACT); a database maintained within this Service and details the number of active leases being administered in the activity as of June 30, 2006.

Validity:

The purpose of this measure is to capture some of the workload for this activity. The measure is valid and appropriated because it serves as an indicator as to the workload of the activity.

Reliability:

The reliability of this data is high because the same data source and methodology are used from year to year. The results for this will be consistent as long and the methodology is constant.

Office of Policy and Budget – July, 2006

LRPP EXHIBIT IV: Performance Measure Validity and Reliability

Department: Management Services

Program: Facilities Program

Service/Budget Entity: Real Estate Development and Management
(Facilities Management)

Measure: Number of maintained square feet (private contract and agency)

Action (check one):

- Requesting revision to approved performance measure.
- Change in data sources or measurement methodologies.
- Requesting new measure.
- Backup for performance measure.

Data Sources and Methodology:

The data source for the Number of maintained square feet (private contract and agency) is the Leasing Section located within DMS in the Facilities Program. This indicator shows the total square footage being maintained by DMS through both the in-house provision and contracting of operations and maintenance services.

The data related to this measure was obtained from a June 30, 2006 Pool Facilities Report, provided by the Leasing Section. This report is based on information obtained from the Facilities Accountability Tool (FACT), a database maintained with this Service and details the amount of square feet being maintained by DMS through both the in-house provision and contracting of operations and maintenance services.

Validity:

The purpose of this measure is to capture the total square footage of space being maintained by DMS, whether through the in-house provision or the contracting of operations and maintenance services. This measure is valid and appropriate because it serves as an indicator of the workload of the Activity.

Reliability:

The reliability of this data is high because the same data source and methodology are used from year to year. The results for this will be consistent as long as the methodology is constant.

Office of Policy and Budget – July, 2006

LRPP EXHIBIT IV: Performance Measure Validity and Reliability

Department: Management Services

Program: Facilities Program

Service/Budget Entity: Real Estate Development and Management
(Facilities Management)

Measure: Average Department of Management Services full service rent - composite cost per net square foot (actual) compared to average private sector full service rent – composite cost per net square foot in markets where the Department manages office facilities

Action (check one):

- Requesting revision to approved performance measure.
- Change in data sources or measurement methodologies.
- Requesting new measure.
- Backup for performance measure.

Data Sources and Methodology:

The data source for Average Department of Management Services full service rent – composite cost per net square foot (actual) compared to average private sector full service rent – composite cost per net square foot in markets where the Department manages office facilities is the Leasing Section located within DMS in the Facilities Program. This indicator is the cost to agencies to occupy space in Department of Management Services' facilities. This measure is the uniform full service rental rate that the Department charges its tenants.

The data source for the for Average Department of Management Services full service rent – composite cost per net square foot (actual) compared to average private sector full service rent – composite cost per net square foot in markets where the Department manages office facilities is the Facilities Accountability Tool (FACT), a database maintained within the Service.

The private sector lease rate was obtained from a June 30, 2006 report run from FACT. This lease rate is an average of all state agency full service leases with private sector vendors in markets where DMS has office facilities that were on file with the Department as of June 30, 2006

Validity:

The purpose of this measure is to capture the actual Department of Management Services full service lease rate for comparison purposes to the average private sector full service lease rate in markets where the Department manages office facilities. This measure is appropriate because it serves as an indicator of how competitive the Department's rates are with the private sector.

This measure is valid because the source is the actual state agency full-service leases with private sector vendors in markets where the Department of Management Services has office facilities that were on file with the Department as of June 30, 2006.

Reliability:

This measure is reliable because the same sources of data and methodology are used from year to year. In addition, the accuracy of this data can be verified by reviewing the full-service rate that the Department charges tenants in its facilities and by reviewing the full-service leases that state agencies have with the private sector.

Office of Policy and Budget – July, 2006

LRPP EXHIBIT IV: Performance Measure Validity and Reliability

Department: Department of Management Services

Program: Facilities

Service/Budget Entity: Building Construction

Measure: Dollar Volume of Fixed Capital Outlay Starts

Action (check one):

- Requesting revision to approved performance measure.
- Change in data sources or measurement methodologies.
- Requesting new measure.
- Backup for performance measure.

Data Sources and Methodology:

Building Construction uses this data to estimate the need and requirements for state project oversight. This measure is based on Facilities Accountability and Communication Tool (FACT) and the sub component of FACT, the Fixed Capital Outlay Management System (FCOMS) for Fixed Capital Outlay (FCO) projects started. Data is collected by Project Managers, Contracts Section and Administrative staff who enter it into the FCOMS for project management, Fixed Capital Outlay budget management, administrative management and historical purposes. This measure is an indicator of the dollar amount of State FCO projects which are started within the fiscal year and appropriated in the General Appropriation Act designating the Department of Management Services the Owner-Representative on behalf of the State and/or for Client Agency agreements with other State of Florida agencies which contract with the Department. This data is used to estimate the need and requirement for state project oversight and contract compliance services.

Validity:

This measure can be fully verified through reports generated from FCOMS. The reports indicate the dollar amount of FCO projects started in the fiscal year. New project data is tracked per Chapter 255.31, F.S. authority to the Department of Management Services to manage construction projects for the state. This statute gives authority to Building Construction to provide project management and administration services for the construction, renovation, repair, modification, or demolition of buildings, utilities, parks, parking lots, or other facilities or improvements for FCO projects in which the funds are appropriated as the Department the Owner Representative on behalf of the state and/or for Client Agency agreements with other State of Florida agencies which contract with the Department.

Reliability:

Contract Section personnel and Project Managers are responsible for reporting FCO project information and entering data concerning each of their projects into FCOMS. Quarterly reports are produced for evaluation by management to ensure thoroughness and completeness of data.

Office of Policy and Budget – July, 2006

LRPP EXHIBIT IV: Performance Measure Validity and Reliability

Department: Department of Management Services

Program: Division of Real Estate Development and Management

Service/Budget Entity: Building Construction

Measure: Gross square foot construction cost of office facilities for the Department of Management Services compared to gross square foot construction cost of office facilities for private industry average.

Action (check one):

- Requesting revision to approved performance measure.
- Change in data sources or measurement methodologies.
- Requesting new measure.
- Backup for performance measure.

Data Sources and Methodology:

Data for the DMS projects are based upon final/actual construction costs for office buildings. Costs are obtained using the construction manager's (general contractor's) final pay request. However, because DMS did not complete any office space during FY 02/03 thru 05/06, the prior year's data was used, but was increased to account for inflation (increased by a factor of 1.035 x no. of years projected – based upon an average inflation rate of 3.5%).

Data for private-sector office buildings was obtained from the latest edition of the RSMeans Building Construction Cost Data via their database software titled: Costworks Version 7.0.

Methodology – This is a comparison of construction costs (building shell plus utilities/services extending five feet out) for office buildings, excluding sitework and tenant build-out costs, for similar size buildings. The RSMeans private-sector cost for low-rise (one- to four-story and 5,000 to 80,000 sq. ft. size range) offices is comparable to the four-story DMS prototypical office buildings.

Validity:

The private-sector costs provided by the RSMeans are considered valid based upon their reputation as the foremost authority and source for estimating construction-related costs. The RSMeans construction costs are based upon approximately 10,200 projects in the Means' national database. The RSMeans data is current and based upon actual construction costs. The RSMeans national average construction cost has been adjusted to reflect construction cost in Florida, i.e. according to Florida's average construction-cost index for the projected year (approx. 80% statewide average each year).

The DMS cost is calculated based upon actual/final construction costs for two office buildings completed during FY 2001-02 and then inflated by a factor of

1.035 to account for the average annual inflation rate (for construction projects). DMS construction costs are obtained from final pay applications for the projects as submitted by the construction management firm in charge of the projects.

Reliability:

The Outcomes of past projects are accurate and verifiable. Future Outcomes are dependent upon material costs and availability, inflation factors, and bid climates.

Office of Policy and Budget – July, 2006

LRPP EXHIBIT IV: Performance Measure Validity and Reliability

Department: Department of Management Services

Program: Support

Service/Budget Entity: Aircraft Management

Measure: Cost per Flight Hour – State vs. Private Provider

Action (check one):

- Requesting revision to approved performance measure.
- Change in data sources or measurement methodologies.
- Requesting new measure.
- Backup for performance measure.

Data Sources and Methodology:

The data sources for this measure are:

- Aircraft Management Flight Manifests give the Flight Hours.
- DMS Division of Purchasing for Expenditures.
- Price Quote from Flightline, Inc., a Private Sector provider.

Manifests from the Aircraft determine the number of Flight Hours each Aircraft has flown in the relative fiscal year. The Division of Purchasing provided a spreadsheet to show total expenditures. The total expenditures were divided by the total flight hours to determine Cost Per Flight Hour for State Aircraft. The cost for the outgoing years has been adjusted annually by 5% to offset the anticipated cost of living adjustment.

Flightline, Inc., indicates their Flight Hour cost as a relative measure.

By costing out the Private Sector against our numbers, we can better evaluate how our Program is doing relative to others.

Validity:

A valid indicator of how we are doing in Government is comparing us to those industry equivalents in the Private Sector. Even when there may be some variables (security, wheels-up time), it is still the most accurate account of efficiency.

Cost comparisons are appropriate when using the Private Sector as a measuring stick for efficiency. There are many companies in the Private Sector that have executive airpools and the variety reflects a large number to pull from for comparison.

Reliability:

See Data Sources and Methodology Section above.

The measure is reliable because it shows real-time numbers and can easily be updated to reflect a change in Private Sector companies.

Office of Policy and Budget – July, 2006

LRPP EXHIBIT IV: Performance Measure Validity and Reliability

Department: Department of Management Services

Program: Support

Service/Budget Entity: Aircraft Management

Measure: Number of Flight Hours

Action (check one):

- Requesting revision to approved performance measure.
- Change in data sources or measurement methodologies.
- Requesting new measure.
- Backup for performance measure.

Data Sources and Methodology:

The data source for the measure is the flight manifest that is kept on every aircraft. Each manifest is entered daily into the computer system from our three aircraft. Those are totaled yearly to produce the Flight Hour number. Manifests are used to measure the workload that our aircraft bear and are the accurate source of information.

Validity:

See Data Sources and Methodology Section Above.

Reliability:

As Flight Hours are considered the Industry standard in aircraft use, we can more easily compare to the Private Sector and our level of efficiency.

Office of Policy and Budget – July, 2006

LRPP EXHIBIT IV: Performance Measure Validity and Reliability

Department: Department of Management Services

Program: Support

Service/Budget Entity: Motor Vehicle and Watercraft Management

Measure: Miles of commercial rental vehicle contract service provided

Action (check one):

- Requesting revision to approved performance measure.
- Change in data sources or measurement methodologies.
- Requesting new measure.
- Backup for performance measure.

Data Sources and Methodology:

The rental vehicle contractor providing the year's total mileage figures provides a report. The contracted vendor provides a database that tracks the number of miles driven by state employees. It is based on the actual miles driven.

Validity:

The reason the figures provided by the contracted vendor are used is to more accurately represent the actual miles driven by state employees. By use of their database they have the figures readily available at any given time during the year. It is appropriate for the reasons previously stated.

Reliability:

The records come directly from invoices in the contracted vendor's database.

Office of Policy and Budget – July, 2006

LRPP EXHIBIT IV: Performance Measure Validity and Reliability

Department: Department of Management Services

Program: Support

Service/Budget Entity: Motor Vehicle and Watercraft Management

Measure: State contract daily vehicle rental rate vs. private provider daily vehicle rental rate

Action (check one):

- Requesting revision to approved performance measure.
- Change in data sources or measurement methodologies.
- Requesting new measure.
- Backup for performance measure.

Data Sources and Methodology: Various Rental Car Agencies were called and asked for their daily rates on compact and mid-sized vehicles, which are the two types primarily rented by our state users. A total of five companies were contacted for the daily rates on compact and mid-sized vehicles. Each company's two rates were averaged together for one total. Each of these five company averages were averaged together to get one private sector provider rate. We averaged the contract vendor rates for the same two types of vehicles and compared the data. The annual incremental increase is based on market prediction. By comparing like vehicles with like companies (even using a 'call-rate' quote from our contracted vendor), we are able to better ascertain whether the State of Florida has provided an efficient service.

Validity: The reason the contract was put into place years ago was to provide significant cost savings to every user agency for transportation needs. If the private sector can provide the service for less, then the State should re-evaluate whether or not to continue providing a State term contract for this service. It is appropriate to use private sector quotes for this purpose. Since most rentals are compact and mid-sized vehicles, we selected these two types to determine the average. It is appropriate for the reasons previously stated.

Reliability: Gathering price differentials through current data collection was the most accurate way of determining what the private sector is charging. The quotes were given by employees of those various rental car companies. The information shows an accurate accounting of current pricing from rental car companies. It is reliable because it is real-time pricing and we can compare at any given time throughout the contract period. It reflects the true difference in what a state employee could rent without a competitively bid contract.

LRPP EXHIBIT IV: Performance Measure Validity and Reliability

Department: Department of Management Services

Program: Support

Service/Budget Entity: Federal Property Assistance

Measure: Federal Property Distribution Rate

Action (check one):

- Requesting revision to approved performance measure.
- Change in data sources or measurement methodologies.
- Requesting new measure.
- Backup for performance measure.

Data Sources and Methodology:

Data Sources are agency generated monthly and quarterly "3040" reports to the Federal government of Federal surplus property receipts and issues and, for the separate law enforcement program, internal inventory records. The Federal property distribution rate measures the amount of Federal excess/surplus property being placed with eligible organizations compared to the amount of Federal excess/surplus property being received into the State's inventory and available for distribution. GSA uses Distribution Rate as one factor for allocating federal surplus property to the states. The measure is stated as a percentage. It is calculated by totaling annual property distributions to eligible organizations and dividing by the annual property receipts. This methodology is consistent with that of the GSA as it tracks the states' distribution rate. GSA uses the distribution rate as one factor in determining allocations of available Federal property assets to the states.

Validity:

Federal Property Distribution Rate is a measurement of the percentage of Federal property being distributed to eligible organizations out of the total property received by the program. The measure logically represents the goal of the Federal property program which is to "donate" property. The program is not intended to be a warehousing function for the Federal government but a distribution function with the ultimate goal of saving taxpayer dollars. The measure describes how well the program is distributing federal property allocated to Florida. Since the primary source of income for the program is the service charges assessed on property distributed, the distribution rate is important to the on-going success of the program. The measure reflects tax dollars savings to users.

Reliability:

Federal Surplus Property Donation Program information used to calculate this measure is data that has been tracked by Federal Property Assistance for

several years. Monthly and quarterly reports ("3040 Report") of Federal surplus property receipts and issues have always been a requirement of the Federal overseeing agency (USGSA). Federal property requisitions and receiving reports are reported into the Federal Property Management Information System (FPMIS) and are added to the automated perpetual inventory. Distribution/Invoice documents are produced by FPMIS when staff scans the bar code of the property requested by the customer. FPMIS posts issues off the stock record at the time of issue. At fiscal month end and at fiscal quarter end, FPMIS produces a "3040 Report" for USGSA. For the Military Excess Property for Law Enforcement Program (1033 Program), property is requisitioned directly from the Defense Reutilization and Marketing Service (DRMS) web site. Law Enforcement Agencies (LEA) search this web site individually and enter their requests for property directly onto this site. The request is automatically forwarded to the State Coordinator for action. Once the State Coordinator has approved or disapproved a LEA request it is either automatically returned to the LEA or forwarded on to the Law Enforcement Support Office (LESO) for their action and ultimately on to MILSTRIP for final approval. MILSTRIP action is automatically reported to the LEA, State Coordinator and LESO. This report automatically generates and adjustment to the LEA inventory and is used by the State Coordinator to generate an invoice document for the LEA. Additions to LEA inventories are reconciled monthly using the DRMS reconciliation function.

Office of Policy and Budget – July, 2006

LRPP EXHIBIT IV: Performance Measure Validity and Reliability

Department: Department of Management Services

Program: Support

Service/Budget Entity: Federal Property Assistance

Measure: Number of Federal Property Orders Processed

Action (check one):

- Requesting revision to approved performance measure.
- Change in data sources or measurement methodologies.
- Requesting new measure.
- Backup for performance measure.

Data Sources and Methodology:

The Federal Property Management Information System (FPMIS) places a sequential number on each order for Federal surplus property in the Federal Surplus Property Donation Program (FSPDP). Subtracting the beginning number from the ending number results in the number of Federal property orders processed in the FSPDP. In the Military Excess Property for Law Enforcement (MEPLE) Program, the invoicing system is currently manual. Sequential numbers are assigned to each property order so that when the beginning number is subtracted from the ending number, the result is the number of orders processed. The number of orders processed in each program is added together for a total for the measure. The baseline was established by analyzing the number of orders processed in FY 95-96 and FY 96-97.

Validity:

The number of federal property orders processed is an indicator of the effectiveness of efforts to distribute federal excess and surplus property and an indicator of workload. This measure refers to the number of issue documents written by the program. Each issue of Federal property to an eligible organization is detailed on an issue document, which also becomes an invoice for the service charge assessed by the program. There can be multiple items to an order. Each property order represents workload because for every order produced, customers have been assisted, property loaded, shipped and utilization checks scheduled and eventually performed. The methodology is simple, easily calculated, and accurately reflects the distribution of federal property.

Reliability:

The data used to determine the results of this measure are determined electronically in the FSPDP and manually in MEPLE. In MEPLE, an invoice log is maintained to ensure that there is no duplication of invoice numbers. External forces that may be present that could affect the agency's ability to accomplish the

measure is the quality and quantity of property available in the program. The Program cannot control this factor.

Office of Policy and Budget – July, 2006

LRPP EXHIBIT IV: Performance Measure Validity and Reliability

Department: Management Services

Program: Support

Service/Budget Entity: Purchasing Oversight

Measure: Percent of state term contract savings

Action (check one):

- Requesting revision to approved performance measure.
- Change in data sources or measurement methodologies.
- Requesting new measure.
- Backup for performance measure.

Data Sources and Methodology:

This measure compares the price of a commodity/service purchased from a state term contract with the price of a commodity/service purchased without benefit of a state term contract.

Vendors provide certification of a percent discount on commodities/services offered compared to prices that would be paid without benefit of a state term contract. The sales information is reported monthly to MyFloridaMarketPlace. This measure is calculated by taking the total dollars saved (price paid without a contract minus price paid with a contract) from the use of state term contracts and dividing it by what would have been paid without a state term contract during the same time

Validity:

The concept being measured is the maximization of State purchasing power by combining and pooling the purchase of commodities and services of the agencies and local governments through State Term Contracts. Percent savings is the measure of the savings, or more appropriately, the cost avoided, by leveraging the purchasing power of the state and local government to gain discounts from volume purchases. The percent savings demonstrates the value of efforts to maximize purchasing power.

Reliability:

With their submission of a bid, vendors are required to certify the percentage discount their bid price is from the normal retail or other reference price, and to identify a website or other resource where State Purchasing staff can verify the reference price against which the discount is claimed. State Purchasing personnel are required to perform the verification and confirm the discount by written notation on the form submitted by the vendor. It is the best currently available and known means of establishing the discount for the contracted prices.

Vendors are required by the contract to report this data in certified form and have consistently done so over a long period.

This measure may vary dependent upon available competition, wages, and other cost of doing business included in vendor pricing.

Although the same methodology and data sources are used annually to calculate this measure, as described above, the reliability of this measure is affected by the accuracy of vendor certified information and limitations of the verification process.

Office of Policy and Budget – July, 2006

LRPP EXHIBIT IV: Performance Measure Validity and Reliability

Department: Management Services

Program: Support

Service/Budget Entity: Purchasing Oversight

Measure: Number of state term contracts and negotiated agreements executed

Action (check one):

- Requesting revision to approved performance measure.
- Change in data sources or measurement methodologies.
- Requesting new measure.
- Backup for performance measure

Data Sources and Methodology:

This is a measure for the Activity: Establish and Administer State Term (Master) Contracts and Negotiated Agreements (ACT1200). This measure identifies the number of contracts and agreements established for commodities and services available for use by state agencies, cities, counties and other eligible users. Data is based on contracts and agreements established and posted on the State Purchasing Direct web site. Data is updated upon addition of new contracts or agreements or upon completion of the term of a contract or agreement cycle. The number of contracts and agreements are counted annually. We wish to replace this measure because we have determined that counting contracts has less relevance, due to the combination of smaller contracts into fewer larger contracts as part of our strategic sourcing initiative to reduce costs. The number of documents does not indicate the efficiency of the Activity. We have a unit output measure that now measures instead the productivity of the contracts by measuring "Dollars expended by state agencies using state term contracts and negotiated agreements."

Validity:

This measure is no longer valid due to the combination of smaller contracts into fewer larger contracts as part of our strategic sourcing initiative to reduce costs. This measure can not provide data on the efficiencies of the divisions operations nor the effectiveness of the contracts meeting the states needs. As we move in a direction of more efficient contract management, contracts will be merged and this contract count will consistently be reduced. The replacing measure, "Dollars expended by state agencies using state term contracts and negotiated agreements" is appropriate because dollars expended through state term contracts and agreements are a measure of the contracts' importance to state agencies, and the state budget overall, and allow comparisons of purchasing operating costs to value of the awarded contracts.

Reliability:

The count of contracts and agreements are made using on-line documents that identify individual contracts and agreements. This information comes from one source and is compiled annually in a consistent manner. We, however, would like to measure how productive these contract are and measure instead the "Dollars expended by state agencies using state term contracts and negotiated agreements."

Office of Policy and Budget – July, 2006

LRPP EXHIBIT IV: Performance Measure Validity and Reliability

Department: Management Services

Program: Support Program

Service/Budget Entity: Purchasing Oversight

Measure: Dollars expended by state agencies using the state term contracts and negotiated agreements

Action (check one):

- Requesting revision to approved performance measure.
- Change in data sources or measurement methodologies.
- Requesting new measure.
- Backup for performance measure

Data Sources and Methodology: This is a measure for the Activity: Establish and Administer State Term (Master) Contracts and Negotiated Agreements (ACT1200). This measure identifies expenditures by state agencies using state term contracts and negotiated agreements. Data is captured from and documented in MyFloridaMarketPlace (e-procurement system). Expenditures are captured monthly for month and year-to-date.

Validity: This measure is verifiable using the electronic purchasing software system mentioned above. This measure is appropriate because dollars expended through state term contracts and agreements are a measure of the contracts' importance to state agencies, and the state budget overall, and allow comparisons of purchasing operating costs to value of the awarded contracts.

For example, during FY 2005-06, purchasing operating costs were less than 1% of total contract expenditures, while discounts averaged about 32% (an outcome measure). Every dollar spent on state contract represented on average \$.47 in savings (\$1.47 less 32%=\$1). Every dollar spent on operating state purchasing returned about \$155 in savings.

Our previous measure, which was a count of contract documents, has less relevance, due to the combination of smaller contracts into fewer larger contracts as part of our strategic sourcing initiative to reduce costs. The number of documents does not indicate the efficiency of the activity.

Reliability: State term contract and agreement purchase order totals are drawn from the electronic procurement systems through which purchase orders are issued. Total purchases may be understated due to some agency contracts and credit card expenditures which, while buying from state term contracts and agreements, are not captured in the purchase order databases. Therefore, the importance of state term contracts and agreements may be slightly understated.

Office of Policy and Budget – July, 2006

LRPP EXHIBIT IV: Performance Measure Validity and Reliability

Department: Department of Management Services

Program: Private Prison Monitoring

Service/Budget Entity: Private Prison Monitoring

Measure: Number of private prison contracts monitored

Action (check one):

- Requesting revision to approved performance measure.
- Change in data sources or measurement methodologies.
- Requesting new measure.
- Backup for performance measure.

Data Sources and Methodology: The source of data is the actual contracts that the Bureau of Private Prison Monitoring has entered into with vendors to operate private correctional facilities. The Bureau currently provides contractual oversight over the operations and management contracts for five private correctional facilities.

Validity: By law, the Department of Management Services, Bureau of Private Prison Monitoring, enters into contracts for the operation of private correctional facilities that have been funded and authorized by the Legislature. The contracts entered into by the Bureau can be fiscally counted and is a valid number.

Reliability: The measure is reliable because the number of contracts can be counted. The Legislature authorizes the construction of any new facilities and this affects the number of contracts the Bureau would execute and oversee.

Office of Policy and Budget – July, 2006

LRPP EXHIBIT IV: Performance Measure Validity and Reliability

Department: Department of Management Services

Program: Support Program

Service/Budget Entity: Office of Supplier Diversity

Measure: Average minority certification process time (in days)

Action (check one): No action requested

- Requesting revision to approved performance measure.
- Change in data sources or measurement methodologies.
- Requesting new measure
- Backup for performance measure.

Data Sources and Methodology:

The factors impacting the outcome of this performance measure will be significantly reduced as new programs are implemented during the upcoming year. There is no need to amend this measure to account for the current disparity.

Validity:

The OSD certified businesses an average of 16.5 days as opposed to the standard of 15. Having certified or recertified approximately 4,000 businesses during the past fiscal year is an indication that this measure should remain.

Reliability:

Staffing constraints impacted directly on the achievement of this impact. A condition that has improved dramatically resulting in increased man hours to address this measure. Currently the rate of certification is consistent with the measure as defined.

Office of Policy and Budget – July, 2006

LRPP EXHIBIT IV: Performance Measure Validity and Reliability

Department: Department of Management Services

Program: Support Program

Service/Budget Entity: Office of Supplier Diversity

Measure: Number of businesses certified and registered

Action (check one): No action requested

- Requesting revision to approved performance measure.
- Change in data sources or measurement methodologies.
- Requesting new measure
- Backup for performance measure.

Data Sources and Methodology:

The OSD utilizes the data collected through MyFloridaMarketPlace registrations and extracts by date the total number of businesses who conduct "commercially useful business functions," as outlined in statute 287.09451 as a base for determining business registrations and certification.

Validity:

The OSD has informed all vendors in its database since July 2003 of the need to register in MyFloridaMarketPlace and continues to direct all businesses encountered to establish MFMP registration.

Reliability:

The OSD continues to receive daily reports from MFPM and establishes a system of "checks and balances" between the established OSD database and that of MFMP.

Office of Policy and Budget – July, 2006

LRPP EXHIBIT IV: Performance Measure Validity and Reliability

Department: Department of Management Services

Program: Support Program

Service/Budget Entity: Office of Supplier Diversity

Measure: Number of businesses reviewed and audited

Action (check one): No action requested

- Requesting revision to approved performance measure.
- Change in data sources or measurement methodologies.
- Requesting new measure
- Backup for performance measure.

Data Sources and Methodology:

The OSD utilizes the data SPURSview reporting in conjunction with FLAIR generated reports to establish the number of certified minority and women's businesses that earn \$100,000 or more annually.

Validity:

The OSD has established a random sampling of those businesses with the highest dollar volume in each minority category included in the grouping.

Reliability:

The OSD as a part of its audit and review establishes the current status of the business's certification and verification of dollar amounts by comparison of dollar volume from both the vendor and agency listing.

Office of Policy and Budget – July, 2006

LRPP EXHIBIT IV: Performance Measure Validity and Reliability

Department: Department of Management Services

Program: Workforce

Service/Budget Entity: Human Resource Management

Measure: Total State Cost per Position in the State Agencies

Action (check one):

- Requesting revision to approved performance measure.
- Change in data sources or measurement methodologies.
- Requesting new measure.
- Backup for performance measure.

Data Sources and Methodology:

The Department of Management Services contracted with Convergys Customer Management Group, Inc. (Convergys/service provider) on August 21, 2002, to provide the State with a personnel information system (HR automated system) and an enterprise-wide suite of human resource services including payroll preparation, benefits, staffing and human resource administration.

The Division of Human Resource Management is proposing to change the title of this performance measure to more accurately reflect legislative intent. The current measure, *Total State Cost Per Position in the State Agencies*, was previously intended to provide the Legislature with information on the savings realized through the HR outsourcing initiative, People First!. This methodology included calculating the estimated cost of personnel services (as provided in the September 2001 Business Plan for the Human Resources Outsourcing Initiative), as a baseline measure, and comparing it to the cost of services provided after the implementation of the project, which includes services provided by the Division of Human Resource Management, agency residual personnel office staff and the personnel information system service provider for People First!. However, the methodology for this measure was changed when the Legislature assigned the cost per FTE in proviso language. This measure no longer includes the residual agency personnel office costs or the OPS costs. This measure only captures the per FTE cost that is calculated by the Office of Policy and Budget and Legislative staff at the end of legislative session since the final FTE count is available at that time. Therefore, the Division is proposing to change the title of this measure to "Cost Per FTE in the State Agencies."

Changing the title to *Cost Per FTE in the State Agencies* aligns the title with the assessment per FTE that each agency contributes toward the HR outsourcing contract and for services provided by the Division of Human Resource Management. The new methodology and title is more accurate and reliable since it meets the intent of the Legislature and because the Division is not the best source to obtain accurate and reliable data for the agency residual personnel costs.

Validity:

The Cost per FTE measure is a valid indicator of the State's cost for human resource services as provided to the State Personnel System agencies by the Division of Human Resource Management and to the covered entities by the HR outsourcing service provider for contracted services and the personnel information system. The Cost per FTE is determined by the Legislature and the Governor's Office of Policy and Budget, and it is included in proviso language in the General Appropriations Act.

Reliability:

Data reliability is ensured since the Office of Policy and Budget and the Legislature calculate the cost per FTE and the cost per FTE is a reliable indicator of costs required to provide human resource services to the agencies and employees.

Office of Policy and Budget – July, 2006

LRPP EXHIBIT IV: Performance Measure Validity and Reliability

Department: Department of Management Services

Program: Workforce

Service/Budget Entity: Human Resource Management

Measure: Number of State Agencies with Established Training Plans

Action (check one):

- Requesting revision to approved performance measure.
- Change in data sources or measurement methodologies.
- Requesting new measure.
- Backup for performance measure.

Data Sources and Methodology:

Section 110.235(2), Florida Statutes, requires each State Personnel System agency (21 Governor's agencies, including the Florida School for the Deaf and the Blind and the Division of Administrative Hearings, 5 Governor and Cabinet agencies, 3 Cabinet agencies, the Public Service Commission) to annually evaluate and report to the department the training it has implemented and the progress it has made in the area of training. To capture this information, the Division of Human Resource Management requests that agencies respond to a survey at the end of every fiscal year. That survey asks agencies if they have developed an annual training plan; whether a training needs assessment was conducted; what training goals have been identified; how many employees participated in courses offered; what percentage of their staff received training; what methodology is used to determine the value added from the training; accomplishments or goals obtained from training courses; what barriers prevented the agency from achieving training goals and what the agency's training goals for the upcoming fiscal year. By agencies submitting their annual reports, the Division will be able to assess whether performance enhancement strategies are incorporated into agency programs.

For the purposes of this measure, only the answer to the first question, "For FY 2005-2006, did your agency have an established training plan?" is used to report the measure. The performance standard anticipates an affirmative answer from all 30 agencies.

The Division's Contact Management System, in which all correspondence received by the Division is logged, serves to document receipt of the agencies' training information.

Validity:

The Division will be able to document agencies' compliance with this reporting requirement through the Division's internal system for tracking correspondence, Contact Management System.

Reliability:

In accordance with established procedures, all correspondence received by the Division is date stamped and entered into the Contact Management System by the assigned staff member. The Contact Management System will serve to document receipt of the agencies' training information.

Office of Policy and Budget – July, 2006

LRPP EXHIBIT IV: Performance Measure Validity and Reliability

Department: Department of Management Services

Program: Workforce

Service/Budget Entity: Human Resource Management

Measure: Percent of All Contracted Performance Standards Met (Outsourced HR)

Action (check one):

- Requesting revision to approved performance measure.
- Change in data sources or measurement methodologies.
- Requesting new measure.
- Backup for performance measure.

Data Sources and Methodology:

The Department of Management Services contracted with Convergys Customer Management Group, Inc. (Convergys/service provider) on August 21, 2002. This contract provides the customer entities (21 Governor's agencies, including the Division of Administrative Hearings and the Florida School for the Deaf and the Blind; 3 Cabinet agencies; 5 Governor and Cabinet agencies; and the Public Service Commission, the Justice Administrative Commission; the Florida Lottery, the State Courts System, Universities and Benefits only entities) with a personnel information system (HR automated system) and an enterprise-wide suite of human resource services including payroll preparation, benefits, staffing and human resource administration.

As the contract administrator, the Division of Human Resource Management manages the contract and oversees the performance of the service provider to ensure compliance with the provisions, including agreed-upon performance standards and delivery of quality services to the users of the system. The People First! contract requires the service provider to submit reports indicating performance on each of the contracted standards. Examples of performance metrics included in the contract are: customer satisfaction, payroll preparation, self-service availability, forced disconnects, and benefits eligibility. The performance measure, "Percent of All Contracted Standards Met," seeks to provide the Legislature with information on the performance of the service provider. To determine this percentage, the total number of performance standards met is divided by the total number of performance standards measured.

NOTE: The Division of Human Resource Management will be reviewing this performance measure and may request a change to the methodology via the Budget Amendment process.

Validity:

The validity of the measure is ensured because the performance measures and standards are set in the contract with the service provider. The Division of Human Resource Management monitors the validity of the service provider's performance information as the Department has access to the data.

Reliability:

Reliability of the measure is ensured because the performance standards are specified in the service provider contract and most of the performance data is system generated.

Office of Policy and Budget – July, 2006

LRPP EXHIBIT IV: Performance Measure Validity and Reliability

Department: Department of Management Services

Program: Workforce

Service/Budget Entity: Human Resource Management

Measure: Overall Customer Satisfaction Rating

Action (check one):

- Requesting revision to approved performance measure.
- Change in data sources or measurement methodologies.
- Requesting new measure.
- Backup for performance measure.

Data Sources and Methodology:

The Division of Human Resource Management (HRM) provides customer agencies with information and technical assistance on various human resource-related topics/issues to assist them in the administration of their human resource programs. Our primary customer base is the 30 agency personnel officers in the executive branch agencies (21 Governor's agencies, including the Fish & Wildlife Conservation Commission the Division of Administrative Hearings, and the Florida School for the Deaf and the Blind; 5 Governor and Cabinet agencies; 3 Cabinet agencies; and the Public Service Commission) from which we receive the human resources assessment as prescribed in the General Appropriations Act. Customer satisfaction surveys are sent to each agency's personnel officer to assess their overall satisfaction with the services (e.g. information and technical assistance) provided by HRM. These "services" are critical elements in ensuring agencies make more effective and efficient human resource-related decisions.

The number of responses indicating satisfaction with our services is divided by the total number of responses to the question to arrive at the percentage of satisfied customers. The performance standard assumes a consistent level of satisfaction from 29 of the 30 agencies surveyed.

NOTE: The Division of Human Resource Management will be conducting a review of this performance measure and may request a change in the data sources and methodology of this performance measure via the Budget Amendment process.

Validity:

The Division of Human Resource Management focuses on developing and supporting a human resource infrastructure designed to assist agencies in recruiting, retaining, rewarding and recognizing a high performance workforce for the State of Florida. The customer satisfaction measure for HRM provides a means to evaluate the value of our services so that we can determine how well we are meeting this goal.

The Division employed procedures to ensure that the return rate from the target population was sufficient to meet the standard. These procedures include reminders at

the personnel officers' meetings, follow up transmissions of the survey, emails and phone calls to customers who missed the original due date.

Reliability:

With the exception of some modifications, this is the sixth year that the Division has used this survey instrument to capture customer satisfaction with the services (technical assistance and information) provided. Therefore, the baseline that was established in previous years is a reliable source. This measure can be used to assess the effectiveness of Human Resource Management's performance and the ultimate results or impacts of the products and services provided. However, it should be noted that this survey is not based on objective criteria but rather subjective responses from the participant.

Office of Policy and Budget – July, 2006

LRPP EXHIBIT IV: Performance Measure Validity and Reliability

Department: Department of Management Services

Program: Workforce

Service/Budget Entity: Human Resource Management

Measure: Percent of Agencies at or Above EEO Minority and Gender Parity with Available Labor Market

Action (check one):

- Requesting revision to approved performance measure.
- Change in data sources or measurement methodologies.
- Requesting new measure.
- Backup for performance measure.

Data Sources and Methodology:

The Division of Human Resource Management (HRM) uses this as an informational measure reflecting gender and minority representation in the executive branch agencies as compared to the available labor market. A labor market parity measure of the agencies is an appraisal of how successful the agencies are in employing a diverse workforce that is representative of the state's overall population. Workforce composition data is collected for the executive branch agencies (22 Governor's agencies; including the Division of Administrative Hearings, the Florida School for the Deaf and the Blind, and the Florida Lottery; 5 Governor and Cabinet agencies; 3 Cabinet agencies; and the Public Service Commission) from the State's personnel information system data warehouse database and compared to the available labor market from the most current federal census data (2000 Census/Equal Employment Opportunity (EEO) Special File).

The federal courts have allowed for some variance in parity to account for other factors that influence hiring decisions. To account for those factors, it is acceptable for the percentage of representation of an EEO group in the workforce to be within two standard deviations of their available labor market percentage in the relevant recruiting area (minority parity =33% and female parity=47%). To determine the percentage of agencies at parity, the Division divided the number of agencies that met the parity standard by the total number of agencies.

Performance Standards:

Gender Representation: The performance standard assumes that at least 27 out of 31 agencies are going to achieve parity

Minority Representation: The performance standard assumes that at least 24 out of 31 agencies are going to achieve parity

Agencies are responsible for all hiring decisions and therefore, this measure is not reflective of the Division's performance.

Validity:

Agencies are responsible for the actual recruitment, selection and retention of a diverse workforce representative of Florida's labor market. This measure is appropriate because it provides the Legislature with information on minority and gender hiring trends for the State as an employer.

Reliability:

By using the State's personnel information system each year, it assures reliability of the data from year to year. Compatibility with the latest federal census also assures reliability of the data.

Office of Policy and Budget – July, 2006

LRPP EXHIBIT IV: Performance Measure Validity and Reliability

Department: Department of Management Services

Program: Workforce

Service/Budget Entity: Human Resource Management

Measure: Number of Positions in the State Agencies Supported by the HR Automated System

Action (check one):

- Requesting revision to approved performance measure.
- Change in data sources or measurement methodologies.
- Requesting new measure.
- Backup for performance measure.

Data Sources and Methodology:

The Department of Management Services contracted with Convergys Customer Management Group, Inc. (Convergys/service provider) on August 21, 2002, to provide the State with a personnel information system (HR automated system) and an enterprise-wide suite of human resource services including payroll preparation, benefits, staffing and human resource administration. The personnel information system, People First!, maintains position and employee data for customer agencies, (which include 22 Governor's agencies, including the Division of Administrative Hearings, the Florida Lottery and the Florida School for the Deaf and the Blind); 5 Governor and Cabinet agencies; 3 Cabinet agencies; the Public Service Commission; the Justice Administrative Commission; and the State Courts System) and also maintains data on other personal services employees.

For each fiscal year, data for the number of established positions and other personal services employees is obtained from the personnel information system's data warehouse. Using data as of June 30th, the measure is calculated by adding the number of established positions and the number of other personal services employees receiving human resource services provided by Convergys. This is a valid output measure since the number of positions receiving services directly correlates to funding the cost of the People First! contract. This is also a unit cost measure.

Validity:

This is a valid output measure since the number of positions and other personal services employees directly correlates to the services provided by the service provider.

Reliability:

The number of positions is reliable as it is compiled from the personnel information system's data warehouse.

Office of Policy and Budget – July, 2006

LRPP EXHIBIT IV: Performance Measure Validity and Reliability

Department: Department of Management Services

Program: Workforce

Service/Budget Entity: Human Resource Management

Measure: Number of Responses to Technical Assistance Requests

Action (check one):

- Requesting revision to approved performance measure.
- Change in data sources or measurement methodologies.
- Requesting new measure.
- Backup for performance measure.

Data Sources and Methodology:

The Division of Human Resource Management (HRM) has adopted this unit cost measure to calculate the number of requests for technical assistance provided by the Division regarding human resource policies, procedures and programs. HRM provides State Personnel System agencies (21 Governor's agencies, including the Division of Administrative Hearings and the Florida School for the Deaf and the Blind; 3 Cabinet agencies; 5 Governor and Cabinet agencies; and the Public Service Commission, the Justice Administrative Commission; the Florida Lottery, the State Courts System) with technical assistance in various human resource related areas in order to assist agencies administer effective and efficient human resource programs. Technical assistance is provided to the agencies both verbally and in writing. HRM also serves the general public and other public employers by providing information on the State's personnel system and its employees.

The number of responses to technical assistance requests was derived by using data from an automated internal tracking system comprised of a Contact Management and Phone Tracking segment. These systems assist the Division of Human Resource Management in maintaining a record of the requests for technical assistance; gathering information for performance-based program budgeting measures; and identifying specific trends reflecting specific agency needs. Reports are generated from each segment of the system to provide the total number of contacts by agency/entity, by employees and by subject category. These reports also include year-to-date and fiscal year trends.

The performance standards have been exceeded due to the various human resource initiatives occurring during the fiscal years such as People First!, Service First, Adoption Benefits, Broadbanding, Rules, etc. The standard also represents a leveling-off of the number of requests for services since agencies are accountable for the management of their human resource programs.

Validity:

The Division of Human Resource Management provides technical assistance pertaining to various human resource programs such as classification and compensation, employment issues, employee benefits, training, workforce transition, and reporting to help the agencies better manage their workforce. Measuring the number of responses to technical assistance requests provides management with a tool to help determine the Division's productivity, as well as, identify the type of training agencies need and the level of technical assistance requested. This will enable the Division to continue improving performance in the delivery of these services to the agencies and maintain appropriate staffing.

Reliability:

The Division relies on an internal automated tracking system to capture this output. The use of these automated systems is more reliable than using estimates or a manual system to maintain an accurate count of the requests for technical assistance. These systems allow the data reports to be sorted by user, dates, topic, pending contacts and response time.

A possible threat to the reliability of the measure is that employees are responsible for recording all requests for technical assistance into one of the automated tracking systems. The data for this measure depends on how accurate and consistent employees are entering the data into these systems. Quarterly data reports, as well as, year-to-date trends are reviewed to ensure accuracy and consistency of the data.

Office of Policy and Budget – July, 2006

LRPP EXHIBIT IV: Performance Measure Validity and Reliability

Department: Department of Management Services

Program: Workforce

Service/Budget Entity: Human Resource Management

Measure: Percent of Dollars Saved by Eliminating and Reducing Expenses

Action (check one):

- Requesting revision to approved performance measure.
- Change in data sources or measurement methodologies.
- Requesting new measure.
- Backup for performance measure.

Data Sources and Methodology:

This measure captures savings generated by agencies that are shared with employees as a means to reward, and recognize high-performing employees. In support of the Savings Sharing Program, (as authorized in Section 110.1245, Florida Statutes), agencies are surveyed to ascertain the number of proposals received; number of proposals implemented; associated cost savings; the number and amount of increases to base rate of pay; and, the number and amount of bonuses awarded to employees from generated savings.

The Office of Policy and Budget verifies information for the Division of Human Resource Management regarding the agencies and their corresponding savings generated from internally-generated program efficiencies and cost reductions that were approved by the Office of Policy and Budget and the Legislative Budget Commission. This measure previously included in its calculation the dollars saved by eliminating positions. However, the 2005 Legislature amended s. 216.262, F.S., and removed the incentive that rewarded agencies for proposing program efficiencies that eliminated positions.

This measure is calculated by dividing total amount saved by total amount of dollars used to reward employees.

NOTE: The Division of Human Resource Management will be conducting a review of this performance measure and may request a change to this measure or request this measure be deleted due to lack of agency participation in the Savings Sharing Program via the Budget Amendment process.

Validity:

The Division of Human Resource Management added this measure to capture savings by agencies that are shared with employees as a means to retain, reward, and recognize high performing employees. The Division recognizes that a possible threat to the validity of this measure is that agencies may not report the information correctly.

Reliability:

The reporting form can be tested for reliability since the Office of Policy and Budget and the Legislative Budget Commission, who are required to review and approve the

agency's plan for their incentive and savings program, can verify the responses regarding approved savings, lump-sum bonuses, and increases to base rate of pay. Similarly, the number and amount of increases to base rate of pay and lump-sum bonuses awarded can be verified from the State's personnel information system.

Office of Policy and Budget – July, 2006

LRPP EXHIBIT IV: Performance Measure Validity and Reliability

Department: Department of Management Services

Program: Workforce

Service/Budget Entity: Insurance Benefits Administration

Measure: Percent of All Contracted Performance Standards Met

Action (check one):

- Requesting revision to approved performance measure.
- Change in data sources or measurement methodologies.
- Requesting new measure.
- Backup for performance measure.

Data Sources and Methodology:

Various contracted vendors are required to submit to the Division of State Group Insurance (DSGI) monthly, quarterly, semi-annual, and annual reports representing their compliance with contractually required performance standards.

Electronic and hard copy data is provided by the various contracted vendors on a monthly, quarterly, and annual basis depending upon the contractual reporting requirement. Data is distributed to the appropriate DSGI staff for compilation and verification and to determine whether the vendors' performance met standards.

The performance measure is computed based on mutually agreed upon methods between DSGI and the contracted vendors. In some cases, agreed upon standard operating procedures are in place. The percent of all contracted performance standards met is computed based on the following formula:

$$\frac{\text{Number of CPS}}{\text{Total Number of CPS}} = \% \text{ of all CPS met}$$

$$\text{Total Number of CPS} = \text{Number of CPS} \times \text{Frequency of Measure}$$

Validity:

DSGI performs routine and ad-hoc audits, and other activities/analyses, to monitor vendor performance in accordance with the contractual performance standards and to validate self-reported performance results. Representations by the vendors through the monthly, quarterly, semi-annual, and annual reports are validated through this monitoring process.

The percent of all contracted performance standards met allows DSGI to determine overall contractual performance by its contracted vendors.

Reliability:

DSGI performs routine and ad-hoc audits, and other activities/analyses, to monitor vendor performance in accordance with the contractual performance standards and to validate self-reported performance results. Representations by the vendors through the monthly, quarterly, semi-annual, and annual reports are validated through this monitoring process.

The Division obtains reasonable assurance regarding the reliability of self-reported performance results through this monitoring process.

Office of Policy and Budget – July 2006

LRPP EXHIBIT IV: Performance Measure Validity and Reliability

Department: Department of Management Services

Program: Workforce

Service/Budget Entity: Insurance Benefits Administration

Measure: State Employees' Preferred Provider Organization Plan – per member/per year cost – (State) compared to the per member/per year cost – (National Benchmark)

Action (check one):

- Requesting revision to approved performance measure.
- Change in data sources or measurement methodologies.
- Requesting new measure.
- Backup for performance measure.

Data Sources and Methodology:

The Division of State Group Insurance (DSGI) has entered into an Administrative Services contract with a servicing agent in order to obtain third-party administrative services, access to a preferred provider network, benefit and utilization management and other services, as they relate to medical services, for the State Employees' Preferred Provider Organization (PPO) plan and its participants. In addition, DSGI has entered into a contract with a Pharmacy Benefits Manager (PBM) to obtain prescription drug cards and mail order services. These services include, but are not limited to, a retail pharmacy network, dispensing drugs through a mail order pharmacy service and claims processing and adjudication. DSGI prepares monthly reports capturing medical and pharmacy utilization and cost data of the State Employees' PPO Plan.

Enrollment information of the State Employees' Group Insurance Program is entered, updated, and stored in the PeopleFirst computerized personnel system by manual input either by the participant, Agency Benefits Coordinators, or PeopleFirst staff. Participants and Agency Benefits Coordinators entered data via the internet web site.

Monthly expenditure information is compiled and reported by several units within DSGI and referred to the appropriate staff member for data verification and reporting. Monthly enrollment information is produced by PeopleFirst computerized personnel system.

The per member per year cost is calculated by dividing the annual medical and pharmacy claim costs of the State Employees' PPO Plan by the average number of members in the program for the fiscal year (members are synonymous with subscribers). The benchmark is obtained from comparable and reliable health insurance industry survey data.

Validity:

Monthly reconciliations are performed by appropriate DSGI staff to ensure that the State Employees' PPO Plan claims costs are accurately compiled and reflected in the reports prepared by DSGI. In addition, monthly reconciliations of enrollment data are performed by DSGI to ensure data accuracy and consistency.

A major objective of DSGI is to provide quality and cost-effective health insurance benefits to its customers in a cost-effective manner. This measure quantifies the direct cost of the State Employees' Group Health Insurance Program and how it compares with national benchmarks. Measuring this cost and comparing it to a benchmark provides a clear picture of how cost-effective the program is managed.

Reliability:

Based upon a consistent methodology of measurement, this measure can be compared to itself over time and provides accurate trend data. DSGI has procedures in place to verify data accuracy. Reconciliation of data is performed on routine basis to ensure that State Employees' PPO Plan claims data is correctly compiled.

However, measuring this cost and comparing it to a national benchmark may render differing results due to circumstances beyond the Division's control thus affecting the reliability of the reported outcome. Factors such as: benefit design, family composition and age/sex demographics of enrolled population, premium structure, geographic price and inflation differences, behavioral differences in the utilization of services, medical and pharmacy management protocols, all influence the related cost calculations.

This measure is currently under review to determine if it would be appropriate to request that the measure be deleted.

Office of Policy and Budget – July 2006

LRPP EXHIBIT IV: Performance Measure Validity and Reliability

Department: Department of Management Services

Program: Workforce

Service/Budget Entity: Insurance Benefits Administration

Measure: DMS Administrative Cost Per Insurance Enrollee

Action (check one):

- Requesting revision to approved performance measure.
- Change in data sources or measurement methodologies.
- Requesting new measure.
- Backup for performance measure.

Data Sources and Methodology:

The Division of State Group Insurance (DSGI) prepares monthly cash flow statements summarizing data maintained by the State of Florida's Accounting System (FLAIR). Data pertaining to operating fund expenditures is maintained in the FLAIR database and reported in DSGI's monthly cash flow statements.

Enrollment information of all the insurance and benefits programs administered by DSGI are entered, updated, and stored in the PeopleFirst computerized personnel system by manual input either by the participant, Agency Benefits Coordinators, or PeopleFirst staff. Participants and Agency Benefits Coordinator enter data via the internet web site.

Monthly operating fund expenditures information is compiled and reported by several units within DSGI and referred to the appropriate staff member for data verification and reporting.

The average annual administrative cost per insurance enrollee will be calculated by dividing operating fund expenditures of all programs administered by DSGI by the average number of enrollees in all insurance and benefit programs administered by DSGI during the fiscal year.

The operating fund expenditures categories that will be considered for this calculation are salaries and benefits, other personal services, expenses, operating capital outlay, transfer to administrative hearings, risk management insurance, human resource statewide contract, and technology resource center.

The operating fund expenditures are from the following trust funds:

- State Employees' Group Health Self-Insurance Trust Fund
- State Employees' Group Life Insurance Trust Fund
- Group Disability Benefits Trust Fund
- Pre-Tax Benefits Trust Fund

Recurring operating fund expenditures exclude Administrative Service Only costs. These costs are contractual payments to the Third-Party Administrators of the State Employees' PPO Plan for claims handling, customer service, and other administrative services and therefore, are not associated with DSGI's internal operations and do not reflect operational efficiency.

Validity:

Monthly reconciliations are performed by the appropriate DSGI staff to ensure that operating fund expenditures are reflected in the FLAIR database. In addition, monthly reconciliations of enrollment data are performed by DSGI to ensure data accuracy and consistency.

DSGI places a focused emphasis on delivering high quality and cost-effective services to the State's workforce using best technology. Measuring this cost provides information to DSGI staff to identify how to better allocate resources in order to provide more efficient services in a cost-effective manner.

Reliability:

This measure is reliable because it can be compared to itself over time and provides accurate trend data. DSGI has procedures in place to classify and code expenditures into the FLAIR database. Reconciliation of data inputted in the FLAIR database against DSGI cash flow statements is performed on a routine basis. Findings are documented, verified, corrected, and discussed with the appropriate staff to ensure understanding and compliance with established procedures.

In addition, written procedures are in place to provide guidelines to Agency Benefit Coordinators and to PeopleFirst staff to properly input enrollment data in the PeopleFirst computerized personnel system from information contained in the *Standard Enrollment Form*.

Office of Policy and Budget – July 2006

LRPP EXHIBIT IV: Performance Measure Validity and Reliability

Department: Department of Management Services

Program: Workforce

Service/Budget Entity: Insurance Benefits Administration

Measure: State Employees' Preferred Provider Organization Plan – Vendors' Administration Cost Per Insurance Enrollee

Action (check one):

- Requesting revision to approved performance measure.
- Change in data sources or measurement methodologies.
- Requesting new measure.
- Backup for performance measure.

Data Sources and Methodology:

The Division of State Group Insurance (DSGI) has entered into an Administrative Services Contract with a Servicing Agent in order to obtain third-party administrative services, access to a preferred provider network, benefit and utilization management and other services, as they relate to medical services, for the State Employees' Preferred Provider Organization (PPO) plan and its participants. In addition, DSGI has entered into a contract with a Pharmacy Benefits Manager (PBM) to obtain prescription drug card and mail order services. These services include, but are not limited to, a retail pharmacy network, dispensing drugs through a mail order pharmacy service and claims processing and adjudication.

The Servicing Agent is paid a monthly administrative fee per enrollee. Monthly administrative fee invoices are prepared by the Servicing Agent and reviewed for accuracy by DSGI.

The vendors' administrative cost per insurance enrollee is calculated by dividing the total fiscal year Administrative Services costs incurred during the year by the average number of members in the State Employees' PPO Plan for the fiscal year (members are synonymous with subscribers).

Enrollment information of the State Employees' PPO Plan is entered, updated, and stored in the PeopleFirst computerized personnel system by manual input either by the participant, Agency Benefits Coordinators, or PeopleFirst staff. Participants and Agency Benefits Coordinators enter data via the internet web site.

Validity:

Monthly reconciliations are performed by the appropriate DSGI staff member to ensure that monthly administrative fee invoices are prepared according to contract specifications and that the administrative per month per enrollee fee is

accurate. In addition, monthly reconciliations of enrollment data are performed by DSGI to ensure data accuracy and consistency. An examination of enrollment data extracted from the PeopleFirst computerized personnel system is routinely performed by DSGI to ensure data accuracy of inputted data.

This measure quantifies the fiscal impact of the services contracted by DSGI to administer the benefits of the State Employees' PPO Plan. Measuring this cost provides information of the fiscal impact to the State Employees' Group Health Insurance Trust Fund of contracting these services.

Reliability:

This measure is reliable because it can be compared against itself over time and provides accurate trend data. DSGI has procedures in place to verify the accuracy of the administrative fee invoices prepared by the Servicing Agent. In addition, written procedures are in place to provide guidelines to Agency Benefit Coordinators and to PeopleFirst staff to properly input enrollment data in the PeopleFirst computerized personnel system from information contained in the *Standard Enrollment Form*.

This measure is currently under review to determine if it would be appropriate to request that the measure be deleted.

Office of Policy and Budget – July 2006

LRPP EXHIBIT IV: Performance Measure Validity and Reliability

Department: Department of Management Services

Program: Workforce

Service/Budget Entity: Insurance Benefits Administration

Measure: Percent of Insurance Benefits Administration Customers Satisfied

Action (check one):

- Requesting revision to approved performance measure.
- Change in data sources or measurement methodologies.
- Requesting new measure.
- Backup for performance measure.

Data Sources and Methodology:

The population selected to participate in the Division of State Group Insurance (DSGI) Customer Satisfaction Survey will consist of subscribers enrolled in all the insurance and benefit programs administered by DSGI at the date of the study. Actual methodology limits the selected population to subscribers enrolled in the State Employees' Group Health Insurance Program and therefore the results of the survey do not take into consideration customer satisfaction relevant to the other insurance and benefit programs administered by DSGI. The revised methodology would allow the reporting of a performance indicator that would measure customer satisfaction relating to services provided by DSGI in administering all insurance and benefits programs.

A recognized institution in the field of research and customer service surveys is contracted by DSGI to conduct the survey. In the last years, the Survey Research Laboratory (SRL), which is part of the College of Social Sciences at Florida State University, has conducted the survey.

The survey is a list-generated phone survey conducted using Computer Assisted Telephone Interviewing (CATI) techniques. The CATI techniques allow for scripted interviewing which produces more reliable data by minimizing coding error. Each interviewer works from a standard script stored on the local network at Florida State University's SRL. Answers to the scripted questions are entered into a networked computer terminal. The CATI system aggregates the results of each survey into a single data file. The data is coded and cleaned using CATI based tools.

The sample of telephone numbers is randomly selected from the PeopleFirst enrollment database by SRL. The sample size is computed based on a 95% confidence level and a plus or minor of 3% expected error rate.

A team of trained interviewers makes telephone calls to potential respondents during daytime and evening hours, Sunday through Friday. Respondents are

given a word classification scale to rank their satisfaction with the several aspects of the insurance benefit programs, including customer service, administration and benefits offerings.

The scale to be used by the respondents will utilize word classifications, such as "satisfy," "neutral," "dissatisfied," and "don't know" to rank their satisfaction level, instead of using a number scale of 1 to 5. The association of word classifications with people's perception about DSGI's performance is more direct, easier to comprehend, and more clearly conveying views than the association of a number scale with people's perception. The change from a number scale to a word classification scale would make the survey more straightforward to the respondents. As the association of word classification is more direct, easier to comprehend and clearly conveying views than a number scale, the revised survey instrument would be more appealing to the respondents than the one that uses number scale. In addition, the change from a number scale to word classifications reduces an unnecessary step of number assignment by the respondent and hence minimized the chance of introducing bias to different understanding of number impression correspondence. The word classification will be developed to provide respondents with sufficient option to allow them to answer according to their perceptions.

The standard on the customer satisfaction survey will be established on a percentage basis instead of on an average basis, in a scale of 1 to 5, with 1 equaling the lowest level of satisfaction and 5 indicating the highest. This standard will provide information on the proportion of subscribers enrolled in all the insurance and benefit programs administered by DSGI who are satisfied (dissatisfied) with the performance of DSGI. As in any survey, there always exists the possibility of getting potential outliers among survey responses. Outliers are extreme values that stand out from the rest of the survey sample and may be faulty under certain circumstances. Reporting based on profiling the proportion if the survey population's impressions could help to counter the outlier effect that could have in simply averaging. Reporting without attention to outliers could skew the general picture of the evaluation by enlarging the influence, mathematically, of the outliers.

Validity:

The Customer Satisfaction Survey measures overall customer satisfaction relating to the various services rendered by DSGI in performing its administrative responsibilities relevant to the insurance and benefit programs administered by DSGI. The sample of telephone numbers is randomly obtained from the PeopleFirst database by SRL.

The sample is drawn with an expected error rate of a plus or minus 3% and a 95% confidence level. This means that 95 times out of 100, the results for any question will fall within plus or minus 3% of what would have been obtained if all participants had been interviewed.

The survey is a list-generated telephone survey conducted using CATI techniques. The CATI techniques allow for scripted interviewing which produces more reliable data by minimizing coding error.

In conducting surveys, the contracted institutions staff adheres to the Code of Professional Ethics and Practices of the American Association for Public Opinion Research. The professionals associated with the process of conducting this survey are also dedicated to adapting sophisticated research techniques used in academic research for use in the answering questions facing state, regional, and local governments.

Reliability:

This measure is reliable because it can be compared to itself over time and provides accurate trend data.

A recognized institution in the field of research and customer service surveys is contracted by DSGI to conduct the survey. In the last years the SRL, which is part of the College of Social Sciences at Florida State University, has conducted the survey.

The SRL uses a two-stage process to clean and work its telephone lists. In the first stage, the lab calls each number to verify that it is a working, non-business number. If no contact was made after twelve attempts, the number is discarded. In the second stage, the lab calls the remaining working numbers until a respondent is reached. Only those households with an eligible sample unit (Florida resident over 18 years of age) are interviewed. This process can result in more completed surveys than required by the study if the number of eligible households is greater than expected.

The sample of telephone numbers is randomly selected from the PeopleFirst enrollment database by SRL. The sample size is computed based on a 95% confidence level and a plus or minus 3% expected error rate.

LRPP EXHIBIT IV: Performance Measure Validity and Reliability

Department: Department of Management Services

Program: Workforce

Service/Budget Entity: Insurance Benefits Administration

Measure: Number of Enrollees (Total, Health, Life, Flexible Spending, Supplemental Insurance, and Disability)

Action (check one):

- Requesting revision to approved performance measure.
- Change in data sources or measurement methodologies.
- Requesting new measure.
- Backup for performance measure.

Data Sources and Methodology:

The source of data for the number of enrollees in the five DSGI offered programs is obtained from the PeopleFirst computerized personnel system. The five programs are Health Insurance, Life Insurance, Flexible Spending Accounts, Supplemental Insurance, and Disability Benefits. Enrollment information is entered, updated, and stored in the PeopleFirst computerized personnel system by manual input by the participant, Agency Benefits Coordinators, or PeopleFirst staff. Participants and Agency Benefits Coordinators enter data via the internet web site.

Participants, Agency Benefits Coordinators or PeopleFirst staff members input data into the PeopleFirst system to enroll new employees and to make employees' enrollment and benefit changes resulting from a Qualifying Status Change Event (QSCE) and process changes for enrollees associated with the Consolidated Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1985 (COBRA).

Routine data reviews are performed by DSGI staff to test data accuracy of enrollment information inputted into the PeopleFirst computerized personnel system. In addition, enrollment reports are reconciled to assure data accuracy and consistency within all reports.

Validity:

Monthly reconciliations are performed by DSGI to ensure data accuracy and consistency among all enrollment reports. An examination of PeopleFirst computerized personnel system is routinely performed by DSGI to monitor data accuracy of manually inputted data.

This measure provides information on the volume of state employees and retirees' participation in the group insurance programs administered by DSGI.

Reliability:

Written procedures are in place to provide guidelines to Agency Benefit Coordinators to appropriately input data into the PeopleFirst computerized personnel system from information contained in the *Standard Enrollment Form*.

Edits are integrated in the PeopleFirst Internet Web Site to only process specific enrollment and benefit changes entered by enrollees during the Open Enrollment period. Non-authorized enrollment and benefit changes cannot be keyed in the PeopleFirst Internet Web Site. Instructions are automatically provided online to eligible participants during the open enrollment period.

A review of the PeopleFirst computerized personnel system is routinely performed by DSGI to monitor performance of Agency Benefit Coordinators and the PeopleFirst staff as it relates to the activity of inputting enrollment data in PeopleFirst computerized personnel system.

Office of Policy and Budget – July 2006

LRPP EXHIBIT IV: Performance Measure Validity and Reliability

Department: Management Services

Program: Workforce

Service/Budget Entity: Retirement Benefits Administration

Measure: Percent of Members Satisfied with Retirement Services

Action (check one):

- Requesting revision to approved performance measure.
- Change in data sources or measurement methodologies.
- Requesting new measure.
- Backup for performance measure.

Data Sources and Methodology:

This measures the members overall satisfaction with retirement services. The survey results for this year will not be available until December 2006. No significant change is expected compared with prior year results.

Statistically valid surveys of active members, recent retirees, and other retirees provide the source of data for this measure. One survey is conducted annually of each source group. An independent contractor performs all statistical calculations and manipulations.

Validity:

Statistically valid surveys are conducted to determine customer satisfaction with retirement information. Any threats to the validity of the measure are minimized through the use of professionally developed survey questionnaires, validated by an independent contractor, that survey an appropriate statistical sample of customers. It should be noted that the survey instrument will change over time due to changing information needs; however, similar survey questions are presented for several years in order to enhance validity.

Reliability:

Consistent questions on similar subject matter are presented during the survey process over several years. Statistically valid samples validated by an independent contractor are used on each source group with different samplings on each survey in order to minimize fluctuations.

Office of Policy and Budget – July, 2006

LRPP EXHIBIT IV: Performance Measure Validity and Reliability

Department: Management Services

Program: Workforce

Service/Budget Entity: Retirement Benefits Administration

Measure: Percent of Retired Payrolls Processed Timely

Action (check one):

- Requesting revision to approved performance measure.
- Change in data sources or measurement methodologies.
- Requesting new measure.
- Backup for performance measure.

Data Sources and Methodology:

This captures one of the most important aspects of service provided by the Division. Service retirees are regular retirees as opposed to disability or survivor benefits. The required data source used to evaluate this measure is the monthly schedule of the Retired Payroll, which reflects in advance the due dates for processing monthly and weekly payrolls. The measure is appropriate as it distinctly establishes the relationship of the due dates against the actual processed dates.

The required data source used to evaluate this measure is the monthly schedule of the Retired Payroll, which reflects in advance the due dates for processing monthly and weekly payrolls. The methodology used to collect the data and to calculate the results is to review the schedule with the due dates and to compare with the actual dates the payroll was processed. The procedure used to measure the indicator is to compare the scheduled due dates against the actual dates the payrolls were processed.

Validity:

The methodology is used to compare the pre-established due dates against the actual processing dates of the payroll. This is used, as it is extremely accurate and reliable in determining the wanted results. The measure is appropriate as it distinctly establishes the relationship of the due dates against the actual processed dates. It clearly produces the measurement's outcome.

Reliability:

This measurement is easily obtained and the data sources are completely reliable. The due dates are in a written schedule that is prepared long in advance of the actual process run. The actual process is systemically run and the actual run date is maintained by the computer system and cannot be altered. This measurement is 100% reliable as the measurement is contained in the computer system and cannot be altered.

LRPP EXHIBIT IV: Performance Measure Validity and Reliability

Department: Management Services

Program: Workforce

Service/Budget Entity: Retirement Benefits Administration

Measure: Percent of Service Retirees Added to the Next Payroll After Receipt of all Documents

Action (check one):

- Requesting revision to approved performance measure.
- Change in data sources or measurement methodologies.
- Requesting new measure.
- Backup for performance measure.

Data Sources and Methodology:

This captures one of the most important aspects of service provided by the Division. The data source for this measure is Retirement Benefits Administration's Automated Image Workflow Process. Once all documentation is received, the retirement folder is moved to the Analyze queue for final review and acceptance. When the folder is verified, the member's name is added to the retired payroll for the appropriate month of retirement.

The data source for the measure is the Division of Retirement Automated Image Workflow Process.

All retirement applications are indexed, imaged, and placed in the Bureau's workflow process. Applications are acknowledged, an estimate of benefit is provided, and the member is advised if additional information is required to process the application. The retirement folder is placed in pending workflow if additional documentation is needed, or if the retirement date is several weeks or months in the future. When the required documents are received, the documents are placed in a queue for processing. Once all documentation is received, the folder is moved to the Analyze queue for final review and acceptance. When the folder is verified, the member's name is added to the retired payroll for the appropriate month of retirement.

To expedite the timeliness of a member receiving their first benefit payment, once the member's folder is analyzed and accepted, the Division's computerized information system automatically adds that member to the next weekly-retired payroll. This first payment would include all amounts due from the date of retirement eligibility. The member is then paid monthly thereafter the appropriate benefit due. A report will be required to compute the average percent each payroll period that members are added to the first appropriate retired payroll after the date all required documentation is received in the bureau. A management report must be developed by the Information Technology Group to capture the data needed to calculate the percent. Perhaps the last date a document is received in the Prepare Queue and the date the folder is verified can be matched and summarized and the percent determined monthly or annually by section and bureau.

Validity:

In December 1999, the Division of Retirement completed development of a computerized information system that converted the Bureau's workflow from a manual intensive process involving hard copy files and microfiche documents to paperless process. Since January 2000, information requests have been imaged and entered in a systemic distribution process that enables staff to perform the calculation/audit functions using the imaging system and other computer processes and to archive the records when the process is complete. This automated process assures virtually 100% of service retirees will be added to the next retired payroll after receipt of all documents.

Management reports were designed to be generated capturing statistical information. However, data is not readily available from the system that will allow us to capture the data needed to provide the needed report. Additional data will be needed, and programming will be required, to develop a report that tracks all the documents and workflow processes needed to calculate the percent. Otherwise, a manual process of tracking and documenting the number of retirement folders not added to the next appropriate retired payroll will have to be developed and implemented for this measure.

Reliability:

The management reports generated for other purposes can be utilized to assist in determining the percent of member retirement folders added to the appropriate retired payroll. In addition, retirees not receiving their first retirement benefit payment in the time expected would contact the Division for an explanation thereby identifying a potential problem.

Office of Policy and Budget – July, 2006

LRPP EXHIBIT IV: Performance Measure Validity and Reliability

Department: Management Services

Program: Workforce

Service/Budget Entity: Retirement Benefits Administration

Measure: Percent of Monthly Payrolls from FRS Employers Processed within 5 Days

Action (check one):

- Requesting revision to approved performance measure.
- Change in data sources or measurement methodologies.
- Requesting new measure.
- Backup for performance measure.

Data Sources and Methodology:

This captures one of the most important aspects of service provided by the Division. This measure directly measures the turn-around time from receipt of data to access of this data for individual members (to be used by Division, employers and employees through on-line access). This measure will produce the same results on repeated trials because it is using a set mathematical formula from data housed in the Division's automated computer system.

The data source is the Payroll Update Status Report, AM340, created through IRIS. The report captures the receipt date of contributions (through Receipt allocation in Accounting) and the update of the payroll (through payroll process) in IRIS. The system calculates the number of days from receipt to update. At year's end, the count of updated payrolls that exceeded 5 days would be divided by the total number of payrolls updated for the percentage measurement.

Validity:

Previous standards measured the employers' reporting compliance. This will measure the Division's effectiveness in timely updating agency payrolls. This measure directly measures the turn-around time from receipt of data to access of this data for individual members (to be used by Division, employers and employees through on-line access). Under the Defined Benefit Plan, timeliness of updating payroll information was not a critical measure. With the implementation of the Defined Contribution Plan, timeliness of updating payroll information and submitting the contributions for employee investing becomes a very critical measure. This measure is also reflected in the Interagency Agreement with the State Board of Administration.

Reliability:

The Receipt Allocation Screen in the Division's computerized information system is updated by the Bureau of Accounting (The update report is a system generated report in the Active Membership Module). This measure will produce the same results on repeated trials because it is using a set mathematical formula from data housed in the Division's computerized information system.

LRPP EXHIBIT IV: Performance Measure Validity and Reliability

Department: Management Services

Program: Workforce

Service/Budget Entity: Retirement Benefits Administration

Measure: Turn around Times for Benefit Calculations – Information Requests
(Calendar Days)

Action (check one):

- Requesting revision to approved performance measure.
- Change in data sources or measurement methodologies.
- Requesting new measure.
- Backup for performance measure.

Data Sources and Methodology: The data source for the measure is Retirement Benefits Administration's Automated Image Workflow Process. The date an information request is received, the request is entered in the workflow process. The date the request is entered in the workflow process will be matched against the archive date (the date the process is complete) and the number of work days to complete the process will be determined.

Information requests are received in the following ways:

Request for Information Form (FR-9)

Written

E-mail

Internet

Walk-in visitors to the Division

Telephone

Forms and written/printed documents, including e-mails and Internet messages are indexed, imaged, and placed in the Bureau's workflow process. Requests received via telephone are entered into the workflow by staff through a personal computer. A report will be generated, upon request, documenting each new information request received by process, social security number, and date entered in workflow. When the process is complete, the documents are archived.

The date an information request is received in the Division, the request is entered in the workflow process. The date the request is entered in the workflow process will be matched against the archive date (the date the process is completed), and the number of calendar days to complete the process will be determined. [Date archived less date entered in workflow = days to complete the process.] All information requests archived for a given period (weekly, monthly, or annually) will be totaled and an average number of calendar days will be calculated for the specified period.

Following the establishment of the current standard, there has been significant turnover in personnel in the Bureau of Retirement Calculations due to retirements, promotions and terminations. This turnover in personnel has resulted in positions being vacant

during the hiring process and substantial time needed for the training of new employees. Management will continue training new employees to build the expertise and efficiency needed to improve response times.

The previously established standard of 14 days was based on having a complete and experienced staff to perform this work for an entire year. The turnover in personnel and the required training time to build the experience and expertise to return to that level of experienced staffing, as well as an increasing volume of work, result in the need for a different standard. The Division of Retirement estimates 20 days in turn around times in benefit calculations for FY 2006-07 and requests a revision to the FY 2007-08 standard from 14 to 20 days.

Validity: In December 1999, the Division of Retirement completed development of a computerized information system that converted the Bureau's workflow from a manual intensive process involving hard copy files and microfiche documents to paperless process. Beginning January 2000 information requests have been imaged and entered in a systemic distribution process that enables staff to perform the calculation/audit functions using the imaging system and other computer processes and to archive the records when the process is complete.

Management reports were designed to capturing statistical information. From this data, a Response Time report was specifically designed to capture the turn around time it takes to complete a request for information. The Division's computerized information system captures all new information requests received, processed, and archived.

Reliability: The management reports generated for other purposes can be utilized to determine the accuracy of member folders (information request) entered in the process and the number of folders archived. Comparison of work performed (folders worked and folders received) by process, by employee, by section and summary by bureau will be used to determine the reliability of the turn around time of information requested.

Office of Policy and Budget – July, 2006

LRPP EXHIBIT IV: Performance Measure Validity and Reliability

Department: Management Services

Program: Workforce

Service/Budget Entity: Retirement Benefits Administration

Measure: Percent of Participating Agencies Satisfied with Retirement Services

Action (check one):

- Requesting revision to approved performance measure.
- Change in data sources or measurement methodologies.
- Requesting new measure.
- Backup for performance measure.

Data Sources and Methodology:

This measures the participating agencies overall satisfaction with retirement services. The survey results for this year will not be available until December 2006. No significant change is expected compared with prior year results.

Statistically valid surveys of the 910 state and local agencies that participate in the Florida Retirement System (FRS) provide the source of data for this measure. The survey is conducted annually. An independent contractor performs all statistical calculations and manipulations.

Validity:

Statistically valid surveys are conducted to determine customer satisfaction with retirement information. Any threats to the validity of the measure are minimized through the use of professionally developed survey questionnaires, validated by an independent contractor, that survey an appropriate statistical sample of customers. It should be noted that the survey instrument will change over time due to changing information needs; however, similar survey questions are presented for several years in order to enhance validity.

Reliability:

Consistent questions on similar subject matter are presented during the survey process over several years. Statistically valid samples validated by an independent contractor are used on each source group with different samplings on each survey in order to minimize fluctuations.

Office of Policy and Budget – July, 2006

LRPP EXHIBIT IV: Performance Measure Validity and Reliability

Department: Management Services

Program: Workforce

Service/Budget Entity: Retirement Benefits Administration

Measure: Percent of Agency Payroll Transactions Correctly Reported

Action (check one):

- Requesting revision to approved performance measure.
- Change in data sources or measurement methodologies.
- Requesting new measure.
- Backup for performance measure.

Data Sources and Methodology:

The accuracy of the data submitted is largely the responsibility of the Division's 910 reporting agencies. However, the Division impacts this measure by reducing transaction errors through its efforts to educate and train participating agencies so that they are well informed about the retirement enrollment and payroll reporting procedures. The actual results achieved in FY 2005-2006 of 98.34% (compared to the standard for FY 2005-2006 of 98%), along with the expectation that future years can be sustained at 98% accuracy, also results from having the Division extensively automate retirement services. In FY 2002-2003 a milestone was reached by having 100% of the reporting agencies submitting enrollment and payroll information on-line.

Agency payroll transactions originate from the participating FRS agencies' payroll systems. The agencies report payroll transactions on employees who are covered for retirement. The payroll transaction reports are sent to the Division via magnetic tape, diskette, file transfer or hard copy. Participating agencies that are well informed about the retirement enrollment and payroll reporting procedures have fewer transaction errors.

Validity:

A higher percentage of accurate payroll transactions occur with greater efforts directed toward educating and training participating agencies. Customer contacts, including the employer handbook, employer workshops, brochures, bulletins, videos, and telephone assistance, all serve in the education and training of participating agencies. A potential negative impact to this measure is legislative change without sufficient time to properly inform agencies and implement such changes.

Totals are systematically accumulated and verified by runs listing all errors and variances for each updated payroll. An error is created when a member's name and/or social security number are listed on the agency's monthly retirement report differently from the way that the member was enrolled into the retirement system. A variance is created when the retirement contributions submitted do not match the contribution rate associated with the plan in which the member is enrolled in the system.

Reliability:

The monthly retirement transactions are submitted by each participating reporting agency on a monthly basis according to uniform standards established by the Division. The yearly accumulation of these totals is accomplished in the year-end closeout runs that are updated after all agency payrolls have been updated.

Office of Policy and Budget – July, 2006

LRPP EXHIBIT IV: Performance Measure Validity and Reliability

Department: Management Services

Program: Workforce

Service/Budget Entity: Retirement Benefits Administration

Measure: Administrative Cost Per Active and Retired Member

Action (check one):

- Requesting revision to approved performance measure.
- Change in data sources or measurement methodologies.
- Requesting new measure.
- Backup for performance measure.

Data Sources and Methodology:

This measure represents the concept of efficient delivery of retirement services because it is used to compare the Division's administrative cost with other retirement systems offering similar services. The source of data for this measure comes from the LAS/PBS Exhibit B within the LBR, the FRS FY Closeout Report, and the FRS Benefit Master System Report. The information needed for this measure will not be available until early December 2006 following close-out of the State's financial records. We do expect to achieve the standard for FY 2005-2006 and achieving this result should still place the Division among the lowest cost, if not the very lowest cost, provider of benefit administrative services of large public retirement programs in the Nation.

The LAS/PBS Exhibit B, the FRS FY Closeout Report, and the FRS Benefit Master System Report provide the source of data for this measure. The total Division administrative cost (excluding the Municipal Police and Firefighters' Premium Tax Trust Fund costs) is divided by the number of active and retired members in producing this measure.

Validity:

This measure logically represents the concept of efficient delivery of retirement services because it is used to compare the Division's administrative cost with other retirement systems offering similar services. Potential negative impacts to the validity are minimized by using similar services and cost factors for comparison purposes. FRS costs are validated through the state FLAIR and LAS/PBS systems. Other systems' costs are validated through the Public Pension Coordinating Council's PENDAT report. The Council is composed of four national associations whose members are directly involved in the administration of public employee retirement systems: the Government Finance Officers Association (GFOA), the National Association of State Retirement Administrators (NASRA), the National Council on Public Employee Retirement Systems (NCPERS), and the National Council on Teacher Retirement (NCTR).

Reliability:

Costs and membership data for state retirement systems are consistently compiled annually by the Public Pension Coordinating Council in a survey database and software using the same data sources and collection methods each year. FRS costs are computed using the state FLAIR system and the methodology is constant year to year.

Office of Policy and Budget – July, 2006

LRPP EXHIBIT IV: Performance Measure Validity and Reliability

Department: Management Services

Program: Workforce

Service/Budget Entity: Retirement Benefits Administration

Measure: Percent of Local Retirement Systems Annually Reviewed, which are Funded on a Sound Actuarial Basis

Action (check one):

- Requesting revision to approved performance measure.
- Change in data sources or measurement methodologies.
- Requesting new measure.
- Backup for performance measure.

Data Sources and Methodology:

Retirement Benefits Administration uses this measure to provide an evaluation of the actuarial soundness of local government retirement systems that are reviewed for a given year. The data source for this measure is the program area's Monthly Production Report that is derived from its Actuarial Valuation Logbook and Actuarial Impact Statement Logbook. Actuarial reviews by the Bureau of Local Retirement has facilitated a better than expected actual result and warrants a positive change in the request made. As different local retirement plans are reviewed on a three year cycle, it is not certain the actual results achieved in recent prior year's can be duplicated.

The program area's Monthly Production Report that is derived from its Actuarial Valuation Logbook and Actuarial Impact Statement Logbook is the source of the data for this measure.

Validity:

The revised measure provides a valid evaluation of the actuarial soundness of local government retirement systems. Additionally, from a conceptual standpoint, the measure is valid in that it accurately measures what the program area is statutorily charged with measuring, i.e., the number or percentage of local government retirement plans that are funded on a sound actuarial basis. The measure is numerically valid due to the methodology employed which consists of dividing the total number of plan actuarial valuations and impact statements annually reviewed by the number of such plan documents which were determined during such annual review period to contain actuarial funding deficiencies. The data upon which the measurement is based, local retirement plan actuarial valuations and impact statements, is valid and accurate in that it is submitted to the program area by certified pension actuaries who must attest to the data's accuracy and completeness. Lastly, the measure's methodology, data, and validity are periodically audited by OPPAGA.

Reliability:

Local governments annually prepare comprehensive financial statements and this financial data is included in the State of Florida Government Financial Reporting System. The Auditor General accomplishes a performance audit of the Local Government Financial Reporting System every two years. These actions provide the necessary consistency to this measure.

Office of Policy and Budget – July, 2006

LRPP EXHIBIT IV: Performance Measure Validity and Reliability

Department: Management Services

Program: Workforce

Service/Budget Entity: Retirement Benefits Administration

Measure: (Unit Cost Output) Number of Local Pension Plan Valuations and Impact Statements Reviewed

Action (check one):

- Requesting revision to approved performance measure.
- Change in data sources or measurement methodologies.
- Requesting new measure.
- Backup for performance measure.

Data Sources and Methodology: Retirement Benefits Administration uses this measure because it reflects the workload demand placed on the Bureau of Local Retirement Systems in fulfilling its statutory responsibilities to oversee local retirement plans. The data utilized in the measurement is extracted from the Actuarial Valuation Log book and the Actuarial Impact Statement Logbook, which captures monthly and summarizes annually the number of actuarial valuations, as well as the number of actuarial impact statements that are received and reviewed by the Bureau of Local Retirement Systems.

It is difficult to accurately estimate the total number of annual valuations and impact statements that will require review in any given year, as that number is dependent on what changes Local plans make to their pension programs. It is believed that annually, between 350 and 450 actuarial valuations and impact statements will be sent to the Division of Retirement for review. With the continued support of third party actuarial services, it is believed all reviews can be kept current and future arrearages can be avoided. In FY 2005-06, the Legislature reduced the standard from 500 to 400 as a result of the Bureau of Local Retirement Systems having caught-up on a long-standing arrearage in outstanding actuarial valuations and impact statements.

Validity: The data utilized in this measurement is extracted from the Actuarial Valuation Logbook and the Actuarial Impact Statement Logbook, which are maintained by the Bureau of Local Retirement Systems.

This data, as it is received, is first captured manually with a hand written entry in the appropriate logbook according to document type; later, the data is entered into a computerized format. From the Actuarial Valuation Logbook and the Actuarial Impact Statement Logbook, a monthly production report is generated which reflects the number of actuarial valuations received and reviewed, as well as the number of actuarial impact statements received and reviewed for that month. The monthly production report is in a fiscal year-to-date format so that the June Monthly Production Report yields the fiscal year totals of the number of actuarial valuations and actuarial impact statements reviewed.

Reliability: The measure is accurate and valid because the data utilized is recorded twice: once manually, and subsequently, by computer. Further, as a cross-reference, the hard copies of the incoming documents are retained and stored in files where they may be accessed manually as the need arises. This measure is appropriate because it is a direct measure of the production activity of the Bureau of Local Retirement Systems. The measure is very reliable in that the data collection methodology described above has been in place for a long period of time and is well understood by the pertinent staff. Further, reliability is enhanced by virtue of the fact that data is maintained both electronically and in hard copy as a “back up.” The verification process involves checking the accumulated data against the manually produced actuarial valuation and actuarial impact statement logbooks.

Office of Policy and Budget – July, 2006

LRPP EXHIBIT IV: Performance Measure Validity and Reliability

Department: Management Services

Program: Workforce

Service/Budget Entity: Retirement Benefits Administration

Measure: Number of FRS members

Action (check one):

- Requesting revision to approved performance measure.
- Change in data sources or measurement methodologies.
- Requesting new measure.
- Backup for performance measure.

Data Sources and Methodology:

Retirement Benefits Administration uses this measure because it reflects the demands placed on the Division of Retirement in performing its statutory responsibilities of administering the Florida Retirement System. The FRS FY Close-out Report provides the source of data for active members of the FRS and participants in the DROP. The FRS Benefit Master System Report provides the source of data for retired FRS members. The three categories of members (active, retirees, and DROP members) are added together to arrive at the total number of FRS members.

The FRS FY Close-out Report provides the source of data for active members of the Florida Retirement System (FRS) and participants in the Deferred Retirement Option Program (DROP). The FRS Benefit Master System Report provides the source of data for retired FRS members. The three categories of members are added together to arrive at the total number of FRS members.

Validity:

This is an appropriate output measure as it reflects the demands placed on the Division of Retirement in performing its statutory responsibilities of administering the FRS. Growth in membership from year to year results in increased requirements in all areas of the Division from enrolling new members, to processing monthly payroll reports and contributions, to calculating benefits as members approach retirement, and finally to administering the retired payroll after the members have retired. FRS membership figures are validated through automated retired payroll data and management information systems.

Reliability:

Data sources and collection methods are consistent every year using the same systems to compile the membership counts as of June 30.

Office of Policy and Budget – July, 2006

LRPP EXHIBIT IV: Performance Measure Validity and Reliability

Department: Department of Management Services

Program: Public Employees Relations Commission

Service/Budget Entity: Public Employees Relations Commission

Measure: Percent of timely labor dispositions

Action (check one):

- Requesting revision to approved performance measure.
- Change in data sources or measurement methodologies.
- Requesting new measure.
- Backup for performance measure.

Summary: PERC developed this measure to calculate the timeliness and efficiency of the issuance of final orders in labor disputes.

Data Sources and Methodology:

Labor actions are initiated by an action document and a case file is set up, which includes the original documents of all actions taken in the case. These are reflected on a docket sheet, indexed by litigant names and sequential numbers. The docket sheet is not closed until the case is closed. This measure is based on data from the Clerk of the Commission's docket sheets, which are available on paper (except for registration petitions) and in electronic form on the Commission computer system. A "disposition" means a final order in an individual case. To compile data for the measure, totals are extracted from the computer system for all labor actions.

Validity:

This measure calculates the percentage of total labor actions in the fiscal year that were completed from filing to closure within statutory and internal time limits. It accurately reveals whether the Commission is complying with statutory and internal time limits for doing its work.

Reliability:

The data on which this measure is based are objective, easily obtained from the docket sheets. A supervisor makes a verification of this data on monthly basis.

LRPP EXHIBIT IV: Performance Measure Validity and Reliability

Department: Department of Management Services

Program: Public Employees Relations Commission

Service/Budget Entity: Public Employees Relations Commission

Measure: Percent of timely employment dispositions

Action (check one):

- Requesting revision to approved performance measure.
- Change in data sources or measurement methodologies.
- Requesting new measure.
- Backup for performance measure.

Summary: PERC developed this measure to calculate the timeliness and efficiency of the issuance of final orders in employment (disciplinary appeals, veterans preference appeals and drug free workplace appeals) matters.

Data Sources and Methodology:

Employment actions are initiated by an action document and a case file is set up, which includes the original documents of all actions taken in the case. These are reflected on a docket sheet, indexed by litigant names and sequential numbers. The docket sheet is not closed until the case is closed. This measure is based on data from the Clerk of the Commission's docket sheets, which are available on paper and in electronic form on the Commission computer system. A "disposition" means a final order in an individual case. To compile data for the measure, totals are extracted from the computer system for all employment actions having a final order during the period.

Validity:

This measure calculates the percentage of total employment actions in the fiscal year that were completed from filing to closure within statutory and internal time limits. It accurately reveals whether the Commission is complying with statutory and internal time limits for doing its work.

Reliability:

The data on which this measure is based are objective, easily obtained from the docket sheets. A supervisor makes a verification of this data on monthly basis.

LRPP EXHIBIT IV: Performance Measure Validity and Reliability

Department: Department of Management Services

Program: Public Employees Relations Commission

Service/Budget Entity: Public Employees Relations Commission

Measure: Percent of dispositions not appealed

Action (check one):

- Requesting revision to approved performance measure.
- Change in data sources or measurement methodologies.
- Requesting new measure.
- Backup for performance measure.

Summary: PERC developed this measure to keep track of the percentage of the total number of both labor and employment final orders not appealed to the District Courts of Appeal.

Data Sources and Methodology:

This measure is based on data from the Clerk of the Commission's official records, which are available on paper and in electronic form on the Commission's computer system. It is calculated by tabulating the total number of labor and employment dispositions in the fiscal year compared to the number appealed to a court on a percentage basis.

Validity:

This measure provides a good indicator of whether the Commission's decisions finally resolve the workplace labor and employment disputes without one or more parties continuing to litigate.

Reliability:

The data is objective and based on docket sheet information kept in each individual case by the Clerk of the Commission.

LRPP EXHIBIT IV: Performance Measure Validity and Reliability

Department: Department of Management Services

Program: Public Employees Relations Commission

Service/Budget Entity: Public Employees Relations Commission

Measure: Percent of appealed dispositions affirmed

Action (check one):

- Requesting revision to approved performance measure.
- Change in data sources or measurement methodologies.
- Requesting new measure.
- Backup for performance measure.

Summary: PERC developed this measure to keep track of the percentage of those appealed final orders that are affirmed by the appellate courts.

Data Sources and Methodology:

This measure is based on data from the Clerk of the Commission's official records, which are available on paper and in electronic form on the Commission's computer system. It is calculated by tabulating the total number of labor and employment dispositions in the fiscal year compared to the number appealed to a court compared to the total number of dispositions that are affirmed on a percentage basis.

Validity:

This measure provides a good indicator of the correctness of the Commission's decisions in resolving workplace labor and employment disputes in the most contested cases.

Reliability:

The data is objective and based on docket sheet information kept in each individual case by the Clerk of the Commission.

LRPP EXHIBIT IV: Performance Measure Validity and Reliability

Department: Department of Management Services

Program: Public Employees Relations Commission

Service/Budget Entity: Public Employees Relations Commission

Measure: Number of labor dispositions

Action (check one):

- Requesting revision to approved performance measure.
- Change in data sources or measurement methodologies.
- Requesting new measure.
- Backup for performance measure.

Summary: PERC developed this measure to track of the total number of final orders issued in all labor cases. Labor cases include employee organization registration petitions, collective bargaining unit representation petitions, unfair labor practice charges, petitions for declaratory statements, elections, and petitions for attorneys fees or back pay determination.

Data Sources and Methodology:

Labor actions are tracked on docket sheets that are set up for each case when filed, indexed by litigant and sequentially numbered. The docket sheet is not closed until the case is closed. This measure is based on data from the Clerk of the Commission's official records, which (except for registration petitions) are available both on paper and in electronic form on the Commission's computer system. A "disposition" means a final order in an individual case, including an order certifying election results.

Validity:

This accurately measures the number of labor actions closed by final order in the fiscal year.

Reliability:

The data is objective and easily counted because it is based on docket sheet information kept by the Clerk for each labor action filed.

LRPP EXHIBIT IV: Performance Measure Validity and Reliability

Department: Department of Management Services

Program: Public Employees Relations Commission

Service/Budget Entity: Public Employees Relations Commission

Measure: Number of employment dispositions

Action (check one):

- Requesting revision to approved performance measure.
- Change in data sources or measurement methodologies.
- Requesting new measure.
- Backup for performance measure.

Summary: PERC developed this measure to track the total number of final orders issued in all employment cases. Employment cases include career service (disciplinary) appeals, veteran preference complaints, whistle-blower appeals drug free workplace appeals and back pay determinations.

Data Sources and Methodology:

Employment actions are tracked on docket sheets that are set up for each case when filed, indexed by litigant and sequentially numbered. The docket sheet is not closed until the case is closed. This measure is based on data from the Clerk of the Commission's official records, which are available both on paper and in electronic form on the Commission's computer system. A "disposition" means a final order in an individual case.

Validity:

This accurately measures the number of employment actions closed by final order in the fiscal year.

Reliability:

The data is objective and easily counted because it is based on docket sheet information kept by the Clerk for each employment action filed.

LRPP EXHIBIT IV: Performance Measure Validity and Reliability

Department: Department of Management Services

Program: Enterprise Information Technology Services

Service/Budget Entity: Telecommunications Services

Measure: Aggregated discount from commercially available rates for voice and data services.

Action (check one):

- Requesting revision to approved performance measure.
- Change in data sources or measurement methodologies.
- Requesting new measure.
- Backup for performance measure.

Data Sources and Methodology:

The outcome measures that calculate the percent SUNCOM discount from commercial rates for local access, long distance and data service will be used to determine the aggregated statewide discount. The percent SUNCOM discounts will be weighted based on volume for each service.

1. Volume for SUNCOM local access, long distance and data service will be determined by actual expenditures.
2. The weight for Percent SUNCOM discount from commercial rates (for local access, long distance and data service) will be determined by their percentage of total expenditures.
3. The aggregated statewide discount will be determined by adding the weighted percentages of SUNCOM discounts from commercial rates for local access, long distance, and data service.

$(\% \text{ local access of total expenditures} * \% \text{ SUNCOM discount local access}) +$
 $(\% \text{ long distance of total expenditures} * \% \text{ SUNCOM discount long distance}) +$
 $(\% \text{ data service of total expenditures} * \% \text{ SUNCOM discount data service}) =$
aggregate statewide discount

Validity:

Using volume in terms of total expenditures by service measures the impact of each of the services and more accurately represents the total SUNCOM discount from commercial rates for voice and data services.

Reliability:

The aggregate percent SUNCOM discount from commercial rates for voice and data services can measure the cost effectiveness of the services as a whole and can be consistently measured over time

LRPP EXHIBIT IV: Performance Measure Validity and Reliability

Department: Department of Management Services
Program: Enterprise Information Technology Services
Service/Budget Entity: Telecommunications Services
Measure: Percent of telecommunications customers satisfied.

Action (check one):

- Requesting revision to approved performance measure.
- Change in data sources or measurement methodologies.
- Requesting new measure.
- Backup for performance measure.

Data Sources and Methodology:

The customer surveys are developed to determine how well the Enterprise Information Technology Services is meeting specific outcomes. The survey is web-based. The link to the survey is distributed to the CSA administrators, who are representatives of the agencies, local municipalities, public and private educational institutions and non-profit organizations currently doing business with Enterprise Information Technology Services. The survey responses are quantified on a scale of 1-5 with non-responses excluded. Then the responses are scored, tabulated and analyzed.

The measure, percent customers satisfied, is calculated by averaging the numeric values of all survey questions for each customer. This determines the satisfaction of each customer. A satisfied customer is defined as having an average score of higher than 3.00. After tabulating the number of satisfied customers, this number is then divided by the total number of completed customer surveys, which is the percent of customers satisfied.

Validity:

The survey is conducted across all major services that will focus on whether users are getting a quality product for a reasonable price, if they are getting the technology they want, and consider their satisfaction in terms of dependability, timely problem resolution and best value. Customer surveys are the best tool to gain an understanding of how our customers view Enterprise Information Technology Services.

Reliability:

The survey results are collected in a database, which reports the responses to each survey. Actual completed survey forms are the data collection mechanism. The number of completed surveys compared to the number of CSA administrators emailed is used to monitor the confidence level of this procedure.

LRPP EXHIBIT IV: Performance Measure Validity and Reliability

Department: Department of Management Services
Program: Enterprise Information Technology Services
Service/Budget Entity: Telecommunications Services
Measure: Total revenue for voice service

Action (check one):

- Requesting revision to approved performance measure.
- Change in data sources or measurement methodologies.
- Requesting new measure.
- Backup for performance measure.

Data Sources and Methodology:

The SUNCOM Network provides shared multi-agency transport and communications. The Communications Working Capital Trust Fund exists to generate customer invoices, receive customer payments, in order to make vendor payments. SUNCOM Network administration meets monthly to review and discuss operation issues. At this meeting, telecommunication vendor payments and revenue invoices are provided on spreadsheets. These spreadsheets are journalized and used for capturing billable minutes, payments, refunds, adjustments, etc. These figures are used in most Network measures. Voice services revenue consists of SUNCOM Long Distance, Local Service, and 800 services.

Validity:

The spreadsheets are the sole source of current information related to revenue for voice services. Obtain the spreadsheet titled SUNCOM Network and Local Service Revenue, sum the column totals for In-state, Out-state, Adjustments, Directory Assistance, and Local Service.

Reliability:

This practice of reporting and holding a monthly review has proven to be invaluable. We have used this method for the past seventeen years and have repeatedly been able to reach the source of the entries. The spreadsheets have the payments identified by vendor, account and month. Revenues track to customer invoices.

Office of Policy and Budget – July, 2006

LRPP EXHIBIT IV: Performance Measure Validity and Reliability

Department: Department of Management Services

Program: Enterprise Information Technology Services

Service/Budget Entity: Telecommunications Services

Measure: Total revenue for data service.

Action (check one):

- Requesting revision to approved performance measure.
- Change in data sources or measurement methodologies.
- Requesting new measure.
- Backup for performance measure.

Data Sources and Methodology:

The SUNCOM Network provides shared multi-agency transport and communications. The Communications Working Capital Trust Fund exists to generate customer invoices, receive customer payments, in order to make vendor payments. SUNCOM Network administration meets monthly to review and discuss operation issues. At this meeting, telecommunication vendor payments and revenue invoices are provided on spreadsheets. These spreadsheets are journalized and used for capturing billable services – local loop, backbone, service related units, payments, refunds, adjustments, etc. These figures are used in most Network measures. To determine data services revenue, we identify payments and revenue for each dedicated service type.

Validity:

The spreadsheets and SIDAOES are the sole sources of current information related to revenue for data services.

Reliability:

This practice of reporting and holding monthly review has proven to be invaluable. We have used this method for the past sixteen years and have repeatedly been able to reach the source of the entries. The spreadsheets have the payments identified by vendor, account and month. Revenues track to customer invoices.

Office of Policy and Budget – July, 2006

LRPP EXHIBIT IV: Performance Measure Validity and Reliability

Department: Department of Management Services
Program: Enterprise Information Technology Services
Service/Budget Entity: Wireless Services
Measure: Percent of wireless customers satisfied

Action (check one):

- Requesting revision to approved performance measure.
- Change in data sources or measurement methodologies.
- Requesting new measure.
- Backup for performance measure.

Data Sources and Methodology:

The customer surveys are developed to determine how well the EITS is meeting specific outcomes. The survey was distributed to the Wireless Services customer base, which consists of, state agencies, local municipalities, public and private educational institutions and non-profit organizations currently doing business with EITS. The surveys are returned and responses are quantified on a scale of 1-5 with non-responses excluded. Then the responses are scored, tabulated and analyzed.

The measure, percent of wireless customers satisfied, is calculated by averaging the numeric values of survey questions for each customer. This determines the satisfaction of each customer. A satisfied customer is defined as having an average score of higher than 3.00. After tabulating the number of satisfied customers, this number is then divided by the total number of completed customer surveys, which is the percent of customers satisfied.

Validity:

The survey is conducted across all major applications and customer agencies that will focus on whether users are getting a quality product for a reasonable price, if they are getting the technology they want, and consider their satisfaction in terms of delivery, features, timely problem resolution, and best value. Customer surveys are the best tool to gain an understanding of how our customers view EITS services.

Reliability:

Actual completed survey forms will be the data collection mechanism. Completed yield compared to actual mail out numbers can be used to monitor the confidence level of this procedure.

LRPP EXHIBIT IV: Performance Measure Validity and Reliability

Department: Department of Management Services

Program: Enterprise Information Technology Services

Service/Budget Entity: Wireless Services

Measure: Percent of state covered by the Joint Task Force Radio System 800 MHz Statewide Law Enforcement Radio System (SLERS)

Action (check one):

- Requesting deletion of performance measure.
- Requesting revision to approved performance measure.
- Change in data sources or measurement methodologies.
- Requesting new measure.
- Backup for performance measure.

Data Sources and Methodology:

NOTE: Recommend that this performance measure be deleted. The outcome reflects the completion of the 800 MHz Statewide Law Enforcement Radio System (SLERS) build out and the replacement of the Phase 1 and 2 equipment with the new vendor. Outcome results of the new vendor are measured in LRPP Measurement #65. This measurement only reflects percent of State being served by an 800 MHz system and with the buildout complete will not have future values that vary and should be deleted.)

The coverage requirement for the 800 MHz Statewide Law Enforcement Radio System (SLERS), as defined by the Joint Task Force Board, is the entire land area of the state, its inland waters, and out to 25 miles offshore. This total area is approximately 99,531 square miles. As each construction phase of the system is completed, the actual square miles covered by 2-way radio signals is measured, using automated measuring equipment. The ratio of the actual total square miles being covered at the end of each phase to the total 99,531 square miles gives the percentage covered. For example, in the Pilot Project (Phase I of the system), 14,844 square miles are covered. This yields: $14,844/99,531 = 15\%$. At the end of FY02/03, construction of Phase I (14,844 square miles), Phase II (17,969 square miles) and Phase III (22,876 square miles) was completed. This yields: $55,689/99,531 = 56\%$ of the state covered by 800 MHz land mobile radio service by the 800 MHz SLERS.

Validity:

The coverage requirement for the statewide radio system, as defined by the Joint Task Force Board, is the entire land area of the state, its inland waters, and out to 25 miles offshore. The deployment of the system is divided into five phases, with each phase covering a percentage of the entire state. This measure shows the percentage of the state covered and gives a good indication of the progress made as each phase is made operational.

Reliability:

Coverage testing of each phase of the system is performed as the construction for that phase is completed and gives an excellent indication of the progress of the geographical coverage of the system

Office of Policy and Budget – July, 2006

LRPP EXHIBIT IV: Performance Measure Validity and Reliability

Department: Department of Management Services

Program: Enterprise Information Technology Services

Service/Budget Entity: Wireless Services

Measure: Percent of all 800 MHz law enforcement radio system contracted performance standards met

Action (check one):

- Requesting revision to approved performance measure.
- Change in data sources or measurement methodologies.
- Requesting new measure.
- Backup for performance measure.

Data Sources and Methodology: The contract for the 800 MHz Statewide Law Enforcement Radio System (SLERS) has numerous contracted performance standards identified that measure the system implementation and performance. Most important of these are the system construction schedule, coverage performance for mobile and portable subscriber units, and the percent availability of the system for use. This measure consists of four contracted performance measures (PMs), which receive equal weighting (maximum of 25 percent each). Overall PM = PM1 + PM2 + PM3 + PM4.

System construction dates for Phases 3-5 are set to meet Federal Communications Commission implementation deadlines associated with the State's 800 MHz frequency licenses. The State must meet the specified construction dates or obtain waivers that would allow delayed construction to avoid risking loss of their 800 MHz frequency licenses for sites within the specified phases. The standard for timely phase construction is to have all of the planned sites for a phase built and accepted by the construction date set in Section 7.2.E of the Service and Access Agreement. Phase III is scheduled to be completed by June 30, 2002, Phase IV by June 30, 2003, and Phase V by June 30, 2004. At each of the construction dates there will be a specified number of sites that are planned to be built and accepted by the construction date and an actual number of sites built. The formula to be used for measuring the performance area of system construction is:

- $PM1 = (\text{Number of sites built by M/A-Com, Inc. to date} / \text{Number of sites planned for construction completion by M/A-Com by Phase Construction Deadline}) \times 25 \%$

For example for the Phases 3-5 buildout, if M/A-Com's final design requires 126 sites to be completed by the FCC Construction Deadline and 123 sites are actually completed, then:

- $PM1 = (123/126) \times 25 \% = 23.81 \%$

The standard is 25 percent since all sites in a Phase are required to be built by the FCC Construction Date.

Mobile Coverage Performance requirements of the contract is identified in Schedule A, Section II and is required to be at least 98 percent of the one-mile by one-mile grids tested by the method outlined in the coverage acceptance test plan. As each phase is built out, a certain area of projected coverage is identified and measured. The number of grids tested in Phases 3-5 are 31,855. Not all grids are expected to be tested due to accessibility constraints. Due to Staff Capacity limitations, previously tested grids were not backed out of the performance measure when grids were retested. The formula to be used for measuring performance of mobile land area coverage is:

- $PM2 = (\text{Number of grids tested successfully for mobile radio coverage} / \text{Number of grids tested for mobile radio coverage}) \times 25\%$

For example for the Phase III buildout, if M/A-Com's final design provides 14,623 one-square mile grids to be tested, and 14,350 grids are successfully tested, then:

- $PM2 = (30,695.4/31,855) \times 25\% = 24.09\%$

The standard is 24.5 percent since this equates to the required 98 percent coverage requirement.

Portable Coverage Performance requirements of the contract is identified in Schedule A, Section II and is required to be at least 98 percent of the one-mile-by-one-mile or smaller grids tested by the method outlined in the coverage acceptance test plan. As each phase is built out, a certain area of projected coverage is identified and measured. The total number of portable coverage grids tested in Phases 3-5 is 7,492. The 98 percent requirement will be applied to all land area grids tested. Not all grids are expected to be tested due to accessibility constraints. The formula to be used for measuring performance of mobile land area coverage is:

- $PM3 = (\text{Number of grids tested successfully for portable radio coverage} / \text{Number of grids tested for portable radio coverage}) \times 25\%$

For example for the JTF Phase III buildout, if M/A-Com's final design provides 2,420 one-square mile grids to be tested, and 2,380 grids are successfully tested, then:

- $PM3 = (7147.5/7492) \times 25\% = 23.85\%$

The standard is 24.5 percent since this equates to the required 98 percent coverage requirement.

System uptime performance requirements are identified in the Service and Access Agreement Section 3.2 and as further defined in Contract Clarification #3. Each IMC is evaluated on a monthly basis and a quarterly uptime performance determined from this data. Currently there are eight IMCs planned for the State Law Enforcement Radio System at completion of build out. The functional IMCs' uptime performance is averaged to give a system uptime performance. The contract performance requirement is a 99% system uptime.

- $PM4 = \text{IMC \#1 uptime} + \text{IMC \#2 uptime} + \dots + \text{IMC \#N uptime} / N \times 25 \%$

For example if each of three IMCs performed at various levels for the entire period evaluated, then they would meet the minimum performance standard and:

- $PM4 = (.9988 + .9984 + .9981) / 3 \times 25 \% = 24.96 \%$

The standard is 24.75 percent since this is the level required for each subsystem to be operating at a 99.0 percent system uptime.

The overall performance measure (PM) would be the sum of each of the four performance areas being measured, with the measurement formula as:

- $PM = PM1 + PM2 + PM3 + PM4$

For example, with the examples previously shown:

- $PM = 23.81 \% + 24.09 \% + 23.85 \% + 24.96 \% = 96.71 \%$

The minimum standard using the requirements for each subsystem is:

- $PM = 25 \% + 24.5 \% + 24.5 \% + 24.75 \% = 98.75 \%$

The example would fail to meet the overall contract measures

Validity:

Each of the performance measures are clearly stated in the contract and are key to state law enforcement agency performance and officer safety.

Performance Measure 1 measures the system build out and is required to maintain the State's FCC licenses of system frequencies.

Performance Measure 2 measures the ability of the system to support the law enforcement officer by providing a high level of coverage anywhere in the state to an officer equipped with a mobile radio.

Performance Measure 3 measures the ability of the system to support the law enforcement officer by providing a high level of coverage in designated areas throughout the state to an officer equipped with a portable radio.

Performance Measure 4 measures the overall operational performance of the system and its availability to State Law Enforcement Agencies to enhance the accomplishments of their missions, officer safety, and protection of the State's citizens and their property.

Reliability:

The measure of system buildout provides an excellent measure of the ability of the Contractor to provide the land mobile radio system in a timely fashion that meets the law enforcement agency needs and maintain the State's FCC licenses.

Mobile coverage testing of the system provides an excellent indication of the effectiveness of the system to support state law enforcement statewide.

Portable coverage testing of the system provides an excellent indication of the effectiveness of the system to support state law enforcement when they are operating outside of their vehicles in densely populated or specially designated areas.

Uptime performance provides an excellent measure of the availability and reliability of the law enforcement radio system to support the law enforcement officer during the daily accomplishment of the mission.

Office of Policy and Budget – July, 2006

LRPP EXHIBIT IV: Performance Measure Validity and Reliability

Department: Department of Management Services

Program: Enterprise Information Technology Services

Service/Budget Entity: Wireless Services

Measure: Number of engineering projects and approvals handled for state and local governments

Action (check one):

- Requesting revision to approved performance measure.
- Change in data sources or measurement methodologies.
- Requesting new measure.
- Backup for performance measure.

Data Sources and Methodology:

EITS Wireless Services tracks its projects for state and local agency activities. The tracking mechanisms are a database maintained in-house using FoxPro software and Project Activity Reporter (PAR). As of January 2001, PAR was used for any new project assigned to non-Emergency Management Service (EMS) wireless service.

Validity:

The number of projects tracked is validated by the integrity of the tracking mechanism, which has been in use for a number of years and utilized for previous performance measures. Both databases are queried for a total number of projects that were handled during the fiscal year.

Reliability:

Projects tracked are only those projects assigned at the request of the customer base or by direction internally.

Office of Policy and Budget – July, 2006

LRPP EXHIBIT IV: Performance Measure Validity and Reliability

Department: Management Services

Program: Enterprise Information Technology Services

Service/Budget Entity: Information Services

Measure: Percent of Information Services Customers Satisfied

Action (check one):

- Requesting revision to approved performance measure.
- Change in data sources or measurement methodologies.
- Requesting new measure.
- Backup for performance measure.

Data Sources and Methodology:

The customer surveys are developed to determine how well the Enterprise Information Technology Services is meeting specific outcomes. The survey is web-based. The link to the survey is distributed to the SLA administrators, who are representatives of the agencies, local municipalities, public and private educational institutions and non-profit organizations currently doing business with Enterprise Information Technology Services. The survey responses are quantified on a scale of 1-5 with non-responses excluded. Then the responses are scored, tabulated and analyzed. The measure, percent customers satisfied, is calculated by averaging the numeric values of all survey questions for each customer. This determines the satisfaction of each customer. A satisfied customer is defined as having an average score of higher than 3.00. After tabulating the number of satisfied customers, this number is then divided by the total number of completed customer surveys, which is the percent of customers satisfied.

Validity:

The survey is conducted across all major applications and customer agencies that will focus on whether users are getting a quality product for a reasonable price, if they are getting the technology they want, and consider their satisfaction in terms of dependability, timely problem resolution and best value. Customer surveys are the best tool to gain an understanding of how our customers view Enterprise Information Technology Services.

Reliability:

The survey results are collected in a database, which reports the responses to each survey. Actual completed survey forms are the data collection mechanism. The number of completed surveys compared to the number of SLA administrators emailed is used to monitor the confidence level of this procedure.

LRPP EXHIBIT IV: Performance Measure Validity and Reliability

Department: Management Services

Program: Enterprise Information Technology Services

Service/Budget Entity: Information Services

Measure: Percent utilization – UNISYS System as used for capacity planning and technology refresh, employing 80% maximum utilization standard

Action (check one):

- Requesting revision to approved performance measure.
- Change in data sources or measurement methodologies.
- Requesting new measure.
- Backup for performance measure.

Data Sources and Methodology:

The performance data for the IX5602-D2 is collected by the Software Instrumentation Package (SIP). SIP is a system-performance data collection function of the operating system, OS 2200. Running SIP results in data files consisting of raw performance data recorded at user-defined intervals. This data is then reported by Performance Analysis Routines (PAR). SIP is turned on every day for twenty-four hours.

Validity:

SIP collects data from the operating system as it occurs. PAR, the reporting tool for the data, is the industry recognized software, for a Unisys system, to produce performance reports from the SIP data.

Reliability:

A job is started every night, from the system job scheduler, at 2400 hours, begins the SIP collection. The data is written to disk storage files for a week. Every Sunday the disk storage files are copied to magnetic tape and the tapes are kept for a period of three years.

LRPP EXHIBIT IV: Performance Measure Validity and Reliability

Department: Management Services

Program: Enterprise Information Technology Services

Service/Budget Entity: Information Services

Measure: Percent utilization – IBM System (as used for capacity planning and technology refresh, employing 80% maximum utilization standard)

Action (check one):

- Requesting revision to approved performance measure.
- Change in data sources or measurement methodologies.
- Requesting new measure.
- Backup for performance measure.

Data Sources and Methodology:

The data for the IBM Z800 is collected by the System Management Facility (SMF) that is embedded in the operating system. SMF is a measurement tool that provides a total system performance data retrieval capability, gather data optionally for different levels of analysis. The Resource Management Facility (RMF) is used to analyze and produce reports from the SMF data files. Percent of utilization is calculated by averaging annual utilization during peak hours of operation. Those peak hours have been defined as 8:30 a.m. to 10:00 a.m., and 2:00 p.m. to 3:30 p.m. Monday through Friday excluding Holidays or scheduled periods of downtime. (See Information Technology Performance Measure Validation, Randy S. Toothaker, Acting Inspector General, dated February 14, 1997).

Validity:

Capacity management is a proactive approach in managing system resources. System capacity requirements are anticipated rather than reacted to. Some areas where capacity management proactively helps manage systems resources are:

Insure User Satisfaction – Achieve consistent, satisfactory user service levels (response time and throughput) as workloads change.

Forecast Future Requirements – Proactively predict future needs and justify costs.

Bottleneck Analysis – Determine what bottlenecks exist in a system, and determine what the capacity of the remaining resources will be if a bottleneck is reduced or eliminated.

System tuning requires analysis that compares the collected system statistics to normal conditions of a tuned system. The following statistics define the recommended guidelines for the IBM 1C5.

Performance Indicator	Threshold Value
-----------------------	-----------------

CPU (processor) utilization	80%
Memory utilization	80%
Disk storage in use	70%

In most systems, indicators of performance will have peaks and valleys over any period of time. The CP utilization may fluctuate between 100% and 40% busy. The values above should be evaluated as an average over a one hour period of time. When the processor utilization averages 80% busy or more for periods of at least an hour, queuing at the processor increases and service levels degrade. Evaluating processor capacity should start well before the threshold is reached. The other performance indicators pertaining to memory and I/O, function in much the same way. Exceeding the threshold of performance indicators can mean degraded service levels.

The performance indicators aid in capacity planning, but do not guarantee good service levels. The performance indicator values, used in conjunction with the type of environment, processor, I/O and communication profiles, all have an effect on service levels.

Reliability:

The SMF data is collected daily, stored on magnetic tape and maintained for a period of three (3) years.

Office of Policy and Budget – July, 2006

LRPP EXHIBIT IV: Performance Measure Validity and Reliability

Department: Management Services

Program: Enterprise Information Technology Services

Service/Budget Entity: Information Services

Measure: Number of customers served

Action (check one):

- Requesting revision to approved performance measure.
- Change in data sources or measurement methodologies.
- Requesting new measure.
- Backup for performance measure.

Data Sources and Methodology:

Customers include state agencies, local municipalities, public and private educational institutions and non-profit organizations. Information services are provided at the customer's request; therefore, some services are not utilized on a regular basis. Customers that utilize services receive an invoice at the end of each billing cycle. At the end of each fiscal year, the numbers of monthly invoices generated are averaged to determine the number of information services customers served during the fiscal year.

The data collection is through RACS – which includes Tech Direct and CIMS. These applications are used for the billing system for services rendered by the Shared Resource Center.

Validity:

Monthly invoices are only sent to customers that received any services through the Shared Resource Center. This measuring instrument is appropriate because there is a record of the service provided to each customer and the invoice for services that was generated.

Reliability:

The number of customers served for information services may be adjusted as the STO considers migration to one service area. In addition, a cost recovery methodology is being developed which may provide data to realize our total customer base. Until the implementation of the enterprise-model is implemented, this number is subject to increase or decrease.

Office of Policy and Budget – July, 2006

LRPP EXHIBIT IV: Performance Measure Validity and Reliability

Department: Management Services

Program: Enterprise Information Technology Services

Service/Budget Entity: Information Services

Measure: Percent of customers satisfied

Action (check one):

- Requesting revision to approved performance measure.
- Change in data sources or measurement methodologies.
- Requesting new measure.
- Backup for performance measure.

Data Sources and Methodology:

The customer surveys are developed to determine how well the Enterprise Information Technology Services is meeting specific outcomes. Each service area (Information Services, Telecommunications Services and Wireless Services) distributes the survey to the customer base, which consists of state agencies, local municipalities, public and private educational institutions and non-profit organizations currently doing business with Enterprise Information Technology Services. The surveys are returned and responses are quantified on a scale of 1-5 with non-responses excluded. Then the responses are scored, tabulated and analyzed.

The measure, percent of customers satisfied, is calculated for each service (Information Services, Telecommunications Services and Wireless Services) by averaging the numeric values of questions for each survey returned. After tabulating the number of satisfied customers for each of the three service areas, the results are totaled and divided by total number of completed customer surveys (for all three service areas). This calculation results in the percent of customers satisfied.

Validity:

The survey is conducted across all major applications and customer agencies that will focus on whether users are getting a quality product for a reasonable price, if they are getting the technology they want, and consider their satisfaction in terms of dependability, timely problem resolution and best value. Customer surveys are the best tool to gain an understanding of how our customers view Enterprise Information Technology Services.

Reliability:

Completed surveys are the data collection mechanism. Completed yield compared to actual mail out numbers are used to monitor the confidence level of this procedure.

Office of Policy and Budget – July, 2006

LRPP EXHIBIT IV: Performance Measure Validity and Reliability

Department: Department of Management Services

Program: Enterprise Information Technology Services

Service/Budget Entity: Information Services

Measure: Percent of scheduled information technology production jobs completed

Action (check one):

- Requesting revision to approved performance measure.
- Change in data sources or measurement methodologies.
- Requesting new measure.
- Backup for performance measure.

Data Sources and Methodology:

IMC is using an automated tracking package, MXG, This tracking package is assisting IMC in tracking the outcome percentage of production processing and the cost associated to achieve the desired outcome needed by the Divisions. Data will be extracted and statistically analyzed by IMC. The number of clients using our Web page will be included in our counts of the total client population. The percentage is calculated by the number of jobs run versus the number of jobs aborted. This gives a percentage of jobs that were completed without error. This also identifies the type of errors that occurred, so that in the future the SD&P staff may eliminate these.

Validity:

Each job that is run on the mainframe is tracked. Any job that contains errors is identified. The percentage calculated is determined by the number of jobs that fail.

The use of this measure of productivity by the IMC can be compared to other data centers within the state.

Reliability:

The reliability has been established by using a totally automated process for tracking the percentage of jobs that are successfully run on the mainframe.

Office of Policy and Budget – July, 2006

LRPP EXHIBIT IV: Performance Measure Validity and Reliability

Department: Department of Management Services

Program: Technology Program

Service/Budget Entity: Information Services

Measure: Percent of information management center's data processing requests completed by due date

Action (check one):

- Requesting revision to approved performance measure.
- Change in data sources or measurement methodologies.
- Requesting new measure.
- Backup for performance measure.

Data Sources and Methodology:

This measure was transferred from Dept of Labor in FY02 when the IMC was merged with the STO (now EITS). This methodology was modified as ITN006 governed these processes, and is now further modified to better align with tools used and the characteristics of operations and customers.

The EITS and the Customer Agencies have agreed to Service Level Agreements (SLA) and measures of satisfaction. Service Requests are tracked in the helpdesk software system of the EITS Services. Customers may enter Service Requests directly into the Service Desk system, or may call the Service Desk to have them entered. All Service Request tickets are moved daily to Application Management Services' time tracking system called STAR. Tickets are assigned time is entered, and tickets are closed. Tickets are Changes, Cases, or Problems. Changes and Cases pertaining to AMS are most often customer's requests for application services. Problems are most often requests for attention to an outage of some kind.

Service Requests created by or for a customer may be created with a requested completion date. If none is provided and the effort is estimated to take more than one business day for a Case or Change, and more than 24 hours for a problem, then a requested completion date will be solicited. If none is desired by the EITS customer then the ticket will be left without one and the completion of the ticket considered timely. Requested completion dates may be negotiated between the customer and AMS. As requests are modified by the customer or development priorities change, the requested completion date may be modified by agreement between the customer and AMS. The Actual Completion date will be updated in STAR when the work effort is completed, the programs are moved to User Acceptance Testing (UAT) status, and the customer is notified. If the type of problem does not involve customer testing then the Actual Completion date will be updated with the ticket is handled or resolved.

Tickets considered On-Time are:

Closed tickets in which the actual completion date is less than or equal to the requested completion date.

Closed tickets with no requested completion date.

Closed Case and Change tickets completed by end of the next business day.

Closed Problem tickets completed within 24 hours.

Tickets created internal to EITS and not by or for an EITS customer.

Tickets considered for the measure are:

Tickets that were closed during the period being measured.

Tickets not cancelled.

The percentage of Service Requests completed is determined by dividing the number of tickets On-Time by the total number of tickets considered for the period.

Validity: AMS maintains its time accounting system called STAR. Service Requests must be entered in STAR and assigned to one or more associates in order for the associate to post the time spent on completing the Service Request. AMS and the customer must validate the accuracy of the outcome before a request can be considered completed and closed.

Each month a report will be made available to the customer of opened and closed tickets for the period that include status, opened date, requested completion date, and actual completion date if it's status is closed. Closed tickets will not show beyond the month they were closed.

Reliability: Data is entered by associates into the AMS time accounting system and monitored by the AMS Managers. A monthly Utilization Report is reviewed by AMS and includes each associate's monthly time, the activity they performed and the specific Agency's account code to which the time has been charged. In addition, AMS provides a count of number of tickets opened and closed during the month and a listing of major activities performed during the month. Biweekly meetings are held with the customer to review major Service Requests and to discuss prioritization. Data is tracked from inception to completion. The criterion for timely percentage completion is predetermined by a Service Level Agreement (SLA) between AMS and the Agencies.

The Service Request is a reliable measure of AMS productivity because it represents the priority and workload assigned by the Agencies. Requested completion dates and actual completion dates are reviewed by customers either bi-weekly, monthly, or on request. Comparison of the requested completion date and the actual completion date easily determines outcome results of the measure.

Office of Policy and Budget – July, 2006

LRPP EXHIBIT IV: Performance Measure Validity and Reliability

Department: Management Services

Program: Technology Program

Service/Budget Entity: Information Services

Measure: System design and programming hourly costs

Action (check one):

- Requesting revision to approved performance measure.
- Change in data sources or measurement methodologies.
- Requesting new measure.
- Backup for performance measure.

Data Sources and Methodology: System design and programming work performed by Application Management Services resources is captured in an application called STAR (Status Time Accounting Report), which identifies all hours expended by the service area. Each employee enters hours against tasks assigned. This information is then fed to the billing system. Costs are projected prior to a fiscal year, along with anticipated hours that will be expended by the team – allowing rates to be set for the coming fiscal year. Actual costs are identified at the end of the fiscal years, and total expended hours are reported from both the billing system and STAR (as a check and balance). Actual costs and actual hours expended are used to determine a cost per hour.

Validity: All time worked in Application Management Services is entered into STAR. An established monthly process takes place to validate that all time has been captured for each employee. Reports are viewed to identify potential gaps, and these gaps are investigated and resolved. With this being a core process of the service area, the data is considered to be valid.

Reliability: All hours worked by the Application Management Services are entered into STAR to ensure cost recovery for the service area. All costs are accurately tracked for all service areas within EITS to adequately report to the Governor's office and the legislature. With the cost per hour being a simple calculation, this measure will be reliably accurate.

LRPP EXHIBIT IV: Performance Measure Validity and Reliability

Department: Management Services

Program: Enterprise Information Technology Services

Service/Budget Entity: Information Services

Measure: Percent of scheduled hours computer and network is available

Action (check one):

- Requesting revision to approved performance measure.
- Change in data sources or measurement methodologies.
- Requesting new measure.
- Backup for performance measure.

Data Sources and Methodology:

We are using an automated process provided through the Multiple Virtual System (MVS) and System Management Facility (SMF) data to track system availability based on the Initial Program Load (IPL) times.

The automated data used to be gathered manually based on noted downtimes during normal working hours.

Validity:

Tracking the operation system IPL times accurately reflects mainframe availability. System backups and maintenance are performed outside available time.

The method used is based on a twenty-four day by six and half days per week. This standard was part of the "Real Decision " benchmarking study.

Reliability:

SMF data is automatically captured by the mainframe operating system (OS/390). The SMF data-set is dumped daily, and the daily dumps are spooled on a weekly basis automated reporting is implemented, the jobs will run against spooled data to automatically calculate mainframe availability without the possibility for human error.

The percentage of reliability created by SMF was recommended in the Real Decisions benchmarking study and found to reliable.

Cost Allocation Formula:

The Associated cost for "Time Scheduled Available – Mainframe" is derived from summing up the to total amount of CPU MIPS (360), and dividing it by the total of Technical Services and Operations salary/benefits, CPU expenses and 25% of the administration costs. This provided the Mainframe cost per MIP.

Office of Policy and Budget – July, 2006

LRPP EXHIBIT IV: Performance Measure Validity and Reliability

Department: Management Services

Program: Enterprise Information Technology Services

Service/Budget Entity: Information Services

Measure: Cost per MIP (millions of instructions per second)

Action (check one):

- Requesting revision to approved performance measure.
- Change in data sources or measurement methodologies.
- Requesting new measure.
- Backup for performance measure.

Data Sources and Methodology:

Measure should be deleted. This is not a valid measure.

We are using an automated process provided through the Multiple Virtual System (MVS) and System Management Facility (SMF) data to track system availability based on the Initial Program Load (IPL) times.

The automated data used to be gathered manually on noted downtime during normal working hours.

The associated cost for "Time Scheduled Available - Mainframe" is derived from summing up the total amount of CPU MIPS (360), and dividing it by the total of Technical Services and Operations salary/benefits, CPU expenses and 25% of the cost of administration for the IMC. This provides the Mainframe cost per MIP.

The method used is based on a twenty-four hour day by six and half days per week.

Validity:

Tracking the operating system IPL, times accurately reflects mainframe availability. System backups and maintenance are performed outside the scheduled available times.

SMF data is automatically captured by the mainframe operating system (OS/390). The SMF data-set is dumped daily, and the daily dumps are spooled on a weekly basis. When automated reporting is implemented, the jobs will run against the spooled data to automatically calculate mainframe availability without the possibility for human error.

The method used is based on a twenty-four hour day by six and half days per week. This standard was part of the "Real Decisions" benchmarking study.

Reliability:

SMF data is automatically captured by the mainframe operating system (OS/390). The SMF data-set is dumped daily, and the daily dumps are spooled on a weekly basis. Automated reporting is implemented; the jobs will run against the spooled data to automatically calculate mainframe availability without the possibility of human error. The Number of reliability created by SMF was recommended in the Real Decisions benchmarking study and found to be reliable.

Office of Policy and Budget – July, 2006

LRPP EXHIBIT IV: Performance Measure Validity and Reliability

Department: Management Services

Program: Enterprise Information Technology Services

Service/Budget Entity: Information Services

Measure: Cost per CPU (Billing charge to users of computer)

Action (check one):

- Requesting revision to approved performance measure.
- Change in data sources or measurement methodologies.
- Requesting new measure.
- Backup for performance measure.

Data Sources and Methodology:

THIS MEASURE SHOULD BE DELETED:

This measure was initially required by the legislature for 2004-05, but without guidance on how to calculate it. A request to delete it was rejected, so DMS/EITS has reported the measure based on the following. EITS is reporting this measure as a cost of the UNIX and Windows systems server CPUs (processors). For UNIX there are 66 servers with 180 CPUs and for Windows there are 93 servers with 154 CPUs, for a total of 334 CPUs. The total cost for the Windows servers in 2005-06 was \$1,449,547 and for UNIX the cost was \$1,622,188 for a total of \$3,071,736. The resulting average cost of a CPU is \$9,196.81. With the consolidation of servers and the replacement of slower processors with faster processors, the cost per CPU should be higher in future years.

Validity:

This measure is a reflection of the cost incurred to operate and support a server processor. Unfortunately, it doesn't reflect relevance for the cost of operations. Efficiencies through consolidation can make this number higher, while simple cost reduction could reduced it.

Calculation = total operational cost / total CPUs

Reliability:

This amount is based on the current inventory and the costs identified for system operational.

LRPP EXHIBIT IV: Performance Measure Validity and Reliability

Department: Management Services

Program: Enterprise Information Technology Services

Service/Budget Entity: Information Services

Measure: First Contact Resolution Rate

Action (check one):

- Requesting revision to approved performance measure.
- Change in data sources or measurement methodologies.
- Requesting new measure.
- Backup for performance measure.

Data Sources and Methodology:

This measure was initially developed to report on the operations of the Information Management Center (IMC) help desk, which provided support solely to the now-eliminated Florida Department of Labor. IMC operations were merged with the STO program in 2002. In 2005-2006, DMS/EITS help desk services are provided through the Services Desk (SD). The DMS/EITS has proposed changing this measure to reflect the effectiveness of the SD. The SD serves as the single point of contact for all inbound service delivery incidents and requests, identifying and resolving those incidents or requests that can be resolved at the initial point of contact (without escalation). It is these incidents that are reflected in the measure First Contact Resolution.

SD customers establish which incidents should be resolved at the SD (noted as "First Contact Resolution (FCR) eligible") and which should be escalated to other service support teams. An example of this would be resetting network passwords - once that capability was assigned to the SD, customer passwords could be reset immediately by the SD without being escalated to other service support teams for resolution.

This measure will show the number of incidents resolved by the SD (of all incidents that are considered FCR eligible.) All incidents and requests are entered into the SD Incident Management tracking system, an incident that has been noted as FCR eligible the SD will attempt to resolve. If the incident is resolved, an FCR marker is created. The SD Incident Management tracking system generates a report on First Contact Resolution, which shows actual FCR, FCR of FCR eligible incidents, and the total number of incidents for a specific period of time.

Validity:

This measure will be a good indicator of effectiveness as the knowledge base continues to grow and more service capabilities are passed from the service support teams to the SD. The success of this measure is dependant on customer

adoption of the SD service, as the customer agencies determine which technology incidents can be addressed by the SD and which incidents should be escalated to service support teams. Through adoption and increased problem resolution by the SD, customer agencies can expect to achieve cost savings and increased staff effectiveness as more routine incidents are resolved through the SD and agency service support staff are able to focus on operations maintenance.

Reliability:

This measure is a component of a First Contact Resolution Rate, which is considered a best practice for support desks in the private sector and has a commonly accepted calculation of incidents resolved divided by the total number of incidents received. The SD Incident Management tracking system is a reliable tracking mechanism for this measure as all SD incidents are generated through this system. The system has a series of report modules, eliminating any potential for human error.

Office of Policy and Budget – July, 2006

LRPP EXHIBIT IV: Performance Measure Validity and Reliability

Department: Management Services

Program: Enterprise Information Technology Services

Service/Budget Entity: Information Services

Measure: Cost per help desk case

Action (check one):

- Requesting revision to approved performance measure.
- Change in data sources or measurement methodologies.
- Requesting new measure.
- Backup for performance measure.

Data Sources and Methodology: This measure reflects the cost per case of the help desk services provided by the EITS Services Desk. The actual cost of operations for the Services Desk divided by the total number of "cases" processed that year. Due to issues related to the settlement of outsourcing contract, cost of operations was lower than expected in 2005-2006 because the settlement cost will not be realized until the 2006-2007 year. During the 2005-2006 primarily support DMS functions, but did continue to provide some services to other agencies. Those agencies will be transitioning to other solutions during 2006-2007. The project rate of \$30.00 for the fiscal year 2006-2007 rate is based on the 2006-2007 projected cost increases, as well as predicted volume changes through fiscal year 2006-2007.

Validity: This measure is a reflection of the tier 1 cost incurred when establishing an incident with the Services Desk. Total cost of operations is a product of our standard financial reports and the total case number is a product of service utilization reports.

Calculation = total operational cost / total cases per fiscal year

Reliability: This amount has been established in the current cost models for services.

LRPP EXHIBIT IV: Performance Measure Validity and Reliability

Department: Management Services

Program: Enterprise Information Technology Services

Service/Budget Entity: Information Services

Measure: Number of Service Requests Completed on Time

Action (check one):

- Requesting revision to approved performance measure.
- Change in data sources or measurement methodologies.
- Requesting new measure.
- Backup for performance measure.

Deletion Justification – This measure is not a valid measure. The outcome of this measure provides no meaning as to the efficiency or effectiveness of the unit. Concerning simply the number of requests, a higher number is not better than a lower number, and vice versa. For Application Management Services, a single service request may be a large project involving 5 developers for 5 months, or a quick hit item of 1 developer for 16 hours. The AMS environment is one in which customers set budget caps. Within this cap (and therefore a cap on resources) the customer may want a few larger development projects accomplished to improve efficiencies, while smaller maintenance items are set aside or put on hold. Or, conversely, they may want many small maintenance items addressed and no large projects. Therefore, the number of requests is meaningless. This measure may be more meaningful for a Service Desk that typically responds to quick hit issues in a short amount of time, and in which higher numbers would mean growth of business. Concerning the completed on time aspect of the number of requests, this is meaningless without comparison. There is no meaningful benchmark in the market for application development since requests will widely vary in scope and level. If comparison is against the number not completed on time, the “Percent Completed on Time” measure already measures this. Quite simply, a measure of the number of service requests handle on-time by itself cannot determine effectiveness in any way for an application development group.

Data Sources and Methodology:

This measure was transferred from Dept of Labor in FY02 when the IMC was merged with the STO. As the processes of this group and the processes of the STO Applications Development section were merged and are now outsourced as part of ITN006, this methodology has been modified to better reflect current operations.

The activity of supporting Service Requests has been outsourced as part of the ITN006/MyFlorida Alliance. Although the STO monitors the outsourced Alliance

Service Provider's activities and the satisfaction of the customer, the STO does not perform the actual function of maintaining the applications.

Service Requests are tracked in the Enterprise Technology Service Desk (ETSD). The Agencies may enter Service Requests directly into ETSD or may call the ETSD to have them entered.

Requested completion dates may also be entered or negotiated between the customer and the MyFlorida Alliance Service Provider. Each Service Request is assigned to a MyFlorida Alliance Service Provider programmer with a due date. When it is completed, the completion date is entered into the ETSD, the customer is notified and the ETSD ticket is closed by the customer. The MyFlorida Alliance Service Provider maintains a separate time accounting system into which their associates enter hours worked for each ticket to which they are assigned.

The percentage of Service Requests completed is determined by using the total number of Service Requests closed along with the due date and completion date. If the Service Requests is completed on or before the due date, it is considered timely.

Validity:

This measure corresponds to the outcome measure "Percent of Service Requests Completed On Time," which reports timeliness and responsiveness on the part of the applications management section. Service Requests must be entered and assigned by the Alliance Service Provider Managers into the time accounting system for the associate to post the time spent on completing the Service Request. Both the customer and the Service Provider Manager must validate the accuracy of the outcome before a request can be considered completed and closed.

Each Alliance Service Provider associate enters his/her time into the Service Provider's time accounting system. At the end of each month, a utilization report is submitted to the STO detailing each associate's monthly time, the activity they performed and the specific Agency's account code to which the time has been charged.

Reliability:

Data is entered by associates into the Alliance Service Provider's time accounting system and monitored by the Alliance Service Provider Managers. A monthly Utilization Report is submitted to the STO detailing each associate's monthly time, the activity they performed and the specific Agency's account code to which the time has been charged. In addition, the Alliance Service Provider provides a count of number of tickets closed during the month and a listing of major activities performed during the month. Biweekly meetings are held with the customer, the STO and the Alliance Service Provider to review major Service

Requests and to discuss prioritization. Data is tracked from inception to completion. The criterion for timely percentage completion is predetermined by a Service Level Agreement (SLA) between the STO and the Agencies. The SLA measurements have been agreed to by the Alliance Service Provider before presenting to the Agencies.

The Service Request is a reliable measure of the MyFlorida Alliance Service Provider productivity because it represents the priority and workload assigned by the Agencies. Date received and the date of completion easily determines outcome results of the measure. When a Service Request is received, it is entered into and tracked in both ETSD and the Alliance Service Provider's Accounting System. At some point, either initially or as negotiated with the customer, a due date is entered and an associate assigned to complete the task. When the Service Request is completed, the completion date is entered into ETSD and the customer is notified. The customer then is responsible for closing the ticket. A query is run against the ETSD for the Service Requests due in a given time frame and Service Requests completed within that time frame.

Office of Policy and Budget – July, 2006

LRPP EXHIBIT IV: Performance Measure Validity and Reliability

Department: Management Services

Program: Enterprise Information Technology Services

Service/Budget Entity: Information Services

Measure: Number of scheduled production jobs completed

Action (check one):

- Requesting revision to approved performance measure.
- Change in data sources or measurement methodologies.
- Requesting new measure.
- Backup for performance measure.

Data Sources and Methodology:

IMC is using an automated tracking package, MXG. This tracking package is assisting IMC in tracking the outcome Number of production processing and the cost associated to achieve the desired outcome needed by the Divisions. Data will be extracted and statistically analyzed by IMC. The number of clients using our Web Page will be included in our counts of the total client population.

The Number is calculated by the number of jobs run versus the number of jobs aborted. This gives a Number of jobs that were completed without error. This also identifies the type of errors that occurred, so that in the future these may be eliminated.

Validity:

Every job that is run on the mainframe is tracked. Any job that contains errors is identified. A count of jobs that run successfully compared to jobs that fail is a valid measure of productivity.

Reliability:

The reliability has been established by using a totally automated process for tracking the Number of jobs that are successfully run on the mainframe.

The Number of reliability created by the automated process will increase the level of confidence of the users and managers.

Office of Policy and Budget – July, 2006

LRPP EXHIBIT IV: Performance Measure Validity and Reliability

Department: Management Services

Program: Enterprise Information Technology Services

Service/Budget Entity: Information Services

Measure: Scheduled hours computer and network is available

Action (check one):

- Requesting revision to approved performance measure.
- Change in data sources or measurement methodologies.
- Requesting new measure.
- Backup for performance measure.

Data Sources and Methodology:

We are using an automated process provided through the Multiple Virtual System (MVS) and System Management Facility (SMF) data to track system availability based on the Initial Program Load (IPL) times. The automated data used to be gathered manually on noted downtime during normal working hours.

Validity:

Tracking the operating system IPL, times accurately reflects mainframe availability. System backups and maintenance are performed outside the scheduled available times.

SMF data is automatically captured by the mainframe operating system (OS/390). The SMF data-set is dumped daily, and the daily dumps are spooled on a weekly basis. When automated reporting is implemented, the jobs will run against the spooled data to automatically calculate mainframe availability without the possibility for human error.

The method used is based on a twenty-four hour day by six and half days per week.

Reliability:

SMF data is automatically captured by the mainframe operating system (OS/390). The SMF data-set is dumped daily, and the daily dumps are spooled on a weekly basis. Automated reporting is implemented; the jobs will run against the spooled data to automatically calculate mainframe availability without the possibility of human error.

The Number of reliability created by SMF was recommended in the Real Decisions benchmarking study and found to be reliable.

Office of Policy and Budget – July, 2006

LRPP EXHIBIT IV: Performance Measure Validity and Reliability

Department: Management Services

Program: Enterprise Information Technology Services

Service/Budget Entity: Information Services

Measure: Number of Incidents Resolved on First Contact (was Number of Help Desk calls resolved within 3 Hours)

Action (check one):

- Requesting revision to approved performance measure.
- Change in data sources or measurement methodologies.
- Requesting new measure.
- Backup for performance measure.

Data Sources and Methodology:

This measure was initially developed to report on the operations of the Information Management Center (IMC) help desk, which provided support solely to the now-eliminated Florida Department of Labor. IMC operations were merged with the STO program in 2002. In 2005-2006, DMS/EITS help desk services are provided through the Services Desk (SD). The DMS/EITS has proposed changing this measure to reflect the effectiveness of the SD. The SD serves as the single point of contact for all inbound service delivery incidents and requests, identifying and resolving those incidents or requests that can be resolved at the initial point of contact (without escalation). It is these incidents that are reflected in the measure First Contact Resolution.

SD customers establish which incidents should be resolved at the SD (noted as "First Contact Resolution (FCR) eligible") and which should be escalated to other service support teams. An example of this would be resetting network passwords - once that capability was assigned to the SD, customer passwords could be reset immediately by the SD without being escalated to other service support teams for resolution.

This measure will show the number of incidents resolved by the SD (of all incidents that are considered FCR eligible.) All incidents and requests are entered into the SD Incident Management tracking system, an incident that has been noted as FCR eligible the SD will attempt to resolve. If the incident is resolved, an FCR marker is created. The SD Incident Management tracking system generates a report on First Contact Resolution, which shows actual FCR, FCR of FCR eligible incidents, and the total number of incidents for a specific period of time.

Validity:

This measure will be a good indicator of effectiveness as the knowledge base continues to grow and more service capabilities are passed from the service

support teams to the SD. The success of this measure is dependant on customer adoption of the SD service, as the customer agencies determine which technology incidents can be addressed by the SD and which incidents should be escalated to service support teams. Through adoption and increased problem resolution by the SD, customer agencies can expect to achieve cost savings and increased staff effectiveness as more routine incidents are resolved through the SD and agency service support staff are able to focus on operations maintenance.

Reliability:

This measure is a component of a First Contact Resolution Rate, which is considered a best practice for support desks in the private sector and has a commonly accepted calculation of incidents resolved divided by the total number of incidents received. The SD Incident Management tracking system is a reliable tracking mechanism for this measure as all SD incidents are generated through this system. The system has a series of report modules, eliminating any potential for human error.

Office of Policy and Budget – July, 2006

LRPP EXHIBIT IV: Performance Measure Validity and Reliability

Department: Management Services

Program: Enterprise Information Technology Services

Service/Budget Entity: Information Technology

Measure: Percent of agency service level agreements met

Action (check one):

- Requesting revision to approved performance measure.
- Change in data sources or measurement methodologies.
- Requesting new measure.
- Backup for performance measure.

Data Sources and Methodology:

Service level agreements are a mechanism to collaborate and document the content and acceptable level of service provided by the Enterprise Information Technology Services. Service level agreements were developed between the Enterprise Information Technology Services and the Governor's agencies. During the STO outsourcing transition year 2003-04, these agreements were initially drafted, revised, and implemented. The service level agreement measurement were to be reported in the subsequent fiscal year, 2004-2005. However during 2004-2005, the former State Technology Office terminated outsourcing contracts and was merged back into the Department Management Services effective July 1, 2005 as the. As a result, the fiscal year of 2005-2006 became a transition year for the redefinition of enterprise services. EITS continued the existing SLAs from 2004-2005, but did not provide performance reports. Starting July 2006, the EITS is implementing a revised SLA process with customers, that has a Master Agreement to define the relationship and Service Level Agreements for each service provided that customer.

A component of the service level agreement is the service objective. The service objective states the expectation of a specific service or outcome. After an objective is determined (e.g., network availability or percent of successful problem resolution), a baseline is captured using existing or historical data, establishing the service level requirement. At the end of the reporting period, the current performance level for this objective is captured and compared against the service level requirement. If the service level requirement did not meet the expectations established, the measure is deemed unsuccessful. The number of successful objectives for each service level agreement for each agency is divided by the total number of objectives for all agencies and multiplied by 100 to calculate the percent of agency service level agreements met.

Validity:

The service level requirements are measurable units of performance. The documented success or failure of these requirements is the mechanism used to capture the percent of agency service level agreements met.

Reliability:

Each service area within the Enterprise Information Technology Services maintains and reports information for the objective(s) that fall within their area. The Enterprise Information Technology Services Client Services and Planning Sections track the objectives monthly. Beginning October 2006, monthly reports will be published by Enterprise Information Technology Services on SLA performance measures.

Office of Policy and Budget – July, 2006

LRPP EXHIBIT IV: Performance Measure Validity and Reliability

Department: Department of Management Services

Program: Florida Commission on Human Relations

Service/Budget Entity: Human Relations

Measure: Percent of Civil Rights Cases Resolved Within 180 Days of Filing

Action (check one):

- Requesting revision to approved performance measure.
- Change in data sources or measurement methodologies.
- Requesting new measure.
- Backup for performance measure.

Data Sources and Methodology:

This measure was developed to determine the responsiveness of the commission to citizen complaints. Additionally, the measure ensures fair treatment of both complainants and respondents in instances of alleged discrimination. The data was gathered from three sources. The primary source is the Commission's UNIX system. It consists of four reports: (1) Open Docketed Cases, (2) Closed Docketed Cases, (3) Cases Sent to Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC), and (4) Cases Sent to Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD). This system contains information that is initially gathered during the intake process. The second source, which related to employment cases only, is utilized by the U.S. EEOC and is called the Charge Data System (CDS). The third source is the system utilized by the U.S. Department of HUD, which is a Hypertext Markup Language (HTML) system. This system is internet-based and is designed to allow the Commission to forward cases to HUD as well. The actual data on file is therefore maintained via the Internet. Upon receiving the data from these sources, the Commission used the following methodology to calculate the baseline:

Validity:

A – cases received during the FY

B – cases resolved within 180 days of filing

C – percent of cases resolved within 180 days of filing

Computation: Baseline Measure Formula= $B/A=C$ (%)

Currently, the sources of data are validated by reconciling records with EEOC and HUD. This system allows the comparisons of state data and statistics and assists in identifying trends and patterns that are useful in developing strategies to combat its performance to other states by researching activities of other discrimination agencies.

Reliability:

In addition to the reports received from the above-mentioned databases, manual counts of cases on hand, cases closed, and cases closed within 180 days were conducted. The commission continues to write programs that will allow us to run reports that aren't readily available in the current database system. The commission relies on data supplied by the web-based system utilized by U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, and the U.S. Equal Opportunities Commission's Charge Data System which is not web-based. During the 2000/2001 Legislative Session, the Commission was granted the authority to begin the development of a new database system designed to integrate the systems currently utilized by these two federal agencies to allow us more accuracy and efficiency in reconciling inventory. Our objective is to provide excellent service to our customers in the most cost-effective manner possible. Through the establishment of the new web-based system, we believe we can accommodate the residents of Florida more efficiently and provide more timely services.

Office of Policy and Budget – July, 2006

LRPP EXHIBIT IV: Performance Measure Validity and Reliability

Department: Management Services

Program: Human Relations Commission

Service/Budget Entity: Human Relations

Measure: Number of Inquiries and Investigations

Action (check one):

- Requesting revision to approved performance measure.
- Change in data sources or measurement methodologies.
- Requesting new measure.
- Backup for performance measure.

Data Sources and Methodology:

The measure ensures fair treatment of both complainants and respondents in instances of alleged discrimination. The data was gathered from three sources. The primary source is the Commission's Case Management System. It consists of three reports: (1) Employment & Housing Technical Assistance, where the commission is contacted either by phone, by an in-office visit, by mail or by e-mail, (2) Processing and tracking of paperwork on cases where EEOC is conducting the active investigation known as deferrals, however, staff is required to oversee these complaints, and (3) Cases resolved during the Fiscal Year regardless of when the complaint was received. This system contains information that is initially gathered during the intake process. The second source, which relates to employment cases only, is utilized by the U.S. EEOC and is called the Integrated Mission System (IMS). The third source is the system utilized by the U.S. Department of Housing Urban and Development (HUD), which is a Hypertext Markup Language (HTML) System called TEAPOTS. Both systems are internet-based and are designed to allow the Commission to receive potential jurisdictional cases from EEOC via IMS, allow the ability to assign EEOC numbers, receive cases from HUD via TEAPOTS and allow the Commission to forward cases to HUD & EEOC for contract credit. Upon receiving the data from these sources, the Commission used the following methodology to calculate the baseline:

Definitions/Data

A= technical assistance received during FY 06

B=deferrals received during FY 06

C=cases resolved during FY 06

D=inquiries and investigations received during FY 06

Computation: **Baseline Measure Formula=** **A+B+C=D**

Validity:

Currently, the sources of data are validated by reconciling records with EEOC and HUD. The system allows the comparison of state data and statistics and assists in identifying trends and patterns that are useful in developing strategies to compact unlawful employment practices. Furthermore, the Commission compares its performance to other states by researching activities of other anti-discrimination agencies.

Reliability:

In FY 03-04, the commission developed and built a Case Management System (CMS) that has greatly enhanced the efficiency of processing complaints and inquiries. The system ensures data integrity, is easier to navigate and allows customization and enhancements. The previous federal Charge Data System (CDS) did not allow for interactive processing of complaints/inquiries by investigators/staff and required manual accounting methods for ensuring timely processing of complaints and inquiries. The technology advances provided by the Case Management System (CMS) has assisted staff in speedy resolution and accounting of complaints and inquiries. Housing data is compiled and extracted from Housing and Urban Development web-based computer system known as TEAPOTS. The Title Eight Automated Paperless Office Tracking System (TEAPOTS) is a waterfall lifecycle system used to record housing discrimination cases, develop investigation processes, generate management reports, and produce case documents for cases filed under Title VIII of the Civil Rights act of 1968, as amended by the Fair Housing Act of 1988, and other processes. It also tracks complaints and compliances for the following authorities: Title VI, Title IX, Section 109, Section 504, Age Discrimination Act, and Americans with Disabilities Act.

Office of Policy and Budget – July, 2006

LRPP EXHIBIT V – ASSOCIATED ACTIVITIES CONTRIBUTING TO PERFORMANCE MEASURES

LRPP Exhibit V: Identification of Associated Activity Contributing to Performance Measures

Measure Number	Approved Performance Measures for FY 2006-07 (Words)		Associated Activities Title
<i>Administration</i>			
1	Administrative costs as a percent of total agency costs		ACT 0010 Executive Direction ACT 0020 General Counsel/Legal ACT 0030 Legislative Affairs ACT 0060 Inspector General ACT 0070 Communications/Public Information ACT 0080 Director of Administration ACT 0090 Planning and Budgeting ACT 0100 Finance and Accounting ACT 0110 Personnel Services/Human Resources ACT 0130 Mail Room (includes Mail Room, Print Shop, and Property Management) ACT 0200 Procurement
2	Administrative positions as a percent of total agency positions		ACT 0010 Executive Direction ACT 0020 General Counsel/Legal ACT 0030 Legislative affairs ACT 0060 Inspector General ACT 0070 Communications/Public Information ACT 0080 Director of Administration ACT 0090 Planning and Budgeting ACT 0100 Finance and Accounting ACT 0110 Personnel Services/Human Resources

continued on next page

LRPP Exhibit V: Identification of Associated Activity Contributing to Performance Measures

Measure Number	Approved Performance Measures for FY 2006-07 (Words)		Associated Activities Title
2	Administrative positions as a percent of total agency positions	ACT 0130 ACT 0200	Mail Room (includes Mail Room, Print Shop, and Property Management) Procurement
<i>State Employee Leasing</i>			
3	Number of employees in the State Employee Leasing Service	ACT 0510	Process payroll and benefits for leased state employees
<i>Facilities Management</i>			
4	Average Department of Management Services full service rent-composite cost per net square foot (actual) compared to average private sector full service rent-composite cost per net square foot in markets where the Department manages office facilities.	ACT 0620	Operate and maintain Department of Management Services' pool facilities
5	DMS average operations and maintenance cost per square foot maintained	ACT 0680 ACT 0010	Special Category: Utility payments Executive Direction
6	Number of maintained square feet (private contract and agency)	ACT 0620 ACT 0680 ACT 0010	Operate and maintain Department of Management Services' pool facilities Special Category: Utility payments Executive Direction
7	Number of leases managed	ACT 0620 ACT 0630 ACT 0010	Operate and maintain Department of Management Services' pool facilities Operate and maintain non-pool facilities Executive Direction
8	Net square feet of state-owned office space occupied by state agencies	ACT 0650 ACT 0010 ACT 0640 ACT 0010	Manage private sector and state leases for state agencies Executive Direction Administer bonding program and plan for state office space requirements Executive Direction

LRRP Exhibit V: Identification of Associated Activity Contributing to Performance Measures

Measure Number	Approved Performance Measures for FY 2006-07 (Words)		Associated Activities Title
9	Net square feet of private sector office space occupied by state agencies	ACT 0650	Manage private sector and state leases for state agencies
10	Number of facilities secured	ACT 0010	Executive Direction
		ACT 0690	Provide facilities security
		ACT 0010	Executive Direction
	<i>Building Construction</i>		
11	Gross square foot construction cost of office facilities for the Department of Management Services compared to gross square foot construction cost of office facilities for private industry average	ACT 0750	Manage construction projects
12	Dollar volume of fixed capital outlay project starts	ACT 0010	Executive Direction
		ACT 0750	Manage construction projects
		ACT 0010	Executive Direction
	<i>Aircraft Management</i>		
13	Cost per flight hour - State vs. private provider	ACT 0900	Operate and maintain the Executive Aircraft Pool
14	Number of flight hours	ACT 0010	Executive Direction
		ACT 0900	Operate and maintain the Executive Aircraft Pool
		ACT 0010	Executive Direction
	<i>Federal Property Assistance</i>		
15	Federal property distribution rate	ACT 1000	Acquire and redistribute federal surplus property
		ACT 1010	Acquire and redistribute military excess property
		ACT 0010	Executive Direction

LRPP Exhibit V: Identification of Associated Activity Contributing to Performance Measures

Measure Number	Approved Performance Measures for FY 2006-07 (Words)		Associated Activities Title
16	Number of federal property orders processed	ACT 1000 ACT 1010 ACT 0010	Acquire and redistribute federal surplus property Acquire and redistribute military excess property Executive Direction
<i>Fleet Management</i>			
17	Miles of commercial rental vehicle contract service provided	ACT 1100	Executive Direction
18	State contract daily vehicle rental rate vs. private provider daily vehicle rental rate	ACT 0010	Executive Direction
<i>Purchasing Oversight</i>			
19	Percent of state term contract savings	ACT 1200	Establish and administer state term (master) contracts and negotiated agreements
20	Number of state contracts and agreements executed	ACT 0010 ACT 1200 ACT 0010	Executive Direction Establish and administer state term (master) contracts and negotiated agreements Executive Direction
21	Dollars expended by state agencies using the state term contracts and negotiated agreements	ACT 1200 ACT 0010	Establish and administer state term (master) contracts and negotiated agreements Executive Direction
<i>Private Prison Monitoring</i>			
22	Number of private prison contracts monitored	ACT 1700	Contract for the construction, operation and oversight of private prisons
<i>Office of Supplier Diversity</i>			
23	Average minority certification process time (in days)	ACT 1300	Provide minority access to contracting opportunities
24	Number of businesses certified and registered	ACT 1310 ACT 1300 ACT 1310	Manage and oversee minority business compliance Provide minority access to contracting opportunities Manage and oversee minority business compliance

L RPP Exhibit V: Identification of Associated Activity Contributing to Performance Measures

Measure Number	Approved Performance Measures for FY 2006-07 (Words)		Associated Activities Title
25	Number of businesses reviewed and audited	ACT 1310	Manage and oversee minority business compliance
<i>Human Resource Management</i>			
26	Total state cost per position in the state agencies	ACT 1400	Provide human resource management expertise/consulting
		ACT 1420	Maintain the Human Resources automated system
		ACT 0010	Executive Direction
27	Number of state agencies with established training plans	ACT 1400	Provide human resource management expertise/consulting
		ACT 0010	Executive Direction
28	Percent of all contracted performance standards met (Outsourced HR)	ACT 1420	Maintain the Human Resources automated system
		ACT 0010	Executive Direction
29	Overall customer satisfaction rating	ACT 1400	Provide human resource management expertise/consulting
		ACT 0010	Executive Direction
30	Percent of agencies at or above EEO gender parity with available labor market	ACT 1400	Provide human resource management expertise/consulting
		ACT 0010	Executive Direction
31	Percent of agencies at or above EEO minority parity with available labor market	ACT 1400	Provide human resource management expertise/consulting
		ACT 0010	Executive Direction
32	Number of positions in the state agencies supported by the HR automated system	ACT 1420	Maintain the Human Resources automated system
		ACT 0010	Executive Direction

LRPP Exhibit V: Identification of Associated Activity Contributing to Performance Measures

Measure Number	Approved Performance Measures for FY 2006-07 (Words)		Associated Activities Title
33	Number of responses to technical assistance requests	ACT 1400	Provide human resource management expertise/consulting
34	Percent of dollars saved by eliminating positions and reducing expenses	ACT 1420 ACT 0010 ACT 1400 ACT 0010	Maintain the Human Resources automated system Executive Direction Provide human resource management expertise/consulting Executive Direction
	<i>Insurance Benefit Administration (Division of State Group Insurance)</i>		
35	Percent of all contracted performance standards met	ACT 1500 ACT 1510 ACT 1530 ACT 0010	Administer the Health Insurance program Administer the Life Insurance program Administer the Supplemental Insurance program Executive Direction
36	State Employees' Preferred Provider Organization Plan - per member/per year cost - (State) compared to the per member/per year cost - (National Benchmark)	ACT 1500 ACT 0010	Administer the Health Insurance program Executive Direction

LRPP Exhibit V: Identification of Associated Activity Contributing to Performance Measures

Measure Number	Approved Performance Measures for FY 2006-07 (Words)		Associated Activities Title
37	DMS Administrative cost per insurance enrollee		ACT 1500 Administer the Health Insurance program
			ACT 1510 Administer the Life Insurance program
			ACT 1520 Administer the Flexible Spending Account program
			ACT 1530 Administer the Supplemental Insurance program
			ACT 1540 Administer the Disability Benefits program
			ACT 0010 Executive Direction
38	State Employees' Preferred Provider Organization Plan - vendor's administrative cost per insurance enrollee		ACT 1500 Administer the Health Insurance program
			ACT 0010 Executive Direction
39	Percent of insurance benefits administration customers satisfied		ACT 1500 Administer the Health Insurance program
			ACT 1510 Administer the Life Insurance program
			ACT 1520 Administer the Flexible Spending Account program
			ACT 1530 Administer the Supplemental Insurance program
			ACT 1540 Administer the Disability Benefits program
			ACT 0010 Executive Direction
40	Number of enrollees (Total)		ACT 1500 Administer the Health Insurance program
			ACT 1510 Administer the Life Insurance program
			ACT 1520 Administer the Flexible Spending Account program
			ACT 1530 Administer the Supplemental Insurance program
			ACT 1540 Administer the Disability Benefits program
			ACT 0010 Executive Direction

LRRP Exhibit V: Identification of Associated Activity Contributing to Performance Measures

Measure Number	Approved Performance Measures for FY 2006-07 (Words)		Associated Activities Title
<i>Retirement Administration (Division of Retirement)</i>			
41	Percent of members satisfied with retirement services	ACT 0010	Executive Direction
42	Percent of retired payrolls processed timely	ACT 1610 ACT 1620 ACT 1610 ACT 1620 ACT 1640 ACT 0010	Administer the Florida Retirement System Administer the Retiree Health Insurance Subsidy program Administer the Florida Retirement System Administer the Retiree Health Insurance Subsidy program Pension and benefits payments - General Revenue only Executive Direction
43	Percent of service retirees added to the next payroll after receipt of all documents	ACT 1610	Administer the Florida Retirement System
44	Percent of monthly payrolls from FRS Employers processed within 5 days	ACT 1620 ACT 1640 ACT 0010	Administer the Retiree Health Insurance Subsidy program Pension and benefits payments - General Revenue only Executive Direction
45	Turn around times for benefit calculations - Information Requests (calendar days).	ACT 1610 ACT 0010	Administer the Florida Retirement System Executive Direction
46	Percent of participating agencies satisfied with retirement services	ACT 1610 ACT 1620 ACT 0010	Administer the Florida Retirement System Administer the Retiree Health Insurance Subsidy program Executive Direction

LRPP Exhibit V: Identification of Associated Activity Contributing to Performance Measures

Measure Number	Approved Performance Measures for FY 2006-07 (Words)		Associated Activities Title
47	Percent of agency payroll transactions correctly reported	ACT 1610	Administer the Florida Retirement System
48	Administrative cost per active and retired member	ACT 1620 ACT 1630 ACT 0010	Administer the Retiree Health Insurance Subsidy program Administer the State University System Optional Retirement program Executive Direction
49	Percent of local retirement systems annually reviewed which are funded on a sound actuarial basis	ACT 1610 ACT 1620 ACT 1630 ACT 0010	Administer the Florida Retirement System Administer the Retiree Health Insurance Subsidy program Administer the State University System Optional Retirement program Executive Direction
50	Percent of local retirement systems annually reviewed which are funded on a sound actuarial basis	ACT 1600	Provide local government pension plan oversight
51	Number of local pension plan valuations and impact statements reviewed	ACT 0010	Executive Direction
52	Number of local pension plan valuations and impact statements reviewed	ACT 1600	Provide local government pension plan oversight
53	Number of FRS members	ACT 0010	Executive Direction
54	Public Employees Relations Commission	ACT 1610 ACT 1620 ACT 0010	Administer the Florida Retirement System Administer the Retiree Health Insurance Subsidy program Executive Direction
52	Percent of timely labor dispositions	ACT 0780	Adjudicate and facilitate mediation of labor and employment disputes through the Public Employees Relations Commission
53	Percent of timely employment dispositions	ACT 0780	Adjudicate and facilitate mediation of labor and employment disputes through the Public Employees Relations Commission
54	Percent of dispositions not appealed	ACT 0780	Adjudicate and facilitate mediation of labor and employment disputes through the Public Employees Relations Commission

LRPP Exhibit V: Identification of Associated Activity Contributing to Performance Measures

Measure Number	Approved Performance Measures for FY 2006-07 (Words)	Associated Activities Title
55	Percent of appealed dispositions affirmed	ACT 0780 Adjudicate and facilitate mediation of labor and employment disputes through the Public Employees Relations Commission
56	Number of labor dispositions	ACT 0780 Adjudicate and facilitate mediation of labor and employment disputes through the Public Employees Relations Commission
57	Number of employment dispositions	ACT 0780 Adjudicate and facilitate mediation of labor and employment disputes through the Public Employees Relations Commission
<i>Commission on Human Relations</i>		
58	Percent of civil rights cases resolved within 180 days of filing	ACT 1800 Investigate complaints of civil rights violations
		ACT 1810 Provide community relations education
		ACT 0010 Executive Direction
59	Number of inquiries and investigations	ACT 1800 Investigate complaints of civil rights violations
		ACT 1810 Provide community relations education
		ACT 0010 Executive Direction
<i>Telecommunications Services</i>		
60	Aggregated discount from commercially available rates for voice and data services	ACT 0310 Information Technology - Administrative Services
		ACT 0340 Information Technology - Network Operations
		ACT 8020 Special Category: Centrex/SUNCOM Vendor Payments
61	Percent of telecommunications customers satisfied	ACT 0310 Information Technology - Administrative Services
		ACT 0340 Information Technology - Network Operations
		ACT 8020 Special Category: Centrex/SUNCOM Vendor Payments
		ACT 8030 Pass through for Wireless 9-1-1 Distributions to Service Providers and Counties
		ACT 8040 Special Category: Telecommunications Infrastructure Project Systems (TIPS)

LRPP Exhibit V: Identification of Associated Activity Contributing to Performance Measures

Measure Number	Approved Performance Measures for FY 2006-07 (Words)		Associated Activities Title
62	Total revenue for voice service	ACT 0310	Information Technology - Administrative Services
		ACT 0340	Information Technology - Network Operations
		ACT 8020	Special Category: Centrex/SUNCOM Vendor Payments
63	Total revenue for data service	ACT 0310	Information Technology - Administrative Services
		ACT 0340	Information Technology - Network Operations
		ACT 8020	Special Category: Centrex/SUNCOM Vendor Payments
Wireless Services			
64	Percent of wireless customers satisfied	ACT 0310	Information Technology - Administrative Services
		ACT 0340	Information Technology - Network Operations
65	Percent of state covered by the Joint Task Force Radio System	ACT 0310	Information Technology - Administrative Services
		ACT 0340	Information Technology - Network Operations
66	Percent of all 800 MHz law enforcement radio system contracted performance standards met	ACT 0310	Information Technology - Administrative Services
		ACT 0340	Information Technology - Network Operations
67	Number of engineering projects and approvals handled for state and local governments	ACT 0310	Information Technology - Administrative Services
		ACT 0340	Information Technology - Network Operations
Information Services			
68	Percent of information services customers satisfied	ACT 0310	Information Technology - Administrative Services
		ACT 0320	Information Technology - Applications Development/Support
		ACT 0330	Information Technology - Computer Operations
		ACT 0350	Information Technology - Desktop Support

LRPP Exhibit V: Identification of Associated Activity Contributing to Performance Measures

Measure Number	Approved Performance Measures for FY 2006-07 (Words)		Associated Activities Title
		ACT 8010	Special Category: State Portal Development
69	Percent utilization by the Unisys System as used for capacity planning and technology refresh, employing 80% maximum utilization standard	ACT 0310	Information Technology - Administrative Services
70	Percent utilization by the IBM System as used for capacity planning and technology refresh, employing 80% maximum utilization standard	ACT 0330	Information Technology - Computer Operations
71	Number of customers served	ACT 0330	Information Technology - Computer Operations
		ACT 0310	Information Technology - Administrative Services
		ACT 0320	Information Technology - Applications Development/Support
		ACT 0330	Information Technology - Computer Operations
		ACT 0350	Information Technology - Desktop Support
72	Percent of customers satisfied (Overall Satisfaction Measure)	ACT 8010	Special Category: State Portal Development
		ACT 0310	Information Technology - Administrative Services
		ACT 0320	Information Technology - Applications Development/Support
		ACT 0330	Information Technology - Computer Operations
		ACT 0350	Information Technology - Desktop Support
73	Percent of scheduled information technology production jobs completed.	ACT 8010	Special Category: State Portal Development
		ACT 0310	Information Technology - Administrative Services
		ACT 0330	Information Technology - Computer Operations

LRPP Exhibit V: Identification of Associated Activity Contributing to Performance Measures

Measure Number	Approved Performance Measures for FY 2006-07 (Words)		Associated Activities Title
74	Percent of information management center's data processing requests completed by due date	ACT 0310	Information Technology - Administrative Services
75	System design and programming hourly cost	ACT 0330	Information Technology - Computer Operations
76	Percent of scheduled hours computer and network is available	ACT 0310	Information Technology - Administrative Services
77	Cost per MIP (millions of instructions per second)	ACT 0320	Information Technology - Applications Development/Support
78	Cost per CPU (Billing charge to users of computer)	ACT 0310	Information Technology - Administrative Services
79	First Contact Resolution Rate	ACT 0330	Information Technology - Computer Operations
80	Cost per help desk case	ACT 0310	Information Technology - Administrative Services
81	Number of service requests completed on time	ACT 0350	Information Technology - Desktop Support
82	Number of scheduled production jobs completed	ACT 0310	Information Technology - Desktop Support
		ACT 0330	Information Technology - Administrative Services
		ACT 0310	Information Technology - Computer Operations
		ACT 0330	Information Technology - Administrative Services
		ACT 0330	Information Technology - Computer Operations

LRPP Exhibit V: Identification of Associated Activity Contributing to Performance Measures

Measure Number	Approved Performance Measures for FY 2006-07 (Words)		Associated Activities Title
83	Scheduled hours computer and network is available	ACT 0310 ACT 0330 ACT 0340	Information Technology - Administrative Services Information Technology - Computer Operations Information Technology - Network Operations
84	Number of Help Desk calls resolved within 3 Hours	ACT 0310	Information Technology - Administrative Services
85	Percent of Agency service level agreements met	ACT 0350 ACT 0310 ACT 0320 ACT 0330 ACT 0350	Information Technology - Desktop Support Information Technology - Administrative Services Information Technology - Applications Development/Support Information Technology - Computer Operations Information Technology - Desktop Support

LRPP EXHIBIT VI – AGENCY – LEVEL UNIT COST SUMMARY

GLOSSARY OF TERMS AND ACRONYMS

Activity: A set of transactions within a budget entity that translates inputs into outputs using resources in response to a business requirement. Sequences of activities in logical combinations form services. Unit cost information is determined using the outputs of activities.

Actual Expenditures: Includes prior year actual disbursements, payables and encumbrances. The payables and encumbrances are certified forward at the end of the fiscal year. They may be disbursed between July 1 and December 31 of the subsequent fiscal year. Certified forward amounts are included in the year in which the funds are committed and not shown in the year the funds are disbursed.

Appropriation Category: The lowest level line item of funding in the General Appropriations Act which represents a major expenditure classification of the budget entity. Within budget entities, these categories may include: salaries and benefits, other personal services (OPS), expenses, operating capital outlay, data processing services, fixed capital outlay, etc. These categories are defined within this glossary under individual listings. For a complete listing of all appropriation categories, please refer to the ACTR section in the LAS/PBS User's Manual for instructions on ordering a report.

Baseline Data: Indicators of a state agency's current performance level, pursuant to guidelines established by the Executive Office of the Governor in consultation with legislative appropriations and appropriate substantive committees.

Budget Entity: A unit or function at the lowest level to which funds are specifically appropriated in the appropriations act. "Budget entity" and "service" have the same meaning.

CIO: Chief information Officer

CIP: Capital Improvements Program Plan

D3-A: A legislative budget request (LBR) exhibit which presents a narrative explanation and justification for each issue for the requested years.

Demand: The number of output units which are eligible to benefit from a service or activity.

EITS: Enterprise Information Technology Services

EOG: Executive Office of the Governor

Estimated Expenditures: Includes the amount estimated to be expended during the current fiscal year. These amounts will be computer generated based on the current year appropriations adjusted for vetoes and special appropriations bills.

FCO: Fixed Capital Outlay

FFMIS: Florida Financial Management Information System

Fixed Capital Outlay: Real property (land, buildings including appurtenances, fixtures and fixed equipment, structures, etc.), including additions, replacements, major repairs, and renovations to real property which materially extend its useful life or materially improve or change its functional use, and including furniture and equipment necessary to furnish and operate a new or improved facility.

FLAIR: Florida Accounting Information Resource Subsystem

F.S.: Florida Statutes

GAA: General Appropriations Act

GR: General Revenue Fund

Indicator: A single quantitative or qualitative statement that reports information about the nature of a condition, entity or activity. This term is used commonly as a synonym for the word “measure.”

Information Technology Resources: Includes data processing-related hardware, software, services, telecommunications, supplies, personnel, facility resources, maintenance, and training.

Input: See Performance Measure.

IOE: Itemization of Expenditure

IT: Information Technology

Judicial Branch: All officers, employees, and offices of the Supreme Court, district courts of appeal, circuit courts, county courts, and the Judicial Qualifications Commission.

LAN: Local Area Network

LAS/PBS: Legislative Appropriation System/Planning and Budgeting Subsystem. The statewide appropriations and budgeting system owned and maintained by the Executive Office of the Governor.

LBC: Legislative Budget Commission

Legislative Budget Commission: A standing joint committee of the Legislature. The Commission was created to: review and approve/disapprove agency requests to amend original approved budgets; review agency spending plans; issue instructions and reports concerning zero-based budgeting; and take other actions related to the fiscal matters of the state, as authorized in statute. It is composed of 14 members appointed by the President of the Senate and by the Speaker of the House of Representatives to two-year terms, running from the organization of one Legislature to the organization of the next Legislature.

LBR: Legislative Budget Request

Legislative Budget Request: A request to the Legislature, filed pursuant to s. 216.023, Florida Statutes, or supplemental detailed requests filed with the Legislature, for the amounts of money an agency or branch of government believes will be needed to perform the functions that it is authorized, or which it is requesting authorization by law, to perform.

L.O.F.: Laws of Florida

LRPP: Long-Range Program Plan

Long-Range Program Plan: A plan developed on an annual basis by each state agency that is policy-based, priority-driven, accountable, and developed through careful examination and justification of all programs and their associated costs. Each plan is developed by examining the needs of agency customers and clients and proposing programs and associated costs to address those needs based on state priorities as established by law, the agency mission, and legislative authorization. The plan provides the framework and context for preparing the legislative budget request and includes performance indicators for evaluating the impact of programs and agency performance.

MAN: Metropolitan Area Network (Information Technology)

NASBO: National Association of State Budget Officers

Narrative: Justification for each service and activity is required at the program component detail level. Explanation, in many instances, will be required to provide a full understanding of how the dollar requirements were computed.

Nonrecurring: Expenditure or revenue which is not expected to be needed or available after the current fiscal year.

OPB: Office of Policy and Budget, Executive Office of the Governor

Outcome: See Performance Measure.

Output: See Performance Measure.

Outsourcing: Describes situations where the state retains responsibility for the service, but contracts outside of state government for its delivery. Outsourcing includes everything from contracting for minor administration tasks to contracting for major portions of activities or services which support the agency mission.

PBPB/PB2: Performance-Based Program Budgeting

Pass Through: Dollars that flow through an agency's budget for which the agency has no discretion with respect to spending or performance. Examples of pass throughs include double budget for data centers, tax or license for local governments, WAGES contracting, etc.

Performance Ledger: The official compilation of information about state agency performance-based programs and measures, including approved programs, approved outputs and outcomes, baseline data, approved standards for each performance measure and any approved adjustments thereto, as well as actual agency performance for each measure

Performance Measure: A quantitative or qualitative indicator used to assess state agency performance.

- Input means the quantities of resources used to produce goods or services and the demand for those goods and services.
- Outcome means an indicator of the actual impact or public benefit of a service.
- Output means the actual service or product delivered by a state agency.

Policy Area: A grouping of related activities to meet the needs of customers or clients which reflects major statewide priorities. Policy areas summarize data at a statewide level by using the first two digits of the ten-digit LAS/PBS program component code. Data collection will sum across state agencies when using this statewide code.

Privatization: Occurs when the state relinquishes its responsibility or maintains some partnership type of role in the delivery of an activity or service.

Program: A set of activities undertaken in accordance with a plan of action organized to realize identifiable goals based on legislative authorization (a program can consist of single or multiple services). For purposes of budget development, programs are identified in the General Appropriations Act for FY 2001-2002 by a title that begins with the word “Program.” In some instances a program consists of several services, and in other cases the program has no services delineated within it; the service is the program in these cases. The LAS/PBS code is used for purposes of both program identification and service identification. “Service” is a “budget entity” for purposes of the LRPP.

Program Purpose Statement: A brief description of approved program responsibility and policy goals. The purpose statement relates directly to the agency mission and reflects essential services of the program needed to accomplish the agency’s mission.

Program Component: An aggregation of generally related objectives which, because of their special character, related workload and interrelated output, can logically be considered an entity for purposes of organization, management, accounting, reporting, and budgeting.

Reliability: The extent to which the measuring procedure yields the same results on repeated trials and data are complete and sufficiently error free for the intended use.

Service: See Budget Entity.

Standard: The level of performance of an outcome or output.

STO: State Technology Office

SWOT: Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities and Threats

TCS: Trends and Conditions Statement

TF: Trust Fund

TRW: Technology Review Workgroup

Unit Cost: The average total cost of producing a single unit of output – goods and services for a specific agency activity.

Validity: The appropriateness of the measuring instrument in relation to the purpose for which it is being used.

WAGES: Work and Gain Economic Stability (Agency for Workforce Innovation)

WAN: Wide Area Network (Information Technology)