



STATE OF FLORIDA  
JUSTICE ADMINISTRATIVE COMMISSION

Post Office Box 1654 (32302)  
227 North Bronough Street, Suite 2100  
Tallahassee, Florida 32301

COMMISSIONERS

Dennis Roberts, Chair  
Public Defender

Diamond R. Litty  
Public Defender

Jerry Hill  
State Attorney

Brad King  
State Attorney

(850) 488-2415  
Toll Free (866) 355-7902

FAX (850) 488-8944  
Toll Free FAX (866) 355-7906

Victoria A. Montanaro  
Executive Director

LONG RANGE PROGRAM PLAN

Justice Administration  
Tallahassee, Florida

September 30, 2009

Jerry L. McDaniel, Director  
Office of Policy and Budget  
Executive Office of the Governor  
1701 Capitol  
Tallahassee, Florida 32399-0001

JoAnne Leznoff, Council Director  
House Full Appropriations Council on General Government & Health Care  
221 Capitol  
Tallahassee, Florida 32399-1300

Skip Martin, Council Director  
House Full Appropriations Council on Education & Economic Development  
221 Capitol  
Tallahassee, Florida 32399-1300

Cynthia Kelly, Staff Director  
Senate Policy and Steering Committee on Ways and Means  
201 Capitol  
Tallahassee, Florida 32399-1300

Dear Directors:

Pursuant to Chapter 216, Florida Statutes, the Long Range Program Plan for all agencies within Justice Administration is submitted in the format prescribed in the budget instructions. The information provided electronically and contained herein is a true and accurate presentation of our mission, goals, objectives, and measures for the Fiscal Year 2010-11 through Fiscal Year 2014-2015. This submission has been approved by Victoria Montanaro, Executive Director of the Justice Administrative Commission.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Victoria Montanaro".

Victoria Montanaro  
Executive Director



**JUSTICE ADMINISTRATIVE COMMISSION**

# **LONG-RANGE PROGRAM PLAN FY 2010-11 THROUGH 2014-15**

**September 30, 2009**



## **STATEWIDE GUARDIAN AD LITEM OFFICE**

### **Long Range Program Plan**

Fiscal Years 2010-2011 through 2014-2015

September 30, 2009

Theresa A. Flury  
Executive Director

600 South Calhoun Street, Suite 273  
Tallahassee, Florida 32399

Phone: (850) 922-7213  
Fax: (850) 922-7211



**CLERKS OF COURT OPERATIONS CORPORATION**

**LONG RANGE PROGRAM PLAN  
FY 2010-2011 THROUGH FY 2014-2015**

**September 30, 2009**

John Dew  
Executive Director  
2541 Barrington Circle No. 1  
Tallahassee, FL 32308-3890  
(850) 386-2223



## **OFFICES OF THE STATE ATTORNEY**

### **LONG RANGE PROGRAM PLAN FY 2010-2011 THROUGH FY 2014-2015**

**September 30, 2009**

**Honorable William Eddins  
State Attorney, First Judicial Circuit**

**Honorable Katherine F. Rundle  
State Attorney, Eleventh Judicial Circuit**

**Honorable William N. Meggs  
State Attorney, Second Judicial Circuit**

**Honorable Earl Moreland  
State Attorney, Twelfth Judicial Circuit**

**Honorable Robert "Skip" L. Jarvis, Jr.  
State Attorney, Third Judicial Circuit**

**Honorable Mark A. Ober  
State Attorney, Thirteenth Judicial Circuit**

**Honorable Angela Corey  
State Attorney, Fourth Judicial Circuit**

**Honorable Glenn Hess  
State Attorney, Fourteenth Judicial Circuit**

**Honorable Brad King  
State Attorney, Fifth Judicial Circuit**

**Honorable Michael McAuliffe  
State Attorney, Fifteenth Judicial Circuit**

**Honorable Bernie McCabe  
State Attorney, Sixth Judicial Circuit**

**Honorable Dennis W. Ward  
State Attorney, Sixteenth Judicial Circuit**

**Honorable R. J. Larizza  
State Attorney, Seventh Judicial Circuit**

**Honorable Michael J. Satz  
State Attorney, Seventeenth Judicial Circuit**

**Honorable William Cervone  
State Attorney, Eighth Judicial Circuit**

**Honorable Norman R. Wolfinger  
State Attorney, Eighteenth Judicial Circuit**

**Honorable Lawson L. Lamar  
State Attorney, Ninth Judicial Circuit**

**Honorable Bruce H. Colton  
State Attorney, Nineteenth Judicial Circuit**

**Honorable Jerry Hill  
State Attorney, Tenth Judicial Circuit**

**Honorable Stephen B. Russell  
State Attorney, Twentieth Judicial Circuit**



## **OFFICES OF THE PUBLIC DEFENDER**

### **LONG RANGE PROGRAM PLAN FY 2010-2011 THROUGH FY 2014-2015**

**September 30, 2009**

**Honorable James Owens  
Public Defender, First Judicial Circuit**

**Honorable Carlos J. Martinez  
Public Defender, Eleventh Judicial Circuit**

**Honorable Nancy Daniels  
Public Defender, Second Judicial Circuit**

**Honorable Larry Eger  
Public Defender, Twelfth Judicial Circuit**

**Honorable Dennis Roberts  
Public Defender, Third Judicial Circuit**

**Honorable Julianne Holt  
Public Defender, Thirteenth Judicial Circuit**

**Honorable Matthew Shirk  
Public Defender, Fourth Judicial Circuit**

**Honorable Herman D. Laramore  
Public Defender, Fourteenth Judicial Circuit**

**Honorable Howard Babb  
Public Defender, Fifth Judicial Circuit**

**Honorable Carey Haughwout  
Public Defender, Fifteenth Judicial Circuit**

**Honorable Bob Dillinger  
Public Defender, Sixth Judicial Circuit**

**Honorable Rosemary Enright  
Public Defender, Sixteenth Judicial Circuit**

**Honorable James Purdy  
Public Defender, Seventh Judicial Circuit**

**Honorable Howard Finkelstein  
Public Defender, Seventeenth Judicial Circuit**

**Honorable C. Richard Parker  
Public Defender, Eighth Judicial Circuit**

**Honorable James F. Russo  
Public Defender, Eighteenth Judicial Circuit**

**Honorable Bob Wesley  
Public Defender, Ninth Judicial Circuit**

**Honorable Diamond R. Litty  
Public Defender, Nineteenth Judicial Circuit**

**Honorable J. Marion Moorman  
Public Defender, Tenth Judicial Circuit**

**Honorable Kathleen Smith  
Public Defender, Twentieth Judicial Circuit**



**OFFICES OF THE PUBLIC DEFENDER – APPELLATE**

**LONG RANGE PROGRAM PLAN  
FY 2010-2011 THROUGH FY 2014-2015**

**September 30, 2009**

**Honorable Nancy Daniels  
Public Defender, Second Judicial Circuit**

**Honorable James Purdy  
Public Defender, Seventh Judicial Circuit**

**Honorable J. Marion Moorman  
Public Defender, Tenth Judicial Circuit**

**Honorable Carlos J. Martinez  
Public Defender, Eleventh Judicial Circuit**

**Honorable Carey Haughwout  
Public Defender, Fifteenth Judicial Circuit**



# **Long Range Program Plan FY 2010-11 through 2014-15**

## **Capital Collateral Regional Councils - Middle and Southern Regions**

**September 2009**





**OFFICES OF CRIMINAL CONFLICT AND CIVIL  
REGIONAL COUNSELS**

**LONG RANGE PROGRAM PLAN  
FY 2010-2011 THROUGH FY 2014-2015**

**September 30, 2009**

**Jeffrey E. Lewis  
Regional Counsel, First Region**

**Jackson S. Flyte  
Regional Counsel, Second Region**

**Joseph P. George, Jr.  
Regional Counsel, Third Region**

**Philip J. Massa  
Regional Counsel, Fourth Region**

**Jeffrey D. Deen  
Regional Counsel, Fifth Region**

---

## AGENCY MISSION AND GOALS

---

### JUSTICE ADMINISTRATIVE COMMISSION

**Mission:** *Provide Superior Services*

*The Justice Administrative Commission administratively serves the offices of State Attorneys, Public Defenders, Capital Collateral Regional Counsels, Criminal Conflict and Civil Regional Counsels, the Statewide Guardian Ad Litem Program and the Clerks of Court Operations Corporation; and provides compliance and financial review of the court appointed attorney due process costs.*

**Priority # 1 Goal:**

*Provide quality administrative services.*

### STATEWIDE GUARDIAN AD LITEM

**Mission:** *The Florida Guardian ad Litem Program is a partnership of community advocates and professional staff providing a powerful voice on behalf of Florida's abused, abandoned or neglected children.*

**Priority # 1 Goal:**

*To provide effective advocacy for all of Florida's abused, abandoned or neglected children.*

**Priority # 2 Goal:**

*Advocate for timely permanency for children.*

**Priority # 3 Goal:**

*Increase number of volunteer advocates for children*

### CLERKS OF COURT OPERATIONS CORPORATION

**Mission:** *Excellence in Clerks of Court Budget Administration*

**Priority # 1 Goal:**

*To request and receive Legislative appropriations to fund Florida's 67 clerks of Court workloads and provide timely and effective court related services.*

---

## AGENCY MISSION AND GOALS

---

### STATE ATTORNEY

**Mission:** *Seeking Justice for Florida*

*"The prosecutor is the representative, not of an ordinary party in a controversy, but of sovereignty whose obligation to govern impartially is as compelling as its obligation to govern at all; and whose interest, therefore, in a criminal prosecution is not that it win a case, but that justice shall be done."*

*Justice Southerland  
Berger vs U.S. 295 U.S. 78 (1935)*

**Priority # 1 Goal:**

*To pursue justice through prosecution effectively, efficiently, and in a timely manner for all criminal cases presented to the State Attorney over the next five years.*

**Priority #2 Goal:**

*To recruit and retain qualified and experienced Assistant State Attorneys to handle the increased caseloads and sophisticated prosecutions on behalf of the people of the State of Florida.*

### PUBLIC DEFENDER

**Mission:** *Protect constitutional rights*

**Priority # 1 Goal:**

*Provide equitable salaries for employees to improve retention and reduce attorney turnover.*

**Priority # 2 Goal:**

*Contact clients in custody within 72 hours of appointment or notification of appointment.*

**Priority # 3 Goal:**

*Preserve right to speedy trial.*

**Priority # 4 Goal:**

*Establish standard caseload for misdemeanor attorneys at 400 cases per year; felony attorneys at 200 per year; and juvenile attorneys at 250 per year.*

---

## AGENCY MISSION AND GOALS

---

### **PUBLIC DEFENDER APPELLATE**

**Mission:** *Protect constitutional rights*

**Priority # 1 Goal:**

*Provide equitable salaries for employees to improve retention.*

**Priority # 2 Goal:**

*Process appeals in a timely manner.*

**Priority # 3 Goal:**

*Establish standard caseload for appellate attorneys at 2.5 capital cases or 40 weighted non-capital records per year.*

### **CAPITAL COLLATERAL REGIONAL COUNSEL**

*Capital Collateral Regional Counsel (CCRC) Purpose: To provide legal representation for state inmates who have received the death penalty and for whom state laws provide post-conviction reviews of their sentence.*

**Mission:** *Assure capital justice*

*Reference Chapter 27 Part IV and the Florida Rules of Criminal Procedure 3.850/3.851. CCRCs are responsible for collecting and analyzing public records of all assigned post-death penalty conviction cases, investigating each case and providing legal representation within state and federal courts performing post-conviction reviews.*

**Priority # 1 Goal:**

*To assure justice prevails, on a timely basis, by providing competent legal representation and a fair hearing during state and federal court post-conviction review processes.*

### **OFFICES OF CRIMINAL CONFLICT AND CIVIL REGIONAL COUNSELS**

**Mission:** *Protect constitutional rights*

**Priority # 1 Goal:**

*Obtain and provide equitable salaries for employees to retain those employees and reduce attorney turnover.*

---

## AGENCY MISSION AND GOALS

---

### OFFICES OF CRIMINAL CONFLICT AND CIVIL REGIONAL COUNSELS

**Priority # 2 Goal:**

*Preserve clients' right to a speedy trial.*

---

## AGENCY OBJECTIVES

---

### JUSTICE ADMINISTRATIVE COMMISSION

#### **Goal 1 Objective 1:**

*Accurately and efficiently process transactions on behalf of 50 agencies administratively served: State Attorneys, Public Defenders, Capital Collateral Regional Counsels, Criminal Conflict and Civil Regional Counsels, the Statewide Guardian Ad Litem Program, and the Clerks of Court Operations Corporation.*

#### **Goal 1 Objective 2:**

*Review court-appointed counsel and due process vendor invoices for compliance with contractual and statutory requirements, and the Department of Financial Services' rules and regulations.*

### STATEWIDE GUARDIAN AD LITEM

#### **Goal 1 Objective:**

*Represent all children under Court supervision as reported by the Department of Children and Families.*

#### **Goal 2 Objective:**

*Provide representation for children until permanency is achieved.*

#### **Goal 3 Objective 1:**

*Increase number of new volunteers.*

#### **Goal 3 Objective 2:**

*Increase active volunteer base.*

### CLERKS OF COURT OPERATIONS CORPORATION

#### **Goal 1 Objective:**

*To timely prepare and credibly explain the Clerks of Court Operations Corporation's "Clerks' Legislative Budget Request" to fund 67 Clerks' offices.*

### STATE ATTORNEY

#### **Goal 1 Objective:**

*Increase the number of habitual and violent felony offenders who receive enhanced sentences.*

---

## AGENCY OBJECTIVES

---

### STATE ATTORNEY

**Goal 2 Objective:**

*Reduce Assistant State Attorney turnover rate by increasing entry-level and mid-level salaries.*

### PUBLIC DEFENDER

**Goals 1 – 4 Objective:**

*Provide quality representation to all appointees and protect the constitutional and statutory rights of all citizens through effective legal representation of court appointed clients.*

### PUBLIC DEFENDER APPELLATE

**Goals 1 – 3 Objective:**

*Provide quality representation to all appointees and protect the constitutional and statutory rights of all citizens through effective legal representation of court appointed clients.*

### CAPITAL COLLATERAL REGIONAL COUNSEL

**Goal 1 Objective:**

*To competently achieve the completion of death penalty post-conviction review by state and federal courts.*

### OFFICES OF CRIMINAL CONFLICT AND CIVIL REGIONAL COUNSELS

**Goals 1 – 2 Objective:**

*Provide quality representation to all clients and protect the constitutional and statutory rights of all citizens through cost efficient and effective legal representation.*

---

## AGENCY SERVICE OUTCOMES AND PERFORMANCE PROJECTION TABLES

---

### JUSTICE ADMINISTRATIVE COMMISSION

Outcome: Number of transactions processed.

Baseline/ Year 2009-10	FY 2010-11	FY 2011-12	FY 2012-13	FY 2013-14	FY 2014-15
352,330	355,853	359,412	363,006	366,636	370,302

Outcome: Number of invoices processed.

Baseline/ Year 2009-10	FY 2010-11	FY 2011-12	FY 2012-13	FY 2013-14	FY 2014-15
63,913	64,552	65,198	65,850	66,509	67,174

### STATEWIDE GUARDIAN AD LITEM

#### PRIMARY SERVICE OUTCOME

Average number of children represented.

Baseline					
FY 2009/10	FY 2010/11	FY 2011/12	FY 2012/13	FY 2013/14	FY 2014/15
85%	86%	87%	88%	89%	90%

Outcome: Percent of cases discharged after DCF supervision is terminated.

Baseline					
FY 2009/10	FY 2010/11	FY 2011/12	FY 2012/13	FY 2013/14	FY 2014/15
78%	79%	80%	81%	82%	83%

Outcome: Number of new volunteers certified as a GAL.

Baseline					
FY 2009/10	FY 2010/11	FY 2011/12	FY 2012/13	FY 2013/14	FY 2014/15
2,350	2,375	2,400	2,425	2,450	2,475

Outcome: Average number of active volunteers.

Baseline					
FY 2009/10	FY 2010/11	FY 2011/12	FY 2012/13	FY 2013/14	FY 2014/15
6,900	7,000	7,100	7,200	7,300	7,400



---

## AGENCY SERVICE OUTCOMES AND PERFORMANCE PROJECTION TABLES

---

### CLERKS OF COURT OPERATIONS CORPORATION

**PRIMARY SERVICE OUTCOME**

The percentage of State of Florida required budget products produced by the CCOC that are completed on time and according to requirements of law.

Baseline/ Year	FY 2010-11	FY 2011-12	FY 2012-13	FY 2013-14	FY 2014-15
N/A					

### STATE ATTORNEY STATE ATTORNEY, FIRST JUDICIAL CIRCUIT

**PRIMARY SERVICE OUTCOME:**

Number of habitual and violent felony offenders who receive enhanced sentences.

	FY 2000-01 BASELINE	FY 2010-11	FY 2011-12	FY 2012-13	FY 2013-14	FY 2014-15
Offenders who qualify for enhanced sentence for whom the State requests enhanced sentence	146	210	211	212	213	214
Offenders for whom the Court orders enhanced sentencing	91	210	211	212	213	214
Percentage of offenders sentenced by the Court to an enhanced sentence	62.00%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

**Outcome:** Assistant State Attorney turnover rate.

FY 2000-01 BASELINE	FY 2010-11	FY 2011-12	FY 2012-13	FY 2013-14	FY 2014-15
15.6%	20%	25%	25%	25%	25%

---

## AGENCY SERVICE OUTCOMES AND PERFORMANCE PROJECTION TABLES

---

### STATE ATTORNEY, SECOND JUDICIAL CIRCUIT

**PRIMARY SERVICE OUTCOME:**

Number of habitual and violent felony offenders who receive enhanced sentences.

	FY 2000-01 BASELINE	FY 2010-11	FY 2011-12	FY 2012-13	FY 2013-14	FY 2014-15
Offenders who qualify for enhanced sentence for whom the State requests enhanced sentence	152	400	450	450	450	450
Offenders for whom the Court orders enhanced Sentencing	53	400	450	450	450	450
Percentage of offenders sentenced by the Court to an enhanced sentence	37%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

**Outcome:** Assistant State Attorney turnover rate.

FY 2000-01 BASELINE	FY 2010-11	FY 2011-12	FY 2012-13	FY 2013-14	FY 2014-15
33.4%	25%	25%	25%	20%	20%

### STATE ATTORNEY, THIRD JUDICIAL CIRCUIT

**PRIMARY SERVICE OUTCOME:**

Number of habitual and violent felony offenders who receive enhanced sentences.

	FY 2000-01 BASELINE	FY 2010-11	FY 2011-12	FY 2012-13	FY 2013-14	FY 2014-15
Offenders who qualify for enhanced sentence for whom the State requests enhanced sentence	7	8	9	10	11	12
Offenders for whom the Court orders enhanced Sentencing	6	7	8	9	10	11
Percentage of offenders sentenced by the Court to an enhanced sentence	85.7%	87.5%	88.8%	90%	91%	92%

**Outcome:** Assistant State Attorney turnover rate.

FY 2000-01 BASELINE	FY 2010-11	FY 2011-12	FY 2012-13	FY 2013-14	FY 2014-15
13.6%	25%	24%	23%	22%	21%

---

## AGENCY SERVICE OUTCOMES AND PERFORMANCE PROJECTION TABLES

---

### STATE ATTORNEY, FOURTH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT

**PRIMARY SERVICE OUTCOME:**

Number of habitual and violent felony offenders who receive enhanced sentences.

	FY 2000-01 BASELINE	FY 2010-11	FY 2010-12	FY 2010-13	FY 2010-14	FY 2010-15
Offenders who qualify for enhanced sentence for whom the State requests enhanced sentence	303	600	580	570	560	560
Offenders for whom the Court orders enhanced Sentencing	300	585	575	565	550	550
Percentage of offenders sentenced by the Court to an enhanced sentence	99%	98%	99%	99%	98%	98%

**Outcome:** Assistant State Attorney turnover rate.

FY 2000-01 BASELINE	FY 2010-11	FY 2011-12	FY 2012-13	FY 2013-14	FY 2014-15
21%	22%	22%	21%	20%	20%

### STATE ATTORNEY, FIFTH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT

**PRIMARY SERVICE OUTCOME:**

Number of habitual and violent felony offenders who receive enhanced sentences.

	FY 2001-02 BASELINE	FY 2010-11	FY 2011-12	FY 2012-13	FY 2013-14	FY 2014-15
Offenders who qualify for enhanced sentence for whom the State requests enhanced sentence	320	478	492	506	521	536
Offenders for whom the Court orders enhanced Sentencing	168	337	347	357	367	377
Percentage of offenders sentenced by the Court to an enhanced sentence	52.50%	70.5%	72.6%	74.7%	76.9%	79.2%

**Outcome:** Assistant State Attorney turnover rate.

FY 2000-01 BASELINE	FY 2010-11	FY 2011-12	FY 2012-13	FY 2013-14	FY 2014-15
20.59%	8.18%	7.94%	7.71%	7.48%	7.26%

---

## AGENCY SERVICE OUTCOMES AND PERFORMANCE PROJECTION TABLES

---

### STATE ATTORNEY, SIXTH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT

**PRIMARY SERVICE OUTCOME:**

Number of habitual and violent felony offenders who receive enhanced sentences.

	FY 2000-01 BASELINE	FY 2010-11	FY 2011-12	FY 2012-13	FY 2013-14	FY 2014-15
Offenders who qualify for enhanced sentence for whom the State requests enhanced sentence	508	500	500	500	490	498
Offenders for whom the Court orders enhanced Sentencing	356	300	300	300	300	300
Percentage of offenders sentenced by the Court to an enhanced sentence	38%	60%	60%	60%	61%	61%

**Outcome:** Assistant State Attorney turnover rate.

FY 2000-01 BASELINE	FY 2010-11	FY 2011-12	FY 2012-13	FY 2013-14	FY 2014-15
15%	15%	15%	16%	15%	14%

### STATE ATTORNEY, SEVENTH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT

**PRIMARY SERVICE OUTCOME:**

Number of habitual and violent felony offenders who receive enhanced sentences.

	FY 2000-01 BASELINE	FY 2010-11	FY 2011-12	FY 2012-13	FY 2013-14	FY 2014-15
Offenders who qualify for enhanced sentence for whom the State requests enhanced sentence	223	165	175	185	195	205
Offenders for whom the Court orders enhanced Sentencing	90	145	156	167	178	189
Percentage of offenders sentenced by the Court to an enhanced sentence	40.5%	88%	89%	90%	91%	92%

**Outcome:** Assistant State Attorney turnover rate.

FY 2000-01 BASELINE	FY 2010-11	FY 2011-12	FY 2012-13	FY 2013-14	FY 2014-15
19.8%	15.5%	15%	14.5%	14%	13.5%

---

## AGENCY SERVICE OUTCOMES AND PERFORMANCE PROJECTION TABLES

---

### STATE ATTORNEY, EIGHTH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT

**PRIMARY SERVICE OUTCOME:**

Number of habitual and violent felony offenders who receive enhanced sentences.

	FY 2006-07 BASELINE	FY 2010-11	FY 2011-12	FY 2012-13	FY 2013-14	FY 2014-15
Offenders who qualify for enhanced sentence for whom the State requests enhanced sentence	175	184	187	190	193	196

**Outcome:** Assistant State Attorney turnover rate.

FY 2006-07 BASELINE	FY 2010-11	FY 2011-12	FY 2012-13	FY 2013-14	FY 2014-15
14.36%	17.00%	19.00%	21.00%	23.00%	25.00%

### STATE ATTORNEY, NINTH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT

**PRIMARY SERVICE OUTCOME:**

Number of habitual and violent felony offenders who receive enhanced sentences.

	FY 2000-01 BASELINE	FY 2010-11	FY 2011-12	FY 2012-13	FY 2013-14	FY 2014-15
Offenders who qualify for enhanced sentence for whom the State requests enhanced sentence	634	453	467	481	496	511
Offenders for whom the Court orders enhanced Sentencing	148	408	420	433	446	460
Percentage of offenders sentenced by the Court to an enhanced sentence	23%	90%	90%	90%	90%	90%

**Outcome:** Assistant State Attorney turnover rate.

FY 2000-01 BASELINE	FY 2010-11	FY 2011-12	FY 2012-13	FY 2013-14	FY 2014-15
28.14%	13.92%	13.92%	13.92%	13.92%	13.92%

---

## AGENCY SERVICE OUTCOMES AND PERFORMANCE PROJECTION TABLES

---

### STATE ATTORNEY, TENTH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT

**PRIMARY SERVICE OUTCOME:**

Number of habitual and violent felony offenders who receive enhanced sentences.

	FY 2000-01 BASELINE	FY 2010-11	FY 2011-12	FY 2012-13	FY 2013-14	FY 2014-15
Offenders who qualify for enhanced sentence for whom the State requests enhanced sentence	465	340	347	354	368	375
Offenders for whom the Court orders enhanced Sentencing	220	323	330	336	350	356
Percentage of offenders sentenced by the Court to an enhanced sentence	47.3%	95%	95%	95%	95%	95%

**Outcome:** Assistant State Attorney turnover rate.

FY 2000-01 BASELINE	FY 2010-11	FY 2011-12	FY 2012-13	FY 2013-14	FY 2014-15
16.7%	25%	25%	25%	25%	25%

### STATE ATTORNEY, ELEVENTH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT

**PRIMARY SERVICE OUTCOME:**

Number of habitual and violent felony offenders who receive enhanced sentences.

	FY 2000-01 BASELINE	FY 2010-11	FY 2011-12	FY 2012-13	FY 2013-14	FY 2014-15
Offenders who qualify for enhanced sentence for whom the State requests enhanced sentence	3,683	3,284	3,448	3,621	3,802	3,992
Offenders for whom the Court orders enhanced sentencing	1,071	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Percentage of offenders sentenced by the Court to an enhanced sentence	29.10%	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

**Outcome:** Assistant State Attorney turnover rate.

FY 2000-01 BASELINE	FY 2010-11	FY 2011-12	FY 2012-13	FY 2013-14	FY 2014-15
21.85%	18%	20%	20%	20%	20%

---

## AGENCY SERVICE OUTCOMES AND PERFORMANCE PROJECTION TABLES

---

### STATE ATTORNEY, TWELFTH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT

**PRIMARY SERVICE OUTCOME:**

Number of habitual and violent felony offenders who receive enhanced sentences.

	FY 2000-01 BASELINE	FY 2010-11	FY 2011-12	FY 2012-13	FY 2013-14	FY 2014-15
Offenders who qualify for enhanced sentence for whom the State requests enhanced sentence	210	108	109	110	111	112
Offenders for whom the Court orders enhanced Sentencing	123	36	38	40	42	44
Percentage of offenders sentenced by the Court to an enhanced sentence	58.57%	33.33%	34.86%	36.36%	37.83%	39.28%

**Outcome:** Assistant State Attorney turnover rate.

FY 2000-01 BASELINE	FY 2010-11	FY 2011-12	FY 2012-13	FY 2013-14	FY 2014-15
20.5%	18.18%	17.18%	16.18%	15.18%	14.18%

### STATE ATTORNEY, THIRTEENTH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT

**PRIMARY SERVICE OUTCOME:**

Number of habitual and violent felony offenders who receive enhanced sentences.

	FY 2000-01 BASELINE	FY 2010-11	FY 2011-12	FY 2012-13	FY 2013-14	FY 2014-15
Offenders who qualify for enhanced sentence for whom the State requests enhanced sentence	210	465	470	475	480	485
Offenders for whom the Court orders enhanced Sentencing	203	454	461	468	475	482
Percentage of offenders sentenced by the Court to an enhanced sentence	96.70%	97.63%	98.09%	98.53%	98.95%	99.38%

**Outcome:** Assistant State Attorney turnover rate.

FY 2000-01 BASELINE	FY 2010-11	FY 2011-12	FY 2012-13	FY 2013-14	FY 2014-15
27.91%	22.5%	22.0%	21.5%	21.0%	20.5%

---

## AGENCY SERVICE OUTCOMES AND PERFORMANCE PROJECTION TABLES

---

### STATE ATTORNEY, FOURTEENTH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT

**PRIMARY SERVICE OUTCOME:**

Number of habitual and violent felony offenders who receive enhanced sentences.

	FY 2000-01 BASELINE	FY 2010-11	FY 2011-12	FY 2012-13	FY 2013-14	FY 2014-15
Offenders who qualify for enhanced sentence for whom the State requests enhanced sentence	13	80	80	80	80	80
Offenders for whom the Court orders enhanced Sentencing	11	80	80	80	80	80
Percentage of offenders sentenced by the Court to an enhanced sentence	87%	90%	90%	90%	90%	90%

**Outcome:** Assistant State Attorney turnover rate.

FY 2000-01 BASELINE	FY 2010-11	FY 2011-12	FY 2012-13	FY 2013-14	FY 2014-15
12.50%	30%	30%	30%	30%	30%

### STATE ATTORNEY, FIFTEENTH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT

**PRIMARY SERVICE OUTCOME:**

Number of habitual and violent felony offenders who receive enhanced sentences.

	FY 2000-01 BASELINE	FY 2010-11	FY 2011-12	FY 2012-13	FY 2013-14	FY 2014-15
Offenders who qualify for enhanced sentence for whom the State requests enhanced sentence	313	300	305	310	315	320
Offenders for whom the Court orders enhanced Sentencing	164	300	305	310	315	320
Percentage of offenders sentenced by the Court to an enhanced sentence	52.40%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

**Outcome:** Assistant State Attorney turnover rate.

FY 2000-01 BASELINE	FY 2010-11	FY 2011-12	FY 2012-13	FY 2013-14	FY 2014-15
24.15%	16%	15%	14%	13%	12%



---

## AGENCY SERVICE OUTCOMES AND PERFORMANCE PROJECTION TABLES

---

### STATE ATTORNEY, SIXTEENTH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT

**PRIMARY SERVICE OUTCOME:**

Number of habitual and violent felony offenders who receive enhanced sentences.

	FY 2000-01 BASELINE	FY 2010-11	FY 2011-12	FY 2012-13	FY 2013-14	FY 2014-15
Offenders who qualify for enhanced sentence for whom the State requests enhanced sentence	44	50	50	50	50	50
Offenders for whom the Court orders enhanced Sentencing	42	20	25	30	35	40
Percentage of offenders sentenced by the Court to an enhanced sentence	95%	40%	50%	60%	79%	80%

**Outcome:** Assistant State Attorney turnover rate.

FY 2000-01 BASELINE	FY 2010-11	FY 2011-12	FY 2012-13	FY 2013-14	FY 2014-15
77%	30%	25%	20%	20%	20%

### STATE ATTORNEY, SEVENTEENTH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT

**PRIMARY SERVICE OUTCOME:**

Number of habitual and violent felony offenders who receive enhanced sentences.

	FY 2001-02 BASELINE	FY 2010-11	FY 2011-12	FY 2012-13	FY 2013-14	FY 2014-15
Offenders who qualify for enhanced sentence for whom the State requests enhanced sentence	849	831	831	831	831	831
Offenders for whom the Court orders enhanced Sentencing	501	540	540	540	540	540
Percentage of offenders sentenced by the Court to an enhanced sentence	59%	65%	65%	65%	65%	65%

**Outcome:** Assistant State Attorney turnover rate.

FY 2000-01 BASELINE	FY 2010-11	FY 2011-12	FY 2012-13	FY 2013-14	FY 2014-15
18%	17.4%	18%	18%	18%	18%

---

## AGENCY SERVICE OUTCOMES AND PERFORMANCE PROJECTION TABLES

---

### STATE ATTORNEY, EIGHTEENTH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT

**PRIMARY SERVICE OUTCOME:**

Number of habitual and violent felony offenders who receive enhanced sentences.

	FY 2000-01 BASELINE	FY 2010-11	FY 2011-12	FY 2012-13	FY 2013-14	FY 2014-15
Offenders who qualify for enhanced sentence for whom the State requests enhanced sentence	121	193	196	198	200	202
Offenders for whom the Court orders enhanced Sentencing	97	193	196	198	200	202
Percentage of offenders sentenced by the Court to an enhanced sentence	80.2%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

**Outcome:** Assistant State Attorney turnover rate.

FY 2000-01 BASELINE	FY 2010-11	FY 2011-12	FY 2012-13	FY 2013-14	FY 2014-15
27.2%	14.00%	13.75%	13.50%	13.25%	13.00%

### STATE ATTORNEY, NINETEENTH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT

**PRIMARY SERVICE OUTCOME:**

Number of habitual and violent felony offenders who receive enhanced sentences.

	FY 2000-01 BASELINE	FY 2010-11	FY 2011-12	FY 2012-13	FY 2013-14	FY 2014-15
Offenders who qualify for enhanced sentence for whom the State requests enhanced sentence	69	95	98	101	104	107
Offenders for whom the Court orders enhanced Sentencing	28	35	38	40	43	45
Percentage of offenders sentenced by the Court to an enhanced sentence	41%	37%	38%	39%	41%	42%

**Outcome:** Assistant State Attorney turnover rate.

FY 2008-09 BASELINE	FY 2010-11	FY 2011-12	FY 2012-13	FY 2013-14	FY 2014-15
17.67%	15%	15%	15%	15%	15%

---

## AGENCY SERVICE OUTCOMES AND PERFORMANCE PROJECTION TABLES

---

### STATE ATTORNEY, TWENTIETH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT

**PRIMARY SERVICE OUTCOME:**

Number of habitual and violent felony offenders who receive enhanced sentences.

	FY 2000-01 BASELINE	FY 2010-11	FY 2011-12	FY 2012-13	FY 2013-14	FY 2014-15
Offenders who qualify for enhanced sentence for whom the State requests enhanced sentence	257	494	494	494	494	494
Offenders for whom the Court orders enhanced sentencing	105	408	408	408	408	408
Percentage of offenders sentenced by the Court to an enhanced sentence	41.00%	83.00%	83.00%	83.00%	83.00%	83.00%

**Outcome:** Assistant State Attorney turnover rate.

FY 2000-01 BASELINE	FY 2010-11	FY 2011-12	FY 2012-13	FY 2013-14	FY 2014-15
27.00%	15.00%	15.00%	15.00%	15.00%	15.00%

### PUBLIC DEFENDER

#### PUBLIC DEFENDER, FIRST THROUGH TWENTIETH CIRCUITS

**Outcome:** Percent of attorney turnover rates.

FY 2000-01 BASELINE	FY 2010-11	FY 2011-12	FY 2012-13	FY 2013-14	FY 2014-15
23.47%	18%	14%	12%	11%	9%

**Outcome:** Percent of attorney staff retained for an average of three years from date of hire.

FY 2000-01 BASELINE	FY 2010-11	FY 2011-12	FY 2012-13	FY 2013-14	FY 2014-15
46.18%	58%	60%	65%	70%	75%

---

## AGENCY SERVICE OUTCOMES AND PERFORMANCE PROJECTION TABLES

---

### PUBLIC DEFENDER, FIRST THROUGH TWENTIETH CIRCUITS

**Outcome:** Percent of public defender clients in custody contacted within 72 hours of appointment or notification of appointment, excluding holidays and weekends.

FY 2000-01 BASELINE	FY 2010-11	FY 2011-12	FY 2012-13	FY 2013-14	FY 2014-15
95.3%	98.5%	98.6%	98.7%	98.8%	98.9%

**Outcome:** Percent of felony and misdemeanor cases resolved within speedy trial rule.

FY 2000-01 BASELINE	FY 2010-11	FY 2011-12	FY 2012-13	FY 2013-14	FY 2014-15
92%	96.5%	96.6%	96.7%	96.8%	96.9%

**Outcome:** Percent of substantiated Bar grievances filed annually.

FY 2000-01 BASELINE	FY 2010-11	FY 2011-12	FY 2012-13	FY 2013-14	FY 2014-15
0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

### PUBLIC DEFENDER APPELLATE PUBLIC DEFENDER. SECOND, SEVENTH, TENTH, ELEVENTH AND FIFTEENTH CIRCUITS

**Outcome:** Percent of attorney turnover rates.

FY 2000-01 BASELINE	FY 2010-11	FY 2011-12	FY 2012-13	FY 2013-14	FY 2014-15
8.1%	8%	7%	6%	5%	4%

**Outcome:** Percent of attorney staff retained for an average of three years from date of hire.

FY 2000-01 BASELINE	FY 2010-11	FY 2011-12	FY 2012-13	FY 2013-14	FY 2014-15
83.86%	88%	88.5%	88.6%	88.7%	88.9%

**Outcome:** Percent of appeals resolved annually.

FY 2000-01 BASELINE	FY 2010-11	FY 2011-12	FY 2012-13	FY 2013-14	FY 2014-15
95.8%	99.5%	99.6%	99.7%	99.8%	99.99%

---

## AGENCY SERVICE OUTCOMES AND PERFORMANCE PROJECTION TABLES

---

### PUBLIC DEFENDER APPELLATE

**PUBLIC DEFENDER. SECOND, SEVENTH, TENTH, ELEVENTH AND FIFTEENTH  
CIRCUITS**

**Outcome:** Percent of substantiated Bar grievances filed annually.

FY 2000-01 BASELINE	FY 2010-11	FY 2011-12	FY 2012-13	FY 2013-14	FY 2014-15
0%	0	0	0	0	0

### CAPITAL COLLATERAL REGIONAL COUNSEL, MIDDLE REGION

**Outcome:** Number of death penalty cases completing their state and federal court system reviews.

FY 2000-01 BASELINE	FY 2010-11	FY 2011-12	FY 2012-13	FY 2013-14	FY 2014-15
3	5	6	6	6	6

### CAPITAL COLLATERAL REGIONAL COUNSEL, SOUTHERN REGION

**Outcome:** Number of death penalty cases completing their state and federal court system reviews.

FY 2000-01 BASELINE	FY 2010-11	FY 2011-12	FY 2012-13	FY 2013-14	FY 2014-15
3	5	6	6	5	6

### OFFICES OF CRIMINAL CONFLICT AND CIVIL REGIONAL COUNSELS

#### CRIMINAL CONFLICT AND CIVIL REGIONAL COUNSEL, FIRST DISTRICT

**Outcome:** Percent of attorney turnover rates.

FY 2007-08 BASELINE	FY 2010-11	FY 2011-12	FY 2012-13	FY 2013-14	FY 2014-15
3.2%	14.32%	14.00%	13.75%	13.50%	13.25%

---

## AGENCY SERVICE OUTCOMES AND PERFORMANCE PROJECTION TABLES

---

### CRIMINAL CONFLICT AND CIVIL REGIONAL COUNSEL, SECOND DISTRICT

**Outcome:** Percent of attorney turnover rates.

FY 2007-08 BASELINE	FY 2010-11	FY 2011-12	FY 2012-13	FY 2013-14	FY 2014-15
27.6%	31.58%	31.49%	31.01%	31%	30.58%

### CRIMINAL CONFLICT AND CIVIL REGIONAL COUNSEL, THIRD DISTRICT

**Outcome:** Percent of attorney turnover rates.

FY 2007-08 BASELINE	FY 2010-11	FY 2011-12	FY 2012-13	FY 2013-14	FY 2014-15
29.5%	25%	15%	11%	9%	9%

### CRIMINAL CONFLICT AND CIVIL REGIONAL COUNSEL, FOURTH DISTRICT

**Outcome:** Percent of attorney turnover rates.

FY 2007-08 BASELINE	FY 2010-11	FY 2011-12	FY 2012-13	FY 2013-14	FY 2014-15
20.68%	20.25%	20.00%	20.00%	20.00%	20.00%

### CRIMINAL CONFLICT AND CIVIL REGIONAL COUNSEL, FIFTH DISTRICT

**Outcome:** Percent of attorney turnover rates.

FY 2007-08 BASELINE	FY 2010-11	FY 2011-12	FY 2012-13	FY 2013-14	FY 2014-15
>16%	15%	15%	15%	15%	15%

---

## LINKAGE TO GOVERNOR'S PRIORITIES

---

### **PRIORITY #1 – PROTECTING OUR COMMUNITIES**

#### **JUSTICE ADMINISTRATIVE COMMISSION**

**Goal 1:** Provide quality administrative services.

**Objective 1:** Accurately and efficiently process transactions on behalf of 50 agencies administratively served: State Attorneys, Public Defenders, Capital Collateral Regional Counsels, Criminal Conflict and Civil Regional Counsels, the Statewide Guardian Ad Litem Program, and the Clerks of Court Operations Corporation.

**Objective 2:** Review court-appointed counsel and due process vendor invoices for compliance with contractual and statutory requirements, and the Department of Financial Services' rules and regulations.

#### **STATEWIDE GUARDIAN AD LITEM**

**Goal 1:** To provide effective advocacy for all of Florida's abused, abandoned or neglected children.

**Goal 2:** Advocate for timely permanency of children.

**Goal 3:** Increase number of volunteer advocates for children.

#### **CLERKS OF COURT OPERATIONS CORPORATION (CCOC)**

**Goal 1:** The CCOC provides critical administrative support to Florida's criminal and civil courts which helps assure timely and efficient justice throughout Florida.

#### **STATE ATTORNEYS**

**Goal 1:** To pursue justice through prosecution effectively, efficiently and in a timely manner for all criminal cases anticipated over the next five years.

**Goal 2:** Recruiting and retaining Assistant State Attorneys to effectively and efficiently handle the heavy caseloads and sophisticated prosecutions on behalf of the people of the State of Florida.

#### **PUBLIC DEFENDERS**

**Goal 2:** Contact clients in custody within 72 hours of appointment or notification of appointment.

**Goal 3:** Preserve the right to a speedy trial.

---

## **LINKAGE TO GOVERNOR'S PRIORITIES**

---

### **PUBLIC DEFENDERS APPELLATE**

**Goal 2:** Process appeals in a timely manner.

### **CAPITAL COLLATERAL REGIONAL COUNSELS (CCRC)**

**Goal:** The CCRCs are created to provide post-conviction state and federal courts system judicial review of death sentences to assure that justice is done. This assurance strengthens community respect for and credibility in federal and state laws and the American state and federal justice systems.

### **OFFICE OF CRIMINAL CONFLICT AND CIVIL REGIONAL COUNSELS**

**Goal:** Preserve clients' right to a speedy trial.

## **PRIORITY #2 – STRENGTHENING FLORIDA'S FAMILIES**

### **STATEWIDE GUARDIAN AD LITEM**

**Goal 1:** To provide effective advocacy for all of Florida's abused, abandoned or neglected children.

**Goal 2:** Advocate for timely permanency of children.

**Goal 3:** Increase number of volunteer advocates for children.

## **PRIORITY #3 – KEEPING FLORIDA'S ECONOMY VIBRANT**

## **PRIORITY #4 – SUCCESS FOR EVERY STUDENT**

## **PRIORITY #5 – KEEPING FLORIDIANS HEALTHY**

## **PRIORITY #6 – PROTECTING FLORIDA'S NATURAL RESOURCES**



---

## **TRENDS AND CONDITIONS STATEMENTS**

---

### **JUSTICE ADMINISTRATIVE COMMISSION**

Pursuant to Chapter 43.16, Florida Statutes, the Justice Administrative Commission's (JAC) duties shall include, but not be limited to the following: maintenance of a central state office for administrative services and assistance when possible to and on behalf of the State Attorneys and Public Defenders of Florida, the Offices of the Capital Collateral Regional Councils, Criminal Conflict and Civil Regional Councils, the Statewide Guardian Ad Litem Program and the Clerks of Court Operations Corporation.

Additionally, the Justice Administrative Commission is further charged with the responsibility of providing compliance and financial review of the court appointed counsel due process costs.

The JAC priorities were determined after consulting with the agencies we administratively serve and related legislative actions. Over the next five years, the JAC will continue to review its priorities with our stakeholders and make modifications as necessary.

The JAC strives to maintain employees who are highly skilled, motivated, quality-minded, productive and professional in order to better serve our customers.

### **STATEWIDE GUARDIAN AD LITEM**

The Guardian ad Litem Program was established in Florida in 1980 to represent the best interests of abused, abandoned or neglected children involved in court proceedings. There are 20 local Guardian ad Litem programs in the 20 judicial circuits in Florida. On January 1, 2004, the Statewide Guardian ad Litem Office was created to provide the infrastructure to increase functionality and standardization among the existing programs. Since then, an annual report has been filed each year which describes the environment, issues and strategies employed to address our basic mission to represent all dependent children, as defined within Chapter 39 of the Florida Statutes. Our next annual report will be filed on October 1, 2009. Reviewers are invited to read that report and contact the Statewide Office with any questions. Our vision is to provide effective advocacy for all of Florida's abused, abandoned or neglected children. In an effort to fulfill our vision, we are leveraging state, county and private funds to meet the needs of the children we represent.

Chapter 39, Florida Statutes, addresses proceedings relating to abused, abandoned or neglected children and requires the appointment of a guardian ad litem for every child. Section 39.8296, Florida Statutes, created the State Office as an independent entity within the Justice Administrative Commission.

---

## TRENDS AND CONDITIONS STATEMENTS

---

### STATEWIDE GUARDIAN AD LITEM

The State Office has oversight responsibility for, and provides technical assistance to all guardian ad litem and attorney ad litem programs located within the judicial circuits. Responsibilities include collecting, reporting and tracking reliable case data, reviewing the programs in Florida and in other states, developing statewide performance measures and standards, forming a training committee and developing a training program, reviewing various funding sources, and developing methods to improve delivery of program services.

Our outcome measures will be affected by the following emerging trends and economic conditions:

- The Program's budget was reduced by approximately 7.5% during the 2009 Legislative Session. This resulted in the termination of a large number of staff and therefore a reduction in the number of children the Program is able to represent. The Program has adjusted Goal #1 to reflect the reduction in its resources to represent all children under Court supervision.
- The Program is anticipating a reduction in the resources provided by county governments, grants and our non-profits which will reduce the number of children the Program can represent. The counties while obligated by statute to provide facilities for the Program, have in some cases provided additional support to the Program including staff. Because of a reduction in county funding, several circuits have already lost county resources and it is unknown how many more counties will reduce their support to the Program and in what amounts. The Program's LRPP goals do not currently reflect any reduction in county resources.

### CLERKS OF COURT OPERATIONS CORPORATION (CCOC)

The following three CCOC “Corporation Activities” are consistent with those referenced in the CCOC’s Legislative Budget Request for its Corporation operations. These “Activities” represent the three major responsibilities, in priority order, that are statutory based.

For each “Activity,” an overview of related “Trends & Conditions” is provided and CCOC strategies for responding over the next five years is presented. These strategies are referenced in the CCOC’s Legislative Budget Request, where appropriate.

#### **ACTIVITY / RESPONSIBILITY 1: Develop and support a Clerks’ Legislative Budget Request and allocate final appropriations.**

##### **Trends & Conditions:**

---

## **TRENDS AND CONDITIONS STATEMENTS**

---

### **CLERKS OF COURT OPERATIONS CORPORATION (CCOC)**

The 2009 Legislative Session required the CCOC to develop and use a new budget process that includes submitting Legislative Budget Requests, calculating core Clerk Service “unit costs” and comparing Clerks’ budgets and actual unit costs within “Clerk Peer Groups.” This new process necessitates the development and use of budget systems and tools that are state of the art for Clerks operations and for State of Florida’s budgeting.

In particular, the use of unit costing for the purpose of building budget requests, comparing expenditure patterns across organizations and then releasing appropriated funds on a quarterly basis requires a much more sophisticated budget process than previously existed within Florida.

The 2009 Legislature also required a professional analysis of the judicial system by the Office of Program Policy Analysis and Governmental Accountability by 2010. This study will clarify roles, responsibilities and efficiency considerations between and among Judges, the Office of Court Administration, Clerks and other court actors.

Especially with the severe recession impacts on the state’s budget, the Legislature is more focused on the judiciary as a “system” involving multiple actors. Pursuing the most efficient as well as effective means of conducting and administering justice in Florida’s criminal and civil court systems is an objective.

The CCOC is developing a professional budget process in response to changes in law and in consultation with multiple state stakeholders including the Legislature, the Supreme Court, the Department of Financial Services and the Auditor General’s Office. This is a multi-year challenge that requires careful CCOC planning, design and execution of its responsibilities to assure the operations of 67 different sized Clerks’ offices with differing operational and administrative capacities are properly funded to provide essential court services.

The creation of credible Legislative Budget Requests is essential to maintain a well-balanced court system that depends on properly funded Clerk operations as much as appropriate funding for Judges, State Attorneys, Public Defenders and the Office of Court Administration.

The CCOC will begin building the basics for newly required budgeting capacities in SFY 2009-10. The law requires full implementation of more sophisticated budgeting in SFY 2010-11 and beyond. The following is a five year plan to build on these beginnings.

---

## TRENDS AND CONDITIONS STATEMENTS

---

### CLERKS OF COURT OPERATIONS CORPORATION (CCOC)

#### Five Year Strategy

##### **Year 1: SFY 2010-11**

The CCOC will focus on building a Legislative Budget Request and appropriation allocation process that meets new requirements of law. In particular, the design, development and application of Peer Groups, individual office and Peer Group average unit costing techniques and comparisons between and among Clerks' offices in Peer Groups will be pursued. This year's initiatives will be focused on building a credible system and set of tools to maximize budget analysis capacities and support critical CCOC budget related decision-making responsibilities in future years.

The CCOC and Clerks also will use an updated program/service/work activity and task structure to better coordinate new budgeting system requirements, especially those related to unit costing and Peer Group comparisons.

##### **Year 2: SFY 2011-12**

Further refinement of Peer Group and unit costing requirements will be continued. In addition, the CCOC's use of unit costing in analyzing Clerks' office expenditures and releasing funds on a quarterly basis to Clerks' offices will be a focus. Further refining analytical tools for projecting revenues will be pursued for use within Clerks' offices as well as the CCOC.

##### **Year 3: SFY 2012-13**

The ability of the CCOC to build and use databases for budget request development and budget issue analysis will increase CCOC budget manager capacities to respond to budget requests and understand actual or evolving budget issues and communicate with Clerks' offices on proposed options for resolving issues.

##### **Year 4: SFY 2013-14**

The focus will be on using more sophisticated web-sites to expand the capacity of the CCOC and Clerks' offices to access data for budget preparation and approved budget management including revenue, expenditure, workload and performance data relationships.

---

## TRENDS AND CONDITIONS STATEMENTS

---

### CLERKS OF COURT OPERATIONS CORPORATION (CCOC)

#### Year 5: SFY 2014-15

The focus will be to integrate more sophisticated budgeting tools, systems and techniques into individual Clerks' offices to increase their capacities to build their budgets, minimize costs, maximize revenues and maximize court related performance.

#### ACTIVITY/ RESPONSIBILITY 2: Trust Fund and Clerks' budget status monitoring, analysis, reporting and issues management.

##### **Trends & Conditions:**

The revenue sources that fund the Operations Trust Fund have been significantly affected by Legislative actions and the recession over the last two years. Court fees were increased but the revenues were diverted to the General Revenue Fund and other trust funds. In addition, the Clerks' Operations Trust Fund must transmit an administrative fee of 8% of all revenues collected to the General Fund. And, the Trust Fund must retain 5% of collected revenues which acts as a required reserve.

A trend by 2010-11 (beginning July 1, 2010) is likely to show economic recovery for the nation and Florida. This will result in slowly decreasing unemployment from over 10% in 2009-10 and increased tourism and a lessen threat for business failures. A significant reduction in Clerks' revenues related to economic downturns such as foreclosure filings will likely occur.

Because of these revenue related trends and conditions, the CCOC must monitor and analyze the Clerks' Operations Trust Fund carefully to determine its capacity to fully support limited Legislative appropriations in SFY 2009-10, SFY 2010-11 and beyond. As much time as possible is required to alter Clerk budgets if revenue transfers, required reserves or shortfalls related to economic conditions appear to be insufficient to fully fund approved budgets.

The CCOC, additionally, must monitor and analyze Clerk budget expenditures, workloads and judicial system performance standards to assess capacities to efficiently and effectively serve the judicial system within budget authority. The CCOC must be operationally focused on Clerk budget monitoring and analysis to maximize the ability of authorized budgets to provide essential quantities of service and meet Clerk performance standards.

---

## **TRENDS AND CONDITIONS STATEMENTS**

---

### **CLERKS OF COURT OPERATIONS CORPORATION (CCOC)**

The CCOC also will focus on designing and developing more sophisticated budget related systems and databases.

The CCOC will focus on the following results over the next five years:

### **Five Year Strategy**

#### **Year 1: SFY 2010-11**

The focus of the CCOC will be on revenue analysis and the determination of capacities to fully fund appropriation levels.

Additionally, the development of individual office and Peer Group service unit costing processes will be further sophisticated to focus on service cost efficiency results.

The CCOC must design and implement a process for “Quarterly Releases” of appropriations to 67 Clerks’ offices based on unit cost and performance changes from one quarter to the next.

Another focus will be on using “Electronic Forums” for Clerks’ office education and training on issues affecting multiple offices.

The ability to use e-filing and other automation will be analyzed and strategies will be developed for its utility in those Clerks’ offices capable of funding and implementing it.

Initiatives will be underway to create a more sophisticated SQL server database that will dramatically improve the productivity of CCOC employees related to budget trends, budget request comparisons between and among Peer Group Clerks’ offices, revenue collection strategy impacts and operating efficiency strategy implementation results on unit costs.

#### **Year 2: SFY 2011-12**

The CCOC will utilize its database automation capacities to better monitor and analyze the interrelationships between and among workload projections, expenditure trends and performance enhancements.

---

## **TRENDS AND CONDITIONS STATEMENTS**

---

### **CLERKS OF COURT OPERATIONS CORPORATION (CCOC)**

E-filing system implementation in Clerks' offices will be analyzed for transfer to other Clerks' offices previously unable to implement it. E-filing results will be tracked to unit cost impacts and possible budget savings.

#### **Year 3: SFY 2012-13**

Enhancements of CCOC budget analysis tools and techniques for use in smaller Clerks' offices, especially, will be pursued. This will require more individualized budget and technical system support for these offices.

#### **Year 4: SFY 2013-14**

Using Web-based capacities to collect, retrieve and analyze critical budget and performance related data for minimizing costs and maximizing revenues and meeting performance standards will be a focus.

#### **Year 5: SFY 2014-15**

Continued enhancement of automated tools for Clerks offices to use in managing budgets and achieving output and outcome quantity and quality levels will be pursued.

### **ACTIVITY/ RESPONSIBILITY 3: Provide education and training to Clerks' Offices.**

#### **Trends & Conditions**

With the requirement for Clerks to be budgeted directly through the Legislative Appropriations process, new budgeting processes, responsibilities and professional skills are required in the CCOC and within Florida's 67 Clerks' offices.

Additionally, the 2010 changes in law, require the inclusion of Legislative Appropriation Committees, the Department of Financial Services, the Supreme Court, the Office of Economic and Demographic Research, the Auditor General, the Department of Revenue and the Justice Administrative Commission in setting up and operating new budget systems in the CCOC and in Clerk's offices.

---

## **TRENDS AND CONDITIONS STATEMENTS**

---

### **CLERKS OF COURT OPERATIONS CORPORATION (CCOC)**

Florida's 67 Clerks' offices vary dramatically in size, from less than 10 employees, including the Clerk, to hundreds depending, of course, on county population and related court activity levels. This fact affects staff capacities within Clerk's offices to understand and operate under these new budget requirements and expectations.

The CCOC must provide much more sophisticated budget request development and execution related education and training than in the past. Clerks' offices must be able to better understand the principles, practice and implications of unit costing, Peer Group comparisons, revenue projections and enhancements, expenditure analyses and efficiency achievements, workload forecasting and standards, and best practice transfers.

This will require multi-year CCOC strategies to build CCOC and Clerks' office budgeting capacities to assure the State of Florida that Clerks' operations are maximizing revenues, minimizing costs, intelligently processing work and maximizing performance on behalf of Florida's court system.

The CCOC also is responsible, in law, for general Clerk education and training programs related to their office administration and management, court services and operations, records maintenance and management, financial administration and management, office technology and resources, State and local government organization, structure and relationships and personal skills development.

### **Five Year Strategy**

#### **Year 1: SFY 2010-11**

Budget education and training will focus on developing data used in the budgeting process including unit cost calculation consistency across Clerk offices. Accurate data collection and reporting of expenditure, revenue, output and outcome data also will be enhanced with training related to definitional and use consistency in Clerks' offices. The use of the Clerks' CCIS data system will be evaluated for increasing data reliability and utility in the budgeting process.

Budget request building skills (e.g. enhanced service costing and revenue projections) will also be a CCOC focus.



---

## **TRENDS AND CONDITIONS STATEMENTS**

---

### **CLERKS OF COURT OPERATIONS CORPORATION (CCOC)**

Budget process “forums” will be developed for sharing skills and strategies between and among offices in Peer Groups especially.

The CCOC will further develop its individual office and workshop “Budget Education & Training” program to support budget issue understanding and strategy development for Clerk’s offices.

The CCOC will plan and be responsible for the presentation of multiple Clerk training and education programs related to general office administration and other operational responsibilities.

The CCOC also will create an education mechanism and approach to build understanding among state stakeholders involved by law and/or by interest in Clerk functions and partnership potential.

#### **Year 2: SFY 2011-12**

More sophisticated Peer Group data and strategy sharing will be emphasized to allow more rapid accumulation of budgeting and performance enhancement skills.

The CCOC will further develop the capacities of its web site to be used in budget preparation and request submissions to the CCOC by Clerks’ offices.

As in the previous year, General Clerks’ office training programs will be provided based on assessment of educational needs.

#### **Year 3: SFY 2012-13**

CCOC “Budget Education and Training” programs will continue to focus on cost minimization and revenue enhancement strategies for Clerks’ offices of every size.

Peer Group best practice sharing will be emphasized.

As in the previous year, general Clerks’ office training programs will be provided based on assessment of educational needs.

---

## **TRENDS AND CONDITIONS STATEMENTS**

---

### **CLERKS OF COURT OPERATIONS CORPORATION (CCOC)**

#### **Year 4: SFY 2013-14**

Special CCOC education and training will focus on individual offices where capacities to minimize costs and enhance revenues and performance appears to be most possible will be the focus.

The CCOC will provide education and training on the budgeting tools, systems and processes developed in previous years.

The CCOC will identify critical budget issues and provide education and training on how to resolve them in some/all Clerks' offices.

As in the previous year, general Clerks' office training programs will be provided based on assessment of educational needs.

#### **Year 5: SFY 2014-15**

The CCOC will further develop its budget education and training tools using internet capacities and opportunities and new automation tools, processes and systems that have been built during the previous few years.

The CCOC will continue to identify critical budget related issues and provide education and training on resolution options.

As in the previous year, general Clerks' office training programs will be provided based on assessment of educational needs.

### **Other Long Range Program Plan Considerations**

In 2009, the CCOC was given significantly increased authority and responsibility in law, including but not limited to the following. The CCOC must be organized and support to meet these expectations:

1. Building a Legislative Budget Request (LBR) based, in part, on individual Clerk's office unit costs and Peer Group average unit costs.

---

## **TRENDS AND CONDITIONS STATEMENTS**

---

### **CLERKS OF COURT OPERATIONS CORPORATION (CCOC)**

2. Creating a budget system focusing on services, not just organizational entities.
3. Building a LBR that fully funds projected Clerk workloads by service and performance expectations of judicial system customers and the public users of Florida's court system.
4. Justifying the Clerks' LBR to the Legislature, Supreme Court and consulting on LBR development with other state stakeholders including the Department of Financial Services.
5. Allocating final Appropriations equitably to 67 Clerks' offices.
6. Closely monitoring a reduced capacity Clerks' Operations Trust Fund and working with all Clerks' offices on revenue and expenditure issues as they arise.
7. Building a process to release appropriations to each Clerk's office, quarterly, based in part on unit cost and performance achievement in previous fiscal year quarter(s).
8. Have CCOC staff fully functional in budgeting skills and techniques to provide technical assistance and education and training to individual Clerks' offices in need of support and to many/all Clerks offices in workshops and other forums.
9. Have CCOC capacities to coordinate budget issues and discuss budget related results with multiple state stakeholders routinely.
10. The CCOC must relate requirements of law and Clerk and Legislative/other state stakeholder intent and expectations to organizational structure, resource and funding needs.

### **Potential Policy Changes Affecting the CCOC's Budget Request**

There were major changes in law affecting the CCOC in 2009. A January 2010 report from the Office of Program Policy Analysis and Government Accountability on the roles and Responsibilities of Clerks Offices and the Office of State Courts Administration may lead to other changes in law in the 2010 Legislative Session.

---

## **TRENDS AND CONDITIONS STATEMENTS**

---

### **STATE ATTORNEYS**

#### **AGENCIES PRIMARY RESPONSIBILITIES AND STATUTORY AUTHORITY**

Pursuant to Article V, Section 17 of the Constitution of the State of Florida, the State Attorney is charged with being the Chief Prosecuting Officer of all criminal trial courts in his/her respective circuit and shall perform all other duties prescribed by general law. Chapter 27 and 29 of the Florida Statutes and the Florida Rules of Criminal Procedure further elaborate upon the duties of the State Attorney. The State Attorney, with the aid of appointed assistants and staff shall appear in the circuit and county courts within his/her judicial circuit and prosecute or defend on behalf of the state, all suits, applications, or motions, civil and criminal, in which the state is a party.

Consistent with and necessary to the performance of these duties is the requirement that the State Attorney provide personnel and procedures for the orderly, efficient and effective investigation, intake and processing of all felony, misdemeanor, criminal traffic, juvenile and specially enumerated civil cases referred by law enforcement, other state, county and municipal agencies and the general public.

There is a State Attorney elected for each of the twenty judicial circuits. These circuits vary greatly from a population of less than 200,000 to populations of over 2,000,000. The geographic area covered by each circuit may be limited to one county or as many as seven counties with multiple offices.

#### **AGENCY PRIORITIES AND THEIR APPLICATIONS**

The State Attorneys' priorities are to pursue justice through prosecution effectively, efficiently and in a timely manner for all criminal cases presented to, or investigated by the State Attorney. In addition, the State Attorney shall represent the State of Florida efficiently and effectively in all civil court suits, applications, motions or actions in which the state is a party or which is assigned to the State Attorney by the Florida Statutes.

#### **JUSTIFICATION OF OUTCOMES WITH IMPACTS RELATING TO DEMAND AND FISCAL IMPLICATIONS**

The true test of any agency will be to meet the goals and objectives within the constraints of state and county appropriations and budgetary restrictions. State Attorneys' duties and obligations have not only increased in the criminal justice system but have now extended into the Civil Courts. This has resulted in an increased workload of serious and sophisticated criminal and civil referrals.

---

## **TRENDS AND CONDITIONS STATEMENTS**

---

### **STATE ATTORNEYS**

In addition, Assistant State Attorneys and staff must be compensated at a sufficient level within the competing markets of other government agencies and the private sector to help reduce turnover and provide a more stable, efficient and productive staff.

Simply put, there is a direct correlation between public safety concerns and the legislative budget appropriations to the State Attorneys. Citizens of Florida should be able to feel safe in the comfort of their homes or in the economics of their businesses.

### **CHANGES THAT REQUIRE LEGISLATIVE ACTION**

There are no activity or performance measure changes this year that require Legislative action.

### **PUBLIC DEFENDERS**

The Public Defender protects the constitutional and statutory rights of all citizens through the effective legal representation of court appointed clients, pursuant to Chapter 27, Florida Statutes.

The Public Defenders of Florida carry out their mission to provide legal representation of court appointed clients through the following two program areas:

**CRIMINAL TRIAL COURT** - Represent appointed clients arrested for or charged with a felony, violation of probation or community control, misdemeanor, criminal traffic offense, criminal contempt, violation of a municipal or county ordinance, and juveniles alleged to be delinquent. Provide representation in other proceedings as appointed by the court.

**CIVIL TRIAL COURT** - Represent appointed clients subject to Baker Act proceedings regarding involuntary commitment pursuant to Chapter 394 or 916, Florida Statutes; clients subject to commitment under the Jimmy Ryce Act pursuant to Chapter 916, Florida Statutes; and appointments pursuant to civil contempt.

The Public Defender's goal is to provide quality representation to all appointees. Because "quality representation" cannot be defined or measured in wins and losses, this program is not necessarily conducive to performance measurement. The measures that have been developed are designed to determine the quality of the work in other ways, i.e. frequency of client contact, time of case resolution, and attorney experience. The

---

## **TRENDS AND CONDITIONS STATEMENTS**

---

following goals have been established in an effort to carry out the Public Defender mission.

1. Provide quality representation to all appointees.
2. Contact jail clients within 72 hours of appointment.
3. Preserve right to speedy trial.
4. Establish standard caseload for misdemeanor attorneys of 400 cases per year.
5. Establish standard caseload for felony attorneys of 200 cases per year.
6. Establish standard caseload for juvenile attorneys at 250 cases per year.
7. Provide equitable salaries for employees to improve retention.

### **PUBLIC DEFENDER APPELLATE**

APPELLATE COURT – Represent appointed clients on appeal.

The Public Defender protects the constitutional and statutory rights of all citizens through the effective representation of court appointed clients. The Public Defenders' goal is to provide quality representation to all appointees. The measures that have been developed are designed to determine the quality of the work i.e. case resolution, adherence to standardized number of cases per attorney and attorney experience.

The following goals have been established in an effort to carry out the Public Defender mission.

1. Provide quality representation to all appointees.
2. Establish standard caseload for appellate attorneys at 2.5 capital appeals or 40 weighted non-capital records per year.
3. Provide equitable salaries for employees to improve retention.

---

## TRENDS AND CONDITIONS STATEMENTS

---

### Capital Collateral Regional Counsel Middle and South Regions Focus Areas, Trends and Conditions and Issues

#### CCRC Statutory Responsibilities:

**State Approved Program:** Legal Representation **CCRC Approved Service:** Legal Representation

#### CCRC GOAL:

To pursue completion of post conviction legal counsel duties in a timely manner while maintaining high legal representation standards.

This is responsive to the Governor's and Legislature's desire to lessen the time it takes to bring post-conviction cases to closure. It also helps assure inappropriately sentenced inmates receive altered sentences as soon as possible.

#### THE CCRC'S PROFESSIONAL FOCUS

**CCRCs strive to meet professional standards for providing post-collateral legal services by competently working all cases assigned by the Supreme Court in as cost and operationally efficient and timely manner as possible.**

#### CCRC MIDDLE AND SOUTH'S LONG RANGE PROGRAM PLAN STORY

**CCRC Focus Areas** indicate where CCRC attention is critical to achieve its professional, operational, financial and results oriented standards and expectations.

**Trends and conditions** provide an overview of current and trending challenges.

**External issues** indicate the pressures and factors that are outside the control of the CCRCs yet have an impact on CCRCs' ability to meet its challenges.

**Internal issues** describe operational pressures and factors that are under the control of CCRCs as challenges are being addressed.

**The LRPP provides the foundation logic for CCRC budget requests presented to the Governor and Legislature.**

---

## TRENDS AND CONDITIONS STATEMENTS

---

### CAPITAL COLLATERAL REGIONAL COUNSELS

<p style="text-align: center;"><b>CCRC FOCUS AREA 1: Meet State &amp; Federal Court Expectations for Competent Representation in Post Conviction/Death Penalty Cases</b></p>
--

#### 1.0 Trends and Conditions:

The primary reasons for providing legal counsel to persons sentenced to death are (1) the public wants to be sure that the sentence is deserved and (2) when it is upheld, there is a societal desire for timely justice, especially for the sake of the victims' families. The trend over the last number of years is that there are increasing concerns about these perspectives.

The Florida Supreme Court initially reviews all death sentences imposed in Florida's Circuit Courts for any indication of an overt mistake during the trial and/or sentencing. In the past, this initial review resulted in a reversal of the trial or death sentence in well over 75 % of the cases. Recently, the Florida Supreme Court's reversal rate is less than 20 % on direct appeal after sentencing. If a death sentence is not altered by the Supreme Court on direct appeal, then CCRCs are assigned the case for further review. **This trend will likely result in many more cases being assigned to the CCRCs over the next five years.**

The Florida Supreme Court has explicitly indicated to the Florida Legislature that the CCRC model for providing post-conviction legal representation is their preferred choice. This is due to their demands for experienced legal representation to avoid case progress disruptions and competency challenges.

#### **Related External Issue 1.1 Meeting court standards for professional legal representation.**

If a court suspects legal representation incompetence, the process shuts down and the delays lengthen. There is an expectation of thorough case analysis, the presentation of issues with good legal basis, and the ability to understand and work efficiently and effectively in cases involving the unique nature of the death penalty.

Therefore, competent and ethical death row legal counsel can facilitate the process and provide greater assurances to society that justice is being carried out.

#### **Related External Issue 1.2: Economic downturn causing budget revenue shortfalls, budget cuts and experienced staff losses.**



---

## TRENDS AND CONDITIONS STATEMENTS

---

### CAPITAL COLLATERAL REGIONAL COUNSELS

Representing capital collateral/death penalty review cases requires legal skills and experience, especially in the federal court system, that is beyond those that most lawyers attain.

The budget cuts over the last two years have reduced CCRCs' budget approximately 17% below FY 2007-08. If additional budget reductions occur, it is likely that 5-6 lawyers and at least 2 investigators will be laid off. The loss of highly experienced and competent lawyers and investigators reduces the capacity of the CCRC offices to handle workloads as effectively. The priority to provide legal counsel that meets court standards will not be compromised. However, the resulting loss of positions will require the CCRCs to reduce the number of cases in each office by 20%. These cases would be transferred to the Registry, which results in a cost shift instead of a savings.

#### **Related Internal Issue 1.3: CCRC efforts to retain experienced professional staff to meet court expectations for competent representation.**

Providing competent post-conviction legal counsel requires gathering, storing and analyzing case related public records, investigating cases, preparing and filing issues and providing legal representation within the state and federal courts. CCRC work tasks are described later in the Long Range Program Plan. Keeping caseloads to reasonable levels is important to retain staff over a longer period of time.

CCRCs have made good progress in attracting, training and keeping post-conviction law experienced attorneys. Currently, 83% of attorneys have greater than 3 years experience in post conviction law. Almost 72.5 % attorneys have greater than 5 years experience. Lowering staff turnover rates has been a priority; however, recent budget cuts have caused the CCRCs to reduce staffing levels by cutting positions. Additionally, the CCRCs have seen several experienced staff members, including the resignation of 5 “lead” attorneys.

**CCRC FOCUS AREA 2:  
Respond to increasing CCRC caseloads, state law  
and court rulings.**

---

## TRENDS AND CONDITIONS STATEMENTS

---

### CAPITAL COLLATERAL REGIONAL COUNSELS

#### 2.0 Trends and Conditions

CCRC caseloads, as assigned by the Florida Supreme Court, typically increase annually. In FY 2008-09, for instance, the CCRCs worked on 179 cases. In FY 2009-10, the caseload is expected to be 183 which is a 3 % increase. Case assignments routinely grow, annually.

The State and federal court systems are focusing more attention on issues related to death penalty review cases. Their dockets reflect a growing interest in conducting more evidentiary hearings on these issues. The CCRCs experienced a 21% increase in hearings in FY 2008-09. This trend is expected to continue into FY 2010-11.

The CCRCs do case trial records research, investigate case backgrounds and issues, produce a filing showing critical issues for state and federal court consideration and provide legal representation in the state and federal courts when issues are heard. When a death warrant is signed by the Governor, the CCRCs have an accelerated requirement to do final state and federal court reviews of the sentence within a short 30-60 day period.

#### **External Issue 2.1: Have the capacity to meet increasing workloads**

The workload increases faced by CCRCs going into FY 2009-10 were as follow:

- Evidentiary hearings in court: + 10 % growth
- Federal court actions: + 8 % growth
- Death warrants: + 100 % growth

This may be typical over the next five years.

#### **External Issue 2.2: Be able to meet legal representation requirements of law.**

State law requires CCRCs, within 365 days, to analyze cases and produce a 3.851 filing with the courts on any issues deemed critical to court review of the death sentence. This is to avoid delays in processing the cases as they are assigned to the CCRCs.

Courts will then schedule hearings on one or more issues per case and require CCRCs to present their findings and discuss their issues. State and federal courts set their own calendars throughout the post-conviction legal process and CCRCs respond. CCRCs can request delays, but rarely do so as they try to keep the cases progressing to meet Legislative/Gubernatorial expectations. In FY2008-09 over 97% of all motions filed during the process were timely filed without requests for extensions. However, in the latest Auditor General's Report to the Legislature comparing CCRCs with private

---

## TRENDS AND CONDITIONS STATEMENTS

---

### CAPITAL COLLATERAL REGIONAL COUNSELS

Registry indicated that the private registry attorneys timely filed their motions 63% of the time.

#### **External Issue 2.3: Be able to respond to increased workloads generated by new Supreme Court rulings.**

Over the past number of years, there have been numerous legal challenges to the process of executing death penalty sentenced inmates. These challenges resulted in federal and state courts slowing death penalty case processing

Recent Supreme Court rulings have settled many of the issues and cases will progress through the state and federal systems at a faster pace than previously. More hearings and executions were conducted in FY 2008-09 and will likely continue at a faster pace in the next five years.

In addition to working more cases, this trend is the basis for more evidentiary hearings, state court appeals, federal court actions and death warrant responses by the CCRCs as indicated previously.

#### **External Issue 2.4: Be able to respond to changes in Court policies and procedures**

For the past eight (8) years, the Florida Supreme Court has reversed many Circuit Courts who have summarily denied post-conviction motions without granting an evidentiary hearing. The court has made it very clear that the Circuit courts should grant evidentiary hearings on a broad range of claims, leading to a significant increase in the number of issues raised by CCRCs that are granted an evidentiary hearing.

This has led to a slight increase in the costs of legal representation and case preparation, but it has also decreased delay in the post-conviction process. Cases that were previously reversed and remanded for an evidentiary hearing after a summary denial are now being considered by the Circuit courts in a timely fashion. The 2-3 year delay caused when the Florida Supreme Court reversed the case, simply because the Circuit court failed to consider issues when they were first raised, rarely occurs, thereby increasing the efficiency of the overall post-conviction process.

The number of cases being decided slowed to a trickle while the trial and appellate courts waited clarification from the Florida Supreme Court on the constitutionality of lethal injections. In April 2008, the U.S. Supreme Court ruled that lethal injections are constitutional.

---

## TRENDS AND CONDITIONS STATEMENTS

---

### CAPITAL COLLATERAL REGIONAL COUNSELS

The Florida Supreme Court and Florida Legislature also issued new rules relating to mental retardation and DNA issues further slowing case progress. During the 2006-07 fiscal year, then Governor Bush issued a moratorium on death penalty warrants and created a commission to review the problems associated with the Angel Diaz execution. This led to numerous challenges.

Final decisions by the U.S. & Florida Supreme Courts led to increases in Death warrant activity and federal court actions requiring additional CCRC responses.

**Internal Issue 2.5: Be able to maintain attorney workloads at reasonable levels to continually provide competent legal representation and keep cases progressing on a timely basis through the court systems.**

The CCRCs have case teams (1 lead attorney, 1 second attorney, 1 investigator and ½ support position). The number of cases per lead attorney is 12 in FY 2009-10. In FY 2010-11 it will be 13 with present staff levels. The Spangenburg Report of 1999 and the American Bar Association recommended a caseload of less than 6 per attorney. If additional attorney FTEs are unavailable in future years, the workload ratios will continue to climb.

The ability of attorneys, investigators and support staff to competently perform their case related work tasks determines the ability of the case to proceed in a timely manner.

**CCRC FOCUS AREA 3:  
Keeping CCRC costs as low as possible  
while still providing competent representation  
and still meeting the Supreme Court's professional  
standards.**

### 3.0 Trends and Conditions:

The CCRCs have focused on producing consistently high quality work at low costs. The Auditor General, as charged by the Legislature, completed its analysis of CCRC financial and operating performance compared to private registry lawyers who are funded in the Appropriations Act to perform the same duties as CCRCs. It is an optional source of legal services for post-conviction case representation. .

---

## TRENDS AND CONDITIONS STATEMENTS

---

### CAPITAL COLLATERAL REGIONAL COUNSELS

The Auditor General's "Report" indicated the following for FY 2005-06 which was the last full year's statistics available when the report was compiled. Even though this Report is now dated, it likely that today's circumstances remain similar.

1. Average cost per case for legal representation: \$ 15,117 (CCRC) vs. \$ 18,579 Registry.
2. Average per hour cost for attorney time: \$ 38 (CCRC) vs. \$ 100 Registry
3. Average per hour cost for investigators: \$ 26 (CCRC) vs. \$ 40 Registry
4. Average cost per 3.851 court filing of issues: \$ 17,033 (CCRC) vs. \$ 18,359 Registry
5. Average cost per court evidentiary hearing on issues: \$ 17,325 (CCRC) vs. \$ 24,589 Registry
  
6. Average cost per appellate representation in courts: \$ 12,237 (CCRC) vs. \$ 17,263 Registry
7. Number of cases worked: 169 (CCRC) vs. 153 Registry
8. There is a potential that the CCRCs will have 183 cases in FY 2010-11, while the estimate for the Registry is likely to be closer to 135.

These cost/case ratios appear relatively consistent from year to year.

### **External Issue 3.1: The number of death warrants signed by the Governor**

As indicated, there was a slow down in death penalty cases progressing through the court systems in the past few years. The recent court rulings that are now accelerating the pace and the CCRC requirements to respond in a 30 – 60 day period is costly. Whereas there was one death warrant issued in FY 2007-08 and 5 in FY 2008-09, there could be as many as 6 in FY 2009-10 and 8 in FY 2010-11. Many more are possible in the following five years. Each death warrant CCRC response costs between \$ 40,000 - \$ 50,000.

### **CCRC FOCUS AREA 4: The Time It Takes To Complete Capital Cases in the Judicial System**

## **4.0 Trends and Conditions**

The time it takes to properly investigate a case is affected by the ability to locate documents, interview original trial witnesses, and family members, search for other crime

---

## TRENDS AND CONDITIONS STATEMENTS

---

### CAPITAL COLLATERAL REGIONAL COUNSELS

witnesses not involved in the original trial, interview inmates and develop investigative results for legal analysis and case preparation.

The combination of records analysis and investigative information gathering, the preparation of motions and strategies for legal representation in both the state and federal courts and the development of issues for presentation in court is characteristically completed in one (1) year.

#### **Internal Issue 4.1: Conducting legal representation on a timely basis**

The **2007 Auditor General's Report** documented the total processing time for cases from the point of being assigned to the CCRC and Private Registry law firms until their completion. There are three primary stages involved.

**The first stage is from the date of Florida Supreme Court assignment until all case processing is completed in the Florida Circuit Court.** During the total time (100 % of it) spent on average in this stage of a case's progress through the entire system, the Auditor General validated that CCRCs only accounted for 21 % of it. The rest (79 %) of the time it took to complete this stage was controlled by non-CCRC parties in the court system.

**The second stage is from the beginning of the "appeals" process in the State courts until there is a court ruling on the appeal.** During the total time (100 % of it) spent on average in this stage of a case's progress through the entire system, the Auditor General validated that CCRCs only accounted for 18.4 % of it. The rest (81.6 %) of the time it took to complete this stage was controlled by non-CCRC parties in the court system.

**The third stage is from the beginning of the case processing in the Federal court system until its conclusion.** During the total time (100 % of it) spent on average in this stage of a case's progress through the entire system, the Auditor General validated that CCRCs only accounted for 13.6 % of it. The rest (86.4 %) of the time it took to complete this stage was controlled by non-CCRC parties in the court system.

The Auditor General verified that CCRCs are not delaying case progress through the state and federal court systems.

#### **External Issue 4.2: Inability to progress cases due to non-CCRC delays.**

The time it takes for the State and Federal courts to hear cases is a major factor affecting the time it takes for cases to progress through the judicial system. Judges set the timelines

---

## TRENDS AND CONDITIONS STATEMENTS

---

### CAPITAL COLLATERAL REGIONAL COUNSELS

for scheduling case hearings. This can be affected by court caseloads and backlog conditions.

Judges must carefully consider case issues and motions before scheduling hearings on those that have merit. It is then the responsibility of the CCRC and a prosecuting attorney to be prepared to participate in the scheduled hearing(s).

At times, the court will grant hearing delays upon a legitimate request by the CCRC or prosecuting attorney. The trend in the increased timeliness of court hearings is due in part to the increased frequency of status conferences by the trial courts required under the new rules promulgated by the Florida Supreme Court.

Also, it is not unusual for death row inmate cases represented by private attorneys to be sent to a CCRC by the Supreme Court for representation following the issuance of a death warrant. A CCRC normally has no familiarization with the case assigned and must devote more staff than average to provide as competent representation as possible in the time allowed.

#### **Internal Issue 4.3 Being able to retain experienced support staff, investigators and attorneys.**

As in Focus Area 1, retaining experienced staff in all areas of CCRC operations affects the ability to efficiently represent cases in the state and federal courts. In FY 2009-10, the CCRCs, combined, have 30 lawyers, 20 investigators, 5 support staff and 6 administrative staff.

The turnover rate for both offices, combined, was 15% over the last two years. While the CCRCs have become quite efficient in their work efforts as verified by the 2007 Auditor General's Report, and confirmed by the Florida Supreme Court in its written comments to the Florida Legislature praising the CCRC model in 2008 and 2009; two years of budget cuts have impacted CCRCs' ability to retain experienced employees. The concern is that this turnover rate could impact CCRC capacities to meet performance measures in the future.

### **CCRC FOCUS AREA 5: CCRC Operational Improvements**

---

## TRENDS AND CONDITIONS STATEMENTS

---

### CAPITAL COLLATERAL REGIONAL COUNSELS

The ability to achieve performance standards also is affected by CCRC capacities to improve its operations and administration.

#### **Internal Issue 5.1: Being able to continually improve CCRC systems and processes.**

CCRC ability to help its investigators and attorneys search case records more efficiently has improved over the past few years. The implementation of advanced technology to scan, store and retrieve records, for instance, reduced attorney time required for case analysis. It also reduced the need for paper storage space and will reduce the requirements for expensive square footage office space.

In FY 2009-10, the CCRCs will introduce technology enhancements such as installing search engines that can help scan records for client information much more quickly than in the past. In addition, newer & faster computers will be available to support lawyers which should increase productivity.

#### **Internal Issue 5.2: Being able to continually improve administrative and management processes.**

CCRCs also are developing improved and more efficient capacities to monitor and evaluate their planning, budgeting and performance and accountability responsibilities. Administrative systems are being integrated to allow the office to administer more efficiently. The production of Long Range Program Plans, budgets and financial and operating performance measures in a much more time efficient, integrative and accurate manner is also being realized.

CCRCs continue to monitor their public records, investigation and legal counsel process activities and work tasks to isolate areas where efficiencies may be enhanced. The tasks involved in each of these processes are as follows:

The purpose is to be able to perform the following CCRC work activities and task in the most efficient way possible,

#### 1.0 Public Records

- 1.1. Review existing records that are available
- 1.2. Generate a file on the death row client
- 1.3. Review additional public records
- 1.4. Litigate public records issues if they are not forthcoming



---

## TRENDS AND CONDITIONS STATEMENTS

---

### CAPITAL COLLATERAL REGIONAL COUNSELS

#### 2.0 Investigations

- 2.1. Develop client history
- 2.2. Identify witnesses and experts who may provide critical information
- 2.3. Develop a strategy for locating and pursuing witnesses and experts
- 2.4. Obtain evidence

#### 3.0 Legal Counsel

- 3.1. Visit client
- 3.2 Analyze witness information
- 3.3. Draft and publish or transmit the 3.851 motion documents
- 3.4. Prepare other motions as appropriate
- 3.5. Participate in evidentiary hearing(s)
- 3.6. Draft post-hearing orders and pleadings
- 3.7. Review court decisions
- 3.8. Prepare for and participate in state court appeals/Habeas Corpus
- 3.9. Prepare and file a petition for Certiorari to the U.S. Supreme Court
- 3.10 Prepare for and participate in Federal Habeas Corpus proceedings
- 3.11 Conduct or attend evidentiary and/or other hearings
- 3.12 Prepare for and participate in Circuit Court of Appeal
- 3.13 Prepare and file a Petition for Certiorari to the U.S. Supreme Court

In FY 2009-10, the CCRCs will be implementing additional budget management capacities that will allow “unit cost” efficiency analysis and performance evaluations.

The current measures identify “output measures that clearly indicate what CCRCs do and how much of it is done annually. These measures can be divided by CCRC budgets and actual expenditures to identify relevant “unit costs”. This allows the LRPP to focus on measures that are critical to budget decision-making and judging CCRC plans and annual performance.

The combination of “output” and “outcome” measures can appropriately integrate financial, operational and results measures to tell the full CCRC story. The CCRC annual budget can be directly integrated with the CCRC Long Range Program Plan with these measures. The Auditor General’s Report found currently authorized measures to be appropriate for telling the post-conviction legal representation story due to the availability of valid and reliable data, their ability to be collected and their ability to be integrated with financial data.

#### **Internal Issue 5.3: Information Technology**

There is no requirement for major information technology improvements in FY 2009-10.

---

## **TRENDS AND CONDITIONS STATEMENTS**

---

### **OFFICES OF CRIMINAL CONFLICT AND CIVIL REGIONAL COUNSELS**

The Offices of Criminal Conflict and Civil Regional Counsels (“Regional Counsels”) protect the constitutional rights of all citizens through the cost efficient and effective legal representation of court appointed clients pursuant to Chapter 27, Florida Statutes. The Offices of Criminal Conflict and Civil Regional Counsels carry out their mission to provide legal representation of court appointed clients in four (4) specific areas:

**A. CRIMINAL TRIAL COURT** – The Regional Counsels represent appointed clients arrested for or charged with a felony, violation of probation or community control, misdemeanor, criminal traffic offense, criminal contempt, violation of a municipal or county ordinance, and juveniles alleged to be delinquent when the Public Defender has declared a conflict of interest or is otherwise prohibited by law from representation.

**B. CIVIL (JUVENILE DIVISION) TRIAL COURT** – The Regional Counsels represent appointed clients pursuant to Chapter 39, Florida Statutes, where a petition seeks a dependency or termination of parental rights action.

**C. CIVIL (PROBATE, GUARDIANSHIP and MENTAL HEALTH DIVISIONS) TRIAL COURT** – The Regional Counsels represent clients subject to sexually transmitted diseases pursuant to Chapter 384, Florida Statutes, clients subject to judicial waiver petitions pursuant to Chapter 390, Florida Statutes, clients subject to the Tuberculosis Control Act pursuant to Chapter 392, Florida Statutes, clients subject to an adjudication of incapacity by the developmental disabilities law pursuant to Chapter 393, Florida Statutes, clients subject to the Florida Mental Health (“Baker Act”) Act proceedings regarding involuntary civil commitment pursuant to Chapter 394, Florida Statutes, where the public defender conflicts out, clients subject to involuntary commitment under the Jimmy Ryce Act, pursuant to Chapter 394, Part 5, Florida Statutes, clients subject to a Hal S. Marchman Alcohol and Other Drug Services (“Marchman Act”) Act of 1993 involuntary civil commitment petition, pursuant to Chapter 397, Florida Statutes, clients subject to involuntary civil commitment and removal of civil rights pursuant to the Adult Protective Services Act, Chapter 415, Florida Statutes, clients requiring removal of disabilities of nonage pursuant to Chapter 743, Florida Statutes, clients subject to involuntary civil commitment and removal of civil rights pursuant to the Florida Guardianship Law, Chapter 744, Florida Statutes, and children and families in need of state services pursuant to Chapter 984, Florida Statutes.

**D. CRIMINAL AND CIVIL APPELLATE COURTS** – The Regional Counsels represent appointed clients on appeal for cases where the clients request an appeal on a case where they were represented by the Office of Public Defender who conflicts out, where they were represented by private court-appointed counsels, and where the Office of Criminal Conflict and Civil Regional Counsel was in the trial court.

---

## **TRENDS AND CONDITIONS STATEMENTS**

---

### **OFFICES OF CRIMINAL CONFLICT AND CIVIL REGIONAL COUNSELS**

The Offices of Criminal Conflict and Civil Regional Counsels' goal is to provide quality representation to all clients. Because "quality representation" cannot be defined or measured in wins and losses, this program is not necessarily conducive to performance measurement. Therefore, the Regional Counsels are proposing performance measures that are designed to determine the quality of the work in other ways, that is, frequency of client contact, time of case resolution, and attorney experience. The following goals have been established in an effort to carry out the Offices of Criminal Conflict and Civil Regional Counsel's mission:

1. Provide quality representation to all clients.
2. Contact jail clients within 72 hours of appointment.
3. Preserve the right to a speedy trial.
4. Establish standard caseload for misdemeanor attorneys.
5. Establish standard caseload for felony attorneys.
6. Establish standard caseload for juvenile attorneys.
7. Establish standard caseload appellate attorneys
8. Provide equitable salaries to obtain and retain employees.

**PERFORMANCE MEASURES AND STANDARDS – LRPP EXHIBIT II**

## EXHIBIT II – PERFORMANCE MEASURES AND STANDARDS

Department: Justice Administrative Commission	Department No.: 21
Program: Justice Administrative Commission	Code: 21300000
Service/Budget Entity: Executive Direction/Support Services	Code: 21308000

*Note: Approved primary service outcomes must be listed first.*

Approved Performance Measures for FY2009-10 (Words)	Approved Prior Year Standard FY2008-09 (Numbers)	Prior Year Actual FY2008-09 (Numbers)	*Approved Standards for FY2009-10 (Numbers)	Requested FY2010-11 Standard (Numbers)
Percent of invoices processed within statutory time frames	95.00%	93.74%	95.00%	95.00%
Number of public records requests	150	189	150	150
Number of cases where registry lawyers request fees above the statutory caps	2,500	1,552	1,500	1,500
Number of cases where the court orders fees above the statutory cap	2,000	1,460	1,400	1,400
Total amount of excess fees awarded by the court per circuit	\$6,000,000	\$11,486,799	\$10,000,000	\$10,000,000
Number of budget, payroll, disbursement, revenue and financial report transactions processed	375,000	333,710	325,000	325,000
Number of court-appointed attorney and due process vendor invoices processed	65,000	63,913	65,000	65,000

\*A budget amendment has been submitted modifying measures and standards.

**EXHIBIT II – PERFORMANCE MEASURES AND STANDARDS**

Department: Justice Administrative Commission	Department No.: 21
Program: Statewide Guardian ad Litem Program	Code: 21300000
Service/Budget Entity: PGM: Stw/Guardian ad Litem	Code: 21310000

*Note: Approved primary service outcomes must be listed first.*

<b>Approved Performance Measures for FY2009-10 (Words)</b>	<b>Approved Prior Year Standard FY2008-09 (Numbers)</b>	<b>Prior Year Actual FY2008-09 (Numbers)</b>	<b>Approved Standards for FY2009-10 (Numbers)</b>	<b>Requested FY2010-11 Standard (Numbers)</b>
Average number of children represented	26,500	26,419	26,500	27,000 or 86%
Percent of cases discharged after DCF supervision is terminated	45 %	82%	45%	79%
Number of new volunteers certified as a GAL	1,464	2,316	1,464	2,375
Average number of active volunteers*	5,057	6,959	5,057	7,000
* - volunteers who are certified as Guardians ad Litem				

## EXHIBIT II – PERFORMANCE MEASURES AND STANDARDS

Department: Justice Administration	Department No.: 21
------------------------------------	--------------------

Program: Clerks of Court	Code: 21.35.00.00	
Service/Budget Entity: Clerks of Court Operations Corporation	Code: 21.35.02.00	

**NOTE: Approved primary service outcomes must be listed first.**

<b><u>Proposed</u> Performance Measures for FY 2009-10 (Words)</b>	<b>Approved</b> Prior Year Standards <b>FY 2008-09</b> (Numbers)	<b>Actual</b> Prior Year Standards <b>FY 2008-09</b> (Numbers)	<b><u>Proposed</u></b> Standards for <b>FY 2009-10</b> (Numbers)	<b>Requested</b> Standards for <b>FY 2010-11</b> (Numbers)
“New Measure” - # of Clerk Budget Requests analyzed for inclusion in the Clerks’ Legislative Budget Request plus # of final appropriation allocations to Florida’s Clerks of the Court. (output measure # 1)	N/A	N/A		
“New Measure” - # of CCOC budget analyses and related reports produced plus Trust Fund and Clerk budget related issues worked and resolved. (output measure # 2)	N/A	N/A		
“New Measure” - # of education and training programs, workshops, events and other opportunities provided to Clerks’ offices during the budget year. (output measure # 3)	NA	NA		
“New Measure” - % of state required budget products produced according to law and on time. (outcome measure)	NA	NA		

## EXHIBIT II – PERFORMANCE MEASURES AND STANDARDS

Department: Justice Administration	Department No.: 21
------------------------------------	--------------------

Program: State Attorney, Circuits 1 – 20	Code: 21.50.00.00
Service/Budget Entity: State Attorney, Circuits 1 – 20	Code: 21.50.00.00

**NOTE: Approved primary service outcomes must be listed first.**

Approved Performance Measures for FY 2008-09 (Words)	Approved Prior Year Standard FY 2008-09 (Numbers)	Actual Prior Year Standard FY 2008-09 (Numbers)
Percent of offenders who qualify for enhanced sentencing for whom state attorneys requested enhanced sentencing	92.00%	92.21%
Total number of dispositions	1,339,035	1,412,870
Number of dispositions by trial verdicts	14,004	13,365
Number of dispositions by pleas	727,246	765,484
Number of dispositions by non trial	157,990	239,353
Number of dispositions by otherwise	439,795	394,668
Percent of dispositions by trial verdicts	1.05%	0.95%
Percent of dispositions by pleas	54.30%	54.18%
Percent of dispositions by non trial	11.80%	16.94%
Percent of dispositions by otherwise	32.84%	27.93%
Number of substantiated Bar grievances filed annually	0	0
Number of misdemeanor criminal case referrals	1,183,597	1,096,627
Number of felony criminal case referrals	490,965	472,296
Number of juvenile criminal case referrals	197,338	166,172
Number of misdemeanor filings	792,393	778,270
Number of felony filings	219,752	213,835
Number of juvenile filings	83,616	69,069
Number of post conviction relief responses or Habeas Corpus responses	22,391	12,774
Number of sexual predator civil commitment proceedings	TBD	3,946
Number of Baker Act hearings	27,686	15,160



## EXHIBIT II – PERFORMANCE MEASURES AND STANDARDS

Department: Justice Administration	Department No.: 21
------------------------------------	--------------------

Program: State Attorney, _1 <sup>st</sup> _ Judicial Circuit	Code: 21.50.01.00
Service/Budget Entity: State Attorney, _1 <sup>st</sup> _ Judicial Circuit	Code: 21.50.01.00

**NOTE: Approved primary service outcomes must be listed first.**

Approved Performance Measures for FY 2008-09 (Words)	Approved Prior Year Standard FY 2008-09 (Numbers)	Actual Prior Year Standard FY 2008-09 (Numbers)	Approved Standards for FY 2009-10 (Numbers)	Requested Standards for FY 2010-11 (Numbers)
Percent of offenders who qualify for enhanced sentencing for whom state attorneys requested enhanced sentencing		100%		100%
Total number of dispositions		69,795		69,795
Number of dispositions by trial verdicts		679		679
Number of dispositions by pleas		36,150		36,150
Number of dispositions by non trial		4,944		4,944
Number of dispositions by otherwise		28,022		28,022
Percent of dispositions by trial verdicts		1%		1%
Percent of dispositions by pleas		52%		52%
Percent of dispositions by non trial		7%		7%
Percent of dispositions by otherwise		40%		40%
Number of substantiated Bar grievances filed annually		0		0
Number of misdemeanor criminal case referrals		30,564		30,564
Number of felony criminal case referrals		17,293		17,293
Number of juvenile criminal case referrals		6,759		6,759
Number of misdemeanor filings		21,828		21,828
Number of felony filings		11,725		11,725
Number of juvenile filings		3,510		3,510
Number of post conviction relief responses or Habeas Corpus responses		604		604
Number of sexual predator civil commitment proceedings		179		179
Number of Baker Act hearings		982		982

## EXHIBIT II – PERFORMANCE MEASURES AND STANDARDS

Department: Justice Administration	Department No.: 21
------------------------------------	--------------------

Program: State Attorney, _2 <sup>nd</sup> _ Judicial Circuit	Code: 21.50.02.00
Service/Budget Entity: State Attorney, _2 <sup>nd</sup> _ Judicial Circuit	Code: 21.50.02.00

**NOTE: Approved primary service outcomes must be listed first.**

Approved Performance Measures for FY 2008-09 (Words)	Approved Prior Year Standard FY 2008-09 (Numbers)	Actual Prior Year Standard FY 2008-09 (Numbers)	Approved Standards for FY 2009-10 (Numbers)	Requested Standards for FY 2010-11 (Numbers)
Percent of offenders who qualify for enhanced sentencing for whom state attorneys requested enhanced sentencing		N/A		N/A
Total number of dispositions		33,825		34,000
Number of dispositions by trial verdicts		427		425
Number of dispositions by pleas		14,598		15,000
Number of dispositions by non trial		1,540		1,400
Number of dispositions by otherwise		17,260		17,175
Percent of dispositions by trial verdicts		1.26%		1.32%
Percent of dispositions by pleas		43.20%		44.10%
Percent of dispositions by non trial		4.55%		4.10%
Percent of dispositions by otherwise		51.00%		50.50%
Number of substantiated Bar grievances filed annually		0		0
Number of misdemeanor criminal case referrals		21,477		22,000
Number of felony criminal case referrals		7,954		8,200
Number of juvenile criminal case referrals		2,371		2,300
Number of misdemeanor filings		16,183		16,000
Number of felony filings		4,831		5,000
Number of juvenile filings		1,672		1,700
Number of post conviction relief responses or Habeas Corpus responses		37		40
Number of sexual predator civil commitment proceedings		113		95
Number of Baker Act hearings		32		50

## EXHIBIT II – PERFORMANCE MEASURES AND STANDARDS

Department: Justice Administration	Department No.: 21
------------------------------------	--------------------

Program: State Attorney, _3 <sup>rd</sup> _ Judicial Circuit	Code: 21.50.03.00
Service/Budget Entity: State Attorney, _3 <sup>rd</sup> _ Judicial Circuit	Code: 21.50.03.00

**NOTE: Approved primary service outcomes must be listed first.**

Approved Performance Measures for FY 2008-09 (Words)	Approved Prior Year Standard FY 2008-09 (Numbers)	Actual Prior Year Standard FY 2008-09 (Numbers)	Approved Standards for FY 2009-10 (Numbers)	Requested Standards for FY 2010-11 (Numbers)
Percent of offenders who qualify for enhanced sentencing for whom state attorneys requested enhanced sentencing		100%		100%
Total number of dispositions		15,633		15,633
Number of dispositions by trial verdicts		153		153
Number of dispositions by pleas		7,853		7,853
Number of dispositions by non trial		1,629		1,629
Number of dispositions by otherwise		5,998		5,998
Percent of dispositions by trial verdicts		3.11%		3.11%
Percent of dispositions by pleas		58%		58%
Percent of dispositions by non trial		15%		15%
Percent of dispositions by otherwise		23.89%		23.89%
Number of substantiated Bar grievances filed annually		0		0
Number of misdemeanor criminal case referrals		9,803		9,803
Number of felony criminal case referrals		3,552		3,552
Number of juvenile criminal case referrals		179		179
Number of misdemeanor filings		7,815		7,815
Number of felony filings		2,530		2,530
Number of juvenile filings		60		60
Number of post conviction relief responses or Habeas Corpus responses		17		17
Number of sexual predator civil commitment proceedings		0		0
Number of Baker Act hearings		76		76

## EXHIBIT II – PERFORMANCE MEASURES AND STANDARDS

Department: Justice Administration	Department No.: 21
------------------------------------	--------------------

Program: State Attorney, _4 <sup>th</sup> _ Judicial Circuit	Code: 21.50.04.00
Service/Budget Entity: State Attorney, _4 <sup>th</sup> _ Judicial Circuit	Code: 21.50.04.00

**NOTE: Approved primary service outcomes must be listed first.**

Approved Performance Measures for FY 2008-09 (Words)	Approved Prior Year Standard FY 2008-09 (Numbers)	Actual Prior Year Standard FY 2008-09 (Numbers)	Approved Standards for FY 2009-10 (Numbers)	Requested Standards for FY 2010-11 (Numbers)
Percent of offenders who qualify for enhanced sentencing for whom state attorneys requested enhanced sentencing		78.62%		78.62%
Total number of dispositions		116,746		116,746
Number of dispositions by trial verdicts		451		451
Number of dispositions by pleas		61,254		61,254
Number of dispositions by non trial		21,249		21,249
Number of dispositions by otherwise		33,792		33,792
Percent of dispositions by trial verdicts		.04%		.04%
Percent of dispositions by pleas		52%		52%
Percent of dispositions by non trial		18%		18%
Percent of dispositions by otherwise		33%		33%
Number of substantiated Bar grievances filed annually		0		0
Number of misdemeanor criminal case referrals		65,590		65,590
Number of felony criminal case referrals		21,790		21,790
Number of juvenile criminal case referrals		8,438		8,438
Number of misdemeanor filings		55,116		55,116
Number of felony filings		13,728		13,728
Number of juvenile filings		4,653		4,653
Number of post conviction relief responses or Habeas Corpus responses		1,897		1,897
Number of sexual predator civil commitment proceedings		259		259
Number of Baker Act hearings		16		16

## EXHIBIT II – PERFORMANCE MEASURES AND STANDARDS

Department: Justice Administration	Department No.: 21
------------------------------------	--------------------

Program: State Attorney, _5 <sup>th</sup> _ Judicial Circuit	Code: 21.50.05.00
Service/Budget Entity: State Attorney, _5 <sup>th</sup> _ Judicial Circuit	Code: 21.50.05.00

**NOTE: Approved primary service outcomes must be listed first.**

Approved Performance Measures for FY 2008-09 (Words)	Approved Prior Year Standard FY 2008-09 (Numbers)	Actual Prior Year Standard FY 2008-09 (Numbers)	Approved Standards for FY 2009-10 (Numbers)	Requested Standards for FY 2010-11 (Numbers)
Percent of offenders who qualify for enhanced sentencing for whom state attorneys requested enhanced sentencing		70.50%		70.50%
Total number of dispositions		60,566		60,566
Number of dispositions by trial verdicts		341		341
Number of dispositions by pleas		34,356		34,356
Number of dispositions by non trial		2,412		2,412
Number of dispositions by otherwise		23,457		23,457
Percent of dispositions by trial verdicts		.56%		.56%
Percent of dispositions by pleas		56.73%		56.73%
Percent of dispositions by non trial		3.98%		3.98%
Percent of dispositions by otherwise		38.73%		38.73%
Number of substantiated Bar grievances filed annually		0		0
Number of misdemeanor criminal case referrals		37,438		37,438
Number of felony criminal case referrals		28,550		28,550
Number of juvenile criminal case referrals		6,558		6,558
Number of misdemeanor filings		17,942		17,942
Number of felony filings		11,676		11,676
Number of juvenile filings		1,839		1,839
Number of post conviction relief responses or Habeas Corpus responses		134		134
Number of sexual predator civil commitment proceedings		286		286
Number of Baker Act hearings		11		11

## EXHIBIT II – PERFORMANCE MEASURES AND STANDARDS

Department: Justice Administration	Department No.: 21
------------------------------------	--------------------

Program: State Attorney, _6 <sup>th</sup> _ Judicial Circuit	Code: 21.50.06.00
Service/Budget Entity: State Attorney, _6 <sup>th</sup> _ Judicial Circuit	Code: 21.50.06.00

**NOTE: Approved primary service outcomes must be listed first.**

Approved Performance Measures for FY 2008-09 (Words)	Approved Prior Year Standard FY 2008-09 (Numbers)	Actual Prior Year Standard FY 2008-09 (Numbers)	Approved Standards for FY 2009-10 (Numbers)	Requested Standards for FY 2010-11 (Numbers)
Percent of offenders who qualify for enhanced sentencing for whom state attorneys requested enhanced sentencing		100%		100%
Total number of dispositions		117,972		118,000
Number of dispositions by trial verdicts		930		900
Number of dispositions by pleas		83,295		83,000
Number of dispositions by non trial		4,318		4,300
Number of dispositions by otherwise		29,429		29,000
Percent of dispositions by trial verdicts		0.8%		0.7%
Percent of dispositions by pleas		70.6%		71%
Percent of dispositions by non trial		3.7%		3.6%
Percent of dispositions by otherwise		24.9%		24.7%
Number of substantiated Bar grievances filed annually		N/A		N/A
Number of misdemeanor criminal case referrals		72,464		73,000
Number of felony criminal case referrals		38,419		39,000
Number of juvenile criminal case referrals		11,476		12,000
Number of misdemeanor filings		50,318		52,000
Number of felony filings		17,594		18,000
Number of juvenile filings		4,181		4,500
Number of post conviction relief responses or Habeas Corpus responses		77		80
Number of sexual predator civil commitment proceedings		290		300
Number of Baker Act hearings		1,436		1,500

## EXHIBIT II – PERFORMANCE MEASURES AND STANDARDS

Department: Justice Administration	Department No.: 21
------------------------------------	--------------------

Program: State Attorney, _7 <sup>th</sup> _ Judicial Circuit	Code: 21.50.07.00
Service/Budget Entity: State Attorney, _7 <sup>th</sup> _ Judicial Circuit	Code: 21.50.07.00

**NOTE: Approved primary service outcomes must be listed first.**

Approved Performance Measures for FY 2008-09 (Words)	Approved Prior Year Standard FY 2008-09 (Numbers)	Actual Prior Year Standard FY 2008-09 (Numbers)	Approved Standards for FY 2009-10 (Numbers)	Requested Standards for FY 2010-11 (Numbers)
Percent of offenders who qualify for enhanced sentencing for whom state attorneys requested enhanced sentencing		60%		90%
Total number of dispositions		105,246		108,000
Number of dispositions by trial verdicts		962		1,000
Number of dispositions by pleas		44,217		57,000
Number of dispositions by non trial		18,757		15,000
Number of dispositions by otherwise		41,310		35,000
Percent of dispositions by trial verdicts		1%		1%
Percent of dispositions by pleas		42%		53%
Percent of dispositions by non trial		18%		14%
Percent of dispositions by otherwise		39%		32%
Number of substantiated Bar grievances filed annually		0		0
Number of misdemeanor criminal case referrals		77,895		79,000
Number of felony criminal case referrals		20,641		21,500
Number of juvenile criminal case referrals		7,403		7,900
Number of misdemeanor filings		33,760		37,000
Number of felony filings		9,268		9,600
Number of juvenile filings		2,796		3,000
Number of post conviction relief responses or Habeas Corpus responses		331		350
Number of sexual predator civil commitment proceedings		171		190
Number of Baker Act hearings		335		350

## EXHIBIT II – PERFORMANCE MEASURES AND STANDARDS

Department: Justice Administration	Department No.: 21
------------------------------------	--------------------

Program: State Attorney, _8 <sup>th</sup> _ Judicial Circuit	Code: 21.50.08.00
Service/Budget Entity: State Attorney, _8 <sup>th</sup> _ Judicial Circuit	Code: 21.50.08.00

**NOTE: Approved primary service outcomes must be listed first.**

Approved Performance Measures for FY 2008-09 (Words)	Approved Prior Year Standard FY 2008-09 (Numbers)	Actual Prior Year Standard FY 2008-09 (Numbers)	Approved Standards for FY 2009-10 (Numbers)	Requested Standards for FY 2010-11 (Numbers)
Percent of offenders who qualify for enhanced sentencing for whom state attorneys requested enhanced sentencing		100%		100%
Total number of dispositions		35,142		34,123
Number of dispositions by trial verdicts		94		93
Number of dispositions by pleas		14,369		14,246
Number of dispositions by non trial		5,390		5,228
Number of dispositions by otherwise		15,289		14,557
Percent of dispositions by trial verdicts		.27%		.27%
Percent of dispositions by pleas		40.89%		41.75%
Percent of dispositions by non trial		15.34%		15.32%
Percent of dispositions by otherwise		43.50%		42.66%
Number of substantiated Bar grievances filed annually		0		0
Number of misdemeanor criminal case referrals		26,768		26,176
Number of felony criminal case referrals		9,803		9,650
Number of juvenile criminal case referrals		3,333		3,210
Number of misdemeanor filings		15,395		15,356
Number of felony filings		4,719		4,713
Number of juvenile filings		1,396		1,270
Number of post conviction relief responses or Habeas Corpus responses		393		378
Number of sexual predator civil commitment proceedings		102		86
Number of Baker Act hearings		1,597		1,738



## EXHIBIT II – PERFORMANCE MEASURES AND STANDARDS

Department: Justice Administration	Department No.: 21
------------------------------------	--------------------

Program: State Attorney, _9 <sup>th</sup> _ Judicial Circuit	Code: 21.50.09.00
Service/Budget Entity: State Attorney, _9 <sup>th</sup> _ Judicial Circuit	Code: 21.50.09.00

**NOTE: Approved primary service outcomes must be listed first.**

Approved Performance Measures for FY 2008-09 (Words)	Approved Prior Year Standard FY 2008-09 (Numbers)	Actual Prior Year Standard FY 2008-09 (Numbers)	Approved Standards for FY 2009-10 (Numbers)	Requested Standards for FY 2010-11 (Numbers)
Percent of offenders who qualify for enhanced sentencing for whom state attorneys requested enhanced sentencing		100%		100%
Total number of dispositions		88,900		91,567
Number of dispositions by trial verdicts		1,252		1,290
Number of dispositions by pleas		44,228		45,555
Number of dispositions by non trial		10,535		10,851
Number of dispositions by otherwise		32,885		33,872
Percent of dispositions by trial verdicts		1.41%		1.45%
Percent of dispositions by pleas		49.75%		51.24%
Percent of dispositions by non trial		11.85%		12.21%
Percent of dispositions by otherwise		36.99%		38.10%
Number of substantiated Bar grievances filed annually		0		0
Number of misdemeanor criminal case referrals		53,341		54,941
Number of felony criminal case referrals		36,126		37,210
Number of juvenile criminal case referrals		14,404		14,836
Number of misdemeanor filings		34,709		35,750
Number of felony filings		16,276		16,764
Number of juvenile filings		6,368		6,559
Number of post conviction relief responses or Habeas Corpus responses		270		278
Number of sexual predator civil commitment proceedings		173		178
Number of Baker Act hearings		979		1,008

## EXHIBIT II – PERFORMANCE MEASURES AND STANDARDS

Department: Justice Administration	Department No.: 21
------------------------------------	--------------------

Program: State Attorney, _10 <sup>th</sup> _ Judicial Circuit	Code: 21.50.10.00
Service/Budget Entity: State Attorney, _10 <sup>th</sup> _ Judicial Circuit	Code: 21.50.10.00

**NOTE: Approved primary service outcomes must be listed first.**

Approved Performance Measures for FY 2008-09 (Words)	Approved Prior Year Standard FY 2008-09 (Numbers)	Actual Prior Year Standard FY 2008-09 (Numbers)	Approved Standards for FY 2009-10 (Numbers)	Requested Standards for FY 2010-11 (Numbers)
Percent of offenders who qualify for enhanced sentencing for whom state attorneys requested enhanced sentencing		100%		100%
Total number of dispositions		52,053		52,000
Number of dispositions by trial verdicts		532		500
Number of dispositions by pleas		33,391		33,400
Number of dispositions by non trial		3,891		3,900
Number of dispositions by otherwise		14,239		14,200
Percent of dispositions by trial verdicts		1%		1%
Percent of dispositions by pleas		64.1%		64.2%
Percent of dispositions by non trial		7.5%		7.5%
Percent of dispositions by otherwise		27.4%		27.3%
Number of substantiated Bar grievances filed annually		0		0
Number of misdemeanor criminal case referrals		40,525		40,500
Number of felony criminal case referrals		13,014		13,000
Number of juvenile criminal case referrals		6,107		6,100
Number of misdemeanor filings		26,433		26,000
Number of felony filings		10,043		10,000
Number of juvenile filings		7,612		7,600
Number of post conviction relief responses or Habeas Corpus responses		214		200
Number of sexual predator civil commitment proceedings		436		300
Number of Baker Act hearings		1,825		1,800

## EXHIBIT II – PERFORMANCE MEASURES AND STANDARDS

Department: Justice Administration	Department No.: 21
------------------------------------	--------------------

Program: State Attorney, _11 <sup>th</sup> _ Judicial Circuit	Code: 21.50.11.00
Service/Budget Entity: State Attorney, _11 <sup>th</sup> _ Judicial Circuit	Code: 21.50.11.00

**NOTE: Approved primary service outcomes must be listed first.**

Approved Performance Measures for FY 2008-09 (Words)	Approved Prior Year Standard FY 2008-09 (Numbers)	Actual Prior Year Standard FY 2008-09 (Numbers)	Approved Standards for FY 2009-10 (Numbers)	Requested Standards for FY 2010-11 (Numbers)
Percent of offenders who qualify for enhanced sentencing for whom state attorneys requested enhanced sentencing		100%		100%
Total number of dispositions		215,530		226,307
Number of dispositions by trial verdicts		2,315		2,431
Number of dispositions by pleas		70,944		74,491
Number of dispositions by non trial		105,543		110,820
Number of dispositions by otherwise		36,728		38,564
Percent of dispositions by trial verdicts		1.1%		1.1%
Percent of dispositions by pleas		32.9%		32.9%
Percent of dispositions by non trial		49.0%		49.0%
Percent of dispositions by otherwise		17.0%		17.0%
Number of substantiated Bar grievances filed annually		0		0
Number of misdemeanor criminal case referrals		162,087		170,191
Number of felony criminal case referrals		77,362		81,230
Number of juvenile criminal case referrals		21,068		22,121
Number of misdemeanor filings		162,087		170,191
Number of felony filings		28,092		29,430
Number of juvenile filings		5,674		5,958
Number of post conviction relief responses or Habeas Corpus responses		3,127		3,283
Number of sexual predator civil commitment proceedings		869		912
Number of Baker Act hearings		Not Reported		

## EXHIBIT II – PERFORMANCE MEASURES AND STANDARDS

Department: Justice Administration	Department No.: 21
------------------------------------	--------------------

Program: State Attorney, 12 <sup>th</sup> Judicial Circuit	Code: 21.50.12.00	
Service/Budget Entity: State Attorney, 12 <sup>th</sup> Judicial Circuit	Code: 21.50.12.00	

**NOTE: Approved primary service outcomes must be listed first.**

Approved Performance Measures for FY 2008-09 (Words)	Approved Prior Year Standard FY 2008-09 (Numbers)	Actual Prior Year Standard FY 2008-09 (Numbers)	Approved Standards for FY 2009-10 (Numbers)	Requested Standards for FY 2010-11 (Numbers)
Percent of offenders who qualify for enhanced sentencing for whom state attorneys requested enhanced sentencing		100%		100%
Total number of dispositions		43,386		43,820
Number of dispositions by trial verdicts		415		419
Number of dispositions by pleas		24,937		25,186
Number of dispositions by non trial		1,595		1,595
Number of dispositions by otherwise		16,439		16,604
Percent of dispositions by trial verdicts		1%		1%
Percent of dispositions by pleas		57.4%		57.4%
Percent of dispositions by non trial		3.7%		3.7%
Percent of dispositions by otherwise		37.9%		37.9%
Number of substantiated Bar grievances filed annually		0		0
Number of misdemeanor criminal case referrals		30,184		30,486
Number of felony criminal case referrals		15,033		15,183
Number of juvenile criminal case referrals		4,555		4,601
Number of misdemeanor filings		17,958		18,138
Number of felony filings		7,403		7,477
Number of juvenile filings		1,976		1,996
Number of post conviction relief responses or Habeas Corpus responses		76		77
Number of sexual predator civil commitment proceedings		91		92
Number of Baker Act hearings		267		270

## EXHIBIT II – PERFORMANCE MEASURES AND STANDARDS

Department: Justice Administration	Department No.: 21
------------------------------------	--------------------

Program: State Attorney, 13 <sup>th</sup> Judicial Circuit	Code: 21.50.13.00
Service/Budget Entity: State Attorney, 13 <sup>th</sup> Judicial Circuit	Code: 21.50.13.00

**NOTE: Approved primary service outcomes must be listed first.**

Approved Performance Measures for FY 2008-09 (Words)	Approved Prior Year Standard FY 2008-09 (Numbers)	Actual Prior Year Standard FY 2008-09 (Numbers)	Approved Standards for FY 2009-10 (Numbers)	Requested Standards for FY 2010-11 (Numbers)
Percent of offenders who qualify for enhanced sentencing for whom state attorneys requested enhanced sentencing		76.51%		92.00%
Total number of dispositions		78,433		79,217
Number of dispositions by trial verdicts		1,214		1,226
Number of dispositions by pleas		45,823		46,281
Number of dispositions by non trial		11,267		11,380
Number of dispositions by otherwise		20,129		20,330
Percent of dispositions by trial verdicts		1.55%		1.55%
Percent of dispositions by pleas		58.42%		58.42%
Percent of dispositions by non trial		14.37%		14.37%
Percent of dispositions by otherwise		25.66%		25.66%
Number of substantiated Bar grievances filed annually		0		0
Number of misdemeanor criminal case referrals		55,754		56,312
Number of felony criminal case referrals		36,351		36,715
Number of juvenile criminal case referrals		10,907		11,016
Number of misdemeanor filings		46,914		47,383
Number of felony filings		15,636		15,792
Number of juvenile filings		4,149		4,190
Number of post conviction relief responses or Habeas Corpus responses		953		963
Number of sexual predator civil commitment proceedings		320		323
Number of Baker Act hearings		2,176		2,198

## EXHIBIT II – PERFORMANCE MEASURES AND STANDARDS

Department: Justice Administration	Department No.: 21
------------------------------------	--------------------

Program: State Attorney, 14 <sup>th</sup> Judicial Circuit	Code: 21.50.14.00	
Service/Budget Entity: State Attorney, 14 <sup>th</sup> Judicial Circuit	Code: 21.50.14.00	

**NOTE: Approved primary service outcomes must be listed first.**

Approved Performance Measures for FY 2008-09 (Words)	Approved Prior Year Standard FY 2008-09 (Numbers)	Actual Prior Year Standard FY 2008-09 (Numbers)	Approved Standards for FY 2009-10 (Numbers)	Requested Standards for FY 2010-11 (Numbers)
Percent of offenders who qualify for enhanced sentencing for whom state attorneys requested enhanced sentencing		82.50%		92%
Total number of dispositions		30,429		30,000
Number of dispositions by trial verdicts		143		300
Number of dispositions by pleas		18,821		18,900
Number of dispositions by non trial		2,358		1,500
Number of dispositions by otherwise		9,107		9,300
Percent of dispositions by trial verdicts		.47%		1.2%
Percent of dispositions by pleas		61.85%		63%
Percent of dispositions by non trial		7.75%		5%
Percent of dispositions by otherwise		29.93%		30.8%
Number of substantiated Bar grievances filed annually		0		0
Number of misdemeanor criminal case referrals		27,040		29,000
Number of felony criminal case referrals		9,809		9,500
Number of juvenile criminal case referrals		2,329		2,800
Number of misdemeanor filings		13,000		12,500
Number of felony filings		3,985		4,600
Number of juvenile filings		1,082		1,500
Number of post conviction relief responses or Habeas Corpus responses		39		350
Number of sexual predator civil commitment proceedings		12		15
Number of Baker Act hearings		326		250

## EXHIBIT II – PERFORMANCE MEASURES AND STANDARDS

Department: Justice Administration	Department No.: 21
------------------------------------	--------------------

Program: State Attorney, 15 <sup>th</sup> Judicial Circuit	Code: 21.50.15.00
Service/Budget Entity: State Attorney, 15 <sup>th</sup> Judicial Circuit	Code: 21.50.15.00

**NOTE: Approved primary service outcomes must be listed first.**

Approved Performance Measures for FY 2008-09 (Words)	Approved Prior Year Standard FY 2008-09 (Numbers)	Actual Prior Year Standard FY 2008-09 (Numbers)	Approved Standards for FY 2009-10 (Numbers)	Requested Standards for FY 2010-11 (Numbers)
Percent of offenders who qualify for enhanced sentencing for whom state attorneys requested enhanced sentencing		100%		100%
Total number of dispositions		74,519		76,000
Number of dispositions by trial verdicts		901		919
Number of dispositions by pleas		43,788		44,654
Number of dispositions by non trial		12,142		12,385
Number of dispositions by otherwise		17,688		18,042
Percent of dispositions by trial verdicts		1.21%		1.2%
Percent of dispositions by pleas		58.76%		58.8%
Percent of dispositions by non trial		16.29%		16.3%
Percent of dispositions by otherwise		23.74%		23.7%
Number of substantiated Bar grievances filed annually		0		0
Number of misdemeanor criminal case referrals		106,049		108,170
Number of felony criminal case referrals		24,725		25,220
Number of juvenile criminal case referrals		10,697		10,911
Number of misdemeanor filings		90,095		91,897
Number of felony filings		12,489		12,739
Number of juvenile filings		3,817		3,893
Number of post conviction relief responses or Habeas Corpus responses		986		1,006
Number of sexual predator civil commitment proceedings		15		16
Number of Baker Act hearings		616		628

## EXHIBIT II – PERFORMANCE MEASURES AND STANDARDS

Department: Justice Administration	Department No.: 21
------------------------------------	--------------------

Program: State Attorney, 16 <sup>th</sup> Judicial Circuit	Code: 21.50.16.00	
Service/Budget Entity: State Attorney, 16 <sup>th</sup> Judicial Circuit	Code: 21.50.16.00	

**NOTE: Approved primary service outcomes must be listed first.**

Approved Performance Measures for FY 2008-09 (Words)	Approved Prior Year Standard FY 2008-09 (Numbers)	Actual Prior Year Standard FY 2008-09 (Numbers)	Approved Standards for FY 2009-10 (Numbers)	Requested Standards for FY 2010-11 (Numbers)
Percent of offenders who qualify for enhanced sentencing for whom state attorneys requested enhanced sentencing		64%		64%
Total number of dispositions		7,071		7,071
Number of dispositions by trial verdicts		58		58
Number of dispositions by pleas		4,626		4,626
Number of dispositions by non trial		1,490		1,490
Number of dispositions by otherwise		897		897
Percent of dispositions by trial verdicts		1%		1%
Percent of dispositions by pleas		65%		65%
Percent of dispositions by non trial		21%		21%
Percent of dispositions by otherwise		13%		13%
Number of substantiated Bar grievances filed annually		0		0
Number of misdemeanor criminal case referrals		5,330		5,330
Number of felony criminal case referrals		2,005		2,005
Number of juvenile criminal case referrals		367		367
Number of misdemeanor filings		4,434		4,434
Number of felony filings		1,200		1,200
Number of juvenile filings		251		251
Number of post conviction relief responses or Habeas Corpus responses		0		0
Number of sexual predator civil commitment proceedings		4		4
Number of Baker Act hearings		19		19



## EXHIBIT II – PERFORMANCE MEASURES AND STANDARDS

Department: Justice Administration	Department No.: 21
------------------------------------	--------------------

Program: State Attorney, 17 <sup>th</sup> Judicial Circuit	Code: 21.50.17.00	
Service/Budget Entity: State Attorney, 17 <sup>th</sup> Judicial Circuit	Code: 21.50.17.00	

**NOTE: Approved primary service outcomes must be listed first.**

Approved Performance Measures for FY 2008-09 (Words)	Approved Prior Year Standard <b>FY 2008-09</b> (Numbers)	Actual Prior Year Standard <b>FY 2008-09</b> (Numbers)	Approved Standards for <b>FY 2009-10</b> (Numbers)	Requested Standards for <b>FY 2010-11</b> (Numbers)
Percent of offenders who qualify for enhanced sentencing for whom state attorneys requested enhanced sentencing		100%		100%
Total number of dispositions		100,906		100,906
Number of dispositions by trial verdicts		896		896
Number of dispositions by pleas		76,732		76,732
Number of dispositions by non trial		8,122		8,122
Number of dispositions by otherwise		15,156		15,156
Percent of dispositions by trial verdicts		.89%		.89%
Percent of dispositions by pleas		76.04%		76.04%
Percent of dispositions by non trial		8.05%		8.05%
Percent of dispositions by otherwise		15.02%		15.02%
Number of substantiated Bar grievances filed annually		0		0
Number of misdemeanor criminal case referrals		110,092		110,092
Number of felony criminal case referrals		46,682		46,682
Number of juvenile criminal case referrals		15,407		15,407
Number of misdemeanor filings		75,043		75,043
Number of felony filings		17,556		17,556
Number of juvenile filings		7,543		7,543
Number of post conviction relief responses or Habeas Corpus responses		939		939
Number of sexual predator civil commitment proceedings		292		292
Number of Baker Act hearings		1,699		1,699

## EXHIBIT II – PERFORMANCE MEASURES AND STANDARDS

Department: Justice Administration	Department No.: 21
------------------------------------	--------------------

Program: State Attorney, 18 <sup>th</sup> Judicial Circuit	Code: 21.50.18.00
Service/Budget Entity: State Attorney, 18 <sup>th</sup> Judicial Circuit	Code: 21.50.18.00

**NOTE: Approved primary service outcomes must be listed first.**

Approved Performance Measures for FY 2008-09 (Words)	Approved Prior Year Standard FY 2008-09 (Numbers)	Actual Prior Year Standard FY 2008-09 (Numbers)	Approved Standards for FY 2009-10 (Numbers)	Requested Standards for FY 2010-11 (Numbers)
Percent of offenders who qualify for enhanced sentencing for whom state attorneys requested enhanced sentencing		100%		100%
Total number of dispositions		54,934		56,000
Number of dispositions by trial verdicts		486		1,000
Number of dispositions by pleas		32,780		33,000
Number of dispositions by non trial		4,762		5,000
Number of dispositions by otherwise		16,906		17,000
Percent of dispositions by trial verdicts		.88%		1.79%
Percent of dispositions by pleas		59.67%		58.93%
Percent of dispositions by non trial		8.67%		8.93%
Percent of dispositions by otherwise		30.78%		30.35%
Number of substantiated Bar grievances filed annually		0		0
Number of misdemeanor criminal case referrals		43,903		44,000
Number of felony criminal case referrals		19,703		19,800
Number of juvenile criminal case referrals		7,955		28,000
Number of misdemeanor filings		27,943		28,000
Number of felony filings		8,589		8,600
Number of juvenile filings		3,159		3,200
Number of post conviction relief responses or Habeas Corpus responses		972		1,000
Number of sexual predator civil commitment proceedings		61		75
Number of Baker Act hearings		512		600

## EXHIBIT II – PERFORMANCE MEASURES AND STANDARDS

Department: Justice Administration	Department No.: 21
------------------------------------	--------------------

Program: State Attorney, 19 <sup>th</sup> Judicial Circuit	Code: 21.50.19.00
Service/Budget Entity: State Attorney, 19 <sup>th</sup> Judicial Circuit	Code: 21.50.19.00

**NOTE: Approved primary service outcomes must be listed first.**

Approved Performance Measures for FY 2008-09 (Words)	Approved Prior Year Standard FY 2008-09 (Numbers)	Actual Prior Year Standard FY 2008-09 (Numbers)	Approved Standards for FY 2009-10 (Numbers)	Requested Standards for FY 2010-11 (Numbers)
Percent of offenders who qualify for enhanced sentencing for whom state attorneys requested enhanced sentencing		36.84%		38%
Total number of dispositions		31,431		33,345
Number of dispositions by trial verdicts		530		562
Number of dispositions by pleas		22,695		24,077
Number of dispositions by non trial		3,758		3,987
Number of dispositions by otherwise		4,448		4,719
Percent of dispositions by trial verdicts		2%		2%
Percent of dispositions by pleas		72%		72%
Percent of dispositions by non trial		12%		12%
Percent of dispositions by otherwise		14%		14%
Number of substantiated Bar grievances filed annually		0		0
Number of misdemeanor criminal case referrals		23,561		24,996
Number of felony criminal case referrals		11,052		11,725
Number of juvenile criminal case referrals		4,783		5,074
Number of misdemeanor filings		12,350		13,102
Number of felony filings		5,415		5,577
Number of juvenile filings		1,780		1,888
Number of post conviction relief responses or Habeas Corpus responses		368		413
Number of sexual predator civil commitment proceedings		146		164
Number of Baker Act hearings		1,080		1,213

## EXHIBIT II – PERFORMANCE MEASURES AND STANDARDS

Department: Justice Administration	Department No.: 21
------------------------------------	--------------------

Program: State Attorney, 20 <sup>th</sup> Judicial Circuit	Code: 21.50.20.00	
Service/Budget Entity: State Attorney, 20 <sup>th</sup> Judicial Circuit	Code: 21.50.20.00	

**NOTE: Approved primary service outcomes must be listed first.**

Approved Performance Measures for FY 2008-09 (Words)	Approved Prior Year Standard FY 2008-09 (Numbers)	Actual Prior Year Standard FY 2008-09 (Numbers)	Approved Standards for FY 2009-10 (Numbers)	Requested Standards for FY 2010-11 (Numbers)
Percent of offenders who qualify for enhanced sentencing for whom state attorneys requested enhanced sentencing		82.59%		82.59%
Total number of dispositions		81,363		82,177
Number of dispositions by trial verdicts		596		602
Number of dispositions by pleas		50,627		51,133
Number of dispositions by non trial		13,651		13,788
Number of dispositions by otherwise		16,489		16,654
Percent of dispositions by trial verdicts		.73%		.73%
Percent of dispositions by pleas		62.23%		62.22%
Percent of dispositions by non trial		16.78%		16.78%
Percent of dispositions by otherwise		20.26%		20.27%
Number of substantiated Bar grievances filed annually		0		0
Number of misdemeanor criminal case referrals		69,950		70,650
Number of felony criminal case referrals		19,803		20,001
Number of juvenile criminal case referrals		8,740		8,827
Number of misdemeanor filings		48,947		49,436
Number of felony filings		11,080		11,191
Number of juvenile filings		3,653		3,691
Number of post conviction relief responses or Habeas Corpus responses		1		1
Number of sexual predator civil commitment proceedings		127		128
Number of Baker Act hearings		1,176		1,188

## EXHIBIT II – PERFORMANCE MEASURES AND STANDARDS

Department: Justice Administration	Department No.: 21
------------------------------------	--------------------

Program: Public Defenders, 1 <sup>st</sup> – 20 <sup>th</sup> Circuits	Code: 21.60.XX.00	
Service/Budget Entity: Public Defenders, 1 <sup>st</sup> – 20 <sup>th</sup> Circuits	Code: 21.60.XX.00	

**NOTE: Approved primary service outcomes must be listed first.**

Approved Performance Measures for FY 2008-09 (Words)	Approved Prior Year Standards FY 2008-09 (Numbers)	Actual Prior Year Standards FY 2008-09 (Numbers)	Approved Standards for FY 2009-10 (Numbers)	Requested Standards for FY 2010-11 (Numbers)
Percent of Public Defender clients in custody contacted within 72 hours after appointment	98.80%	98%	98.80%	98.5%
Percent of felony and misdemeanor cases resolved within speedy trial rule unless dismissed	96.50%	96.23%	96.50%	96.5%
Number of substantiated Bar grievances filed annually	0	0	0	0
Number of appointed cases	835,319	834,130	835,319	875,837
Number of criminal cases closed	732,475	747,585	732,475	784,964
Number of civil cases closed	17,925	21,963	17,925	23,061
Number of cases nolle processed or dismissed	72,387	86,980	72,387	91,329
Number of pleas	384,827	379,484	384,827	398,458
Number of trials	9,987	8,542	9,987	8,969
Number of clients represented	710,052	671,487	710,052	705,061
Number of contested violation of probation hearings	13,531	7,761	13,531	8,149
Number of initial interviews for assigned cases held for initial appointment	467,946	477,640	467,946	501,522

Legislature has not changed standards since 06-07.

EXHIBIT II PERFORMANCE MEASURES AND STANDARDS – BY CIRCUIT  
FY 2008-09 – September 2009

	1 <sup>st</sup>	2 <sup>nd</sup>	3 <sup>rd</sup>	4 <sup>th</sup>	5 <sup>th</sup>	6 <sup>th</sup>	7 <sup>th</sup>	8 <sup>th</sup>	9 <sup>th</sup>	10 <sup>th</sup>	11 <sup>th</sup>	12 <sup>th</sup>	13 <sup>th</sup>	14 <sup>th</sup>	15 <sup>th</sup>	16 <sup>th</sup>	17 <sup>th</sup>	18 <sup>th</sup>	19 <sup>th</sup>	20 <sup>th</sup>	TOTAL
# CLIENTS	28,851	16,999	7,729	43,378	27,525	81,447	31,680	17,200	52,778	28,223	95,692	14,921	14,761	15,921	41,221	4,924	51,618	30,963	22,146	43,510	671,487
SPEEDY TRIAL CALCULATION: <u>TOTAL CASES CLOSED FOR YEAR</u>	38,685	17,802	8,763	47,751	33,219	80,984	37,747	18,883	49,382	34,343	94,083	15,704	70,494	18,395	49,727	5,249	48,372	34,918	25,375	37,739	767,615
SPEEDY TRIAL CALCULATION: <u>TOTAL CASES CLOSED WITHIN SPEEDY TRIAL RULE</u>	38,493	17,802	8,758	47,750	33,219	80,984	37,747	18,862	33,070	29,143	94,076	10,751	70,469	18,388	49,727	5,240	48,372	32,629	25,377	37,739	738,596
SPEEDY TRIAL CALCULATION: <u>% CASES CLOSED WITHIN SPEEDY TRIAL RULE</u>	99.50%	100.00%	99.94%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	99.89%	66.97%	84.86%	99.99%	68.46%	99.96%	99.96%	100.00%	99.83%	100.00%	93.44%	100.01%	100.00%	96.22%
# CONTESTED VOP/VOCC HEARINGS	159	110	145	356	423	90	35	107	3,098	386	459	112	572	20	36	2	523	1,027	30	71	7,761
72 HOUR INITIAL CONTACT CALCULATION: <u>TOTAL NUMBER OF INCARCERATED CLIENTS TO BE INTERVIEWED</u>	11,124	5,172	2,229	6,744	16,316	72,260	25,424	10,114	30,277	17,537	95,692	10,836	36,561	11,090	43,312	4,548	38,780	10,253	11,747	27,352	487,368
72 HOUR INITIAL CONTACT CALCULATION: <u>TOTAL NUMBER OF INITIAL CONTACTS COMPLETED WITHIN 72 HOURS</u>	11,043	4,444	2,229	3,382	15,857	72,260	25,424	10,114	30,277	15,545	95,692	10,360	36,561	11,090	43,312	4,548	38,780	8,385	10,985	27,352	477,640
72 HOUR INITIAL CONTACT CALCULATION: <u>% OF INITIAL CONTACTS W/ INCARCERATED CLIENTS COMPLETED WITHIN 72 HOURS</u>	99.27%	85.92%	100.00%	50.15%	97.19%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	88.64%	100.00%	95.61%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	81.78%	93.51%	100.00%	98.00%
# SUBSTANTIATED BAR GRIEVANCES	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
% ATTORNEY STAFF RETAINED FOR AN AVERAGE OF 3 YEARS FROM DATE OF HIRE	51.70%	66.76%	73.68%	36.24%	61.68%	56.99%	79.82%	67.65%	27.41%	70.15%	59.88%	74.71%	46.99%	75.41%	61.40%	52.94%	49.45%	55.74%	38.24%	53.85%	57.43%
ANNUAL ATTORNEY TURNOVER RATE	26.98%	21.01%	18.18%	46.00%	24.02%	12.75%	12.84%	26.47%	25.43%	16.30%	18.27%	12.93%	26.07%	20.17%	15.47%	12.50%	15.26%	25.76%	25.00%	24.83%	20.40%
NUMBER OF CASES INVESTIGATED	39,272	21,188	9,140	48,529	33,635	81,447	37,273	22,670	65,986	35,882	102,367	20,308	69,758	21,168	48,117	5,590	61,469	34,706	25,472	50,168	834,145
NUMBER OF APPOINTED & RE-OPENED CASES	39,272	21,188	9,140	48,529	33,635	81,447	37,273	22,670	65,986	35,882	102,367	20,308	69,758	21,168	48,117	5,590	61,469	34,706	25,472	50,168	834,145
NUMBER OF CRIMINAL CASES CLOSED	37,830	14,941	8,730	47,130	32,104	79,265	36,761	18,881	48,565	33,458	90,976	14,762	67,871	18,239	48,916	5,238	46,672	34,373	24,266	36,669	745,647
NUMBER OF CIVIL CASES CLOSED	855	2,861	33	621	1,115	1,719	986	2	817	885	3,107	942	2,623	156	811	11	1,700	545	1,109	1,070	21,968
NUMBER OF PLEAS	25,326	10,621	5,000	21,333	20,039	35,062	18,949	7,637	26,810	14,245	37,846	8,108	24,504	13,331	28,079	2,678	23,454	20,984	14,927	18,596	377,529
NUMBER OF TRIALS	370	464	136	283	155	859	175	98	812	827	1,104	190	1,029	43	571	20	434	454	252	266	8,542
NUMBER OF CASES NOLLE PROSSED OR DISMISSED	3,160	2,939	595	5,448	1,886	2,543	3,026	2,058	14,627	3,230	17,216	939	5,774	735	7,371	460	6,600	3,085	1,921	3,373	86,986
NUMBER OF CONFLICT HEARINGS	2,335	2,256	436	2,211	1,818	2,445	1,219	2,398	1,922	2,609	4,553	1,138	1,026	1,104	2,026	132	3,269	1,129	794	2,723	37,543

## EXHIBIT II – PERFORMANCE MEASURES AND STANDARDS

Department: Justice Administration	Department No.: 21
------------------------------------	--------------------

Program: Public Defender Appellate, 2 <sup>nd</sup> , 7 <sup>th</sup> , 10 <sup>th</sup> , 11 <sup>th</sup> 15 <sup>th</sup> Circuits	Code: 21.65.XX.00	
Service/Budget Entity: Public Defender Appellate 2 <sup>nd</sup> , 7 <sup>th</sup> , 10 <sup>th</sup> , 11 <sup>th</sup> , 15 <sup>th</sup> Circuits	Code: 21.65.XX. 00	

**NOTE: Approved primary service outcomes must be listed first.**

Approved Performance Measures for FY 2008-09 (Words)	Approved Prior Year Standards <b>FY 2008-09</b> (Numbers)	Actual Prior Year Standards <b>FY 2008-09</b> (Numbers)	Approved Standards for <b>FY 2009-10</b> (Numbers)	Requested Standards for <b>FY 2010-11</b> (Numbers)
Percent of appeals resolved	99%	99.44%	99%	99.99%
Number of substantiated Bar grievances filed annually	0	0	0	0
Number of appointed cases	5,339	5,375	5,339	5,643
Number of clients represented	5,461	5,533	5,461	5,810
Number of briefs filed	5,285	5,684	5,285	5,968
Number of writs filed	130	101	130	106
Number of cases closed	5,726	5,345	5,726	5,612

---

## EXHIBIT II – PERFORMANCE MEASURES AND STANDARDS

---

**Public Defender Appellate Offices  
PB2 BASELINE DATA COLLECTION FY 2008-2009 -  
9/4/2009**

**Exhibit II – Performance Measures and Standards by  
Circuit**

	2nd	7th	10th	11th	15th	Total
# CLIENTS REPRESENTED	1,125	1,116	1,785	499	1,008	5,533
# CASES CLOSED	1,266	1,121	1,497	542	919	5,345
# BRIEFS FILED	1,224	1,142	1,707	446	1,165	5,684
# WRITS FILED	14	10	23	44	10	101
# SUBSTANTIATED BAR GRIEVANCES FILED ANNUALLY	0	0	0	0	0	0
% ATTORNEY STAFF RETAINED FOR AN AVERAGE OF 3 YEARS FROM DATE OF HIRE *	90.00%	90.78%	95.81%	73.33%	92.00%	87.89%
ANNUAL ATTORNEY TURNOVER RATES *	3.00%	4.72%	4.18%	33.00%	7.55%	8.74%

**Notes / Explanations:   \*\*"   Indicates employee data to be supplied by JAC through COPES.**



## EXHIBIT II – PERFORMANCE MEASURES AND STANDARDS

Department: Justice Administration Department No.: 21	
Program: Capital Collateral Regional Counsel	Code: 21.70.00.00
Service/Budget Entity: CCRC, <b>Middle &amp; Southern Regions Aggregate</b>	Code: 21.70.00.00

*NOTE: Approved primary service outcomes must be listed first.*

Approved Performance Measures for FY 2008-09 (Words)	Approved Prior Year Standards FY 2008-09 (Numbers)	Prior Year Actual FY 2008-09 (Numbers)
Percent of cases in which post-conviction motion, post-conviction appeal, federal habeas corpus motion or federal appeal is timely filed, without extension	90%	97%
Number of substantiated Bar grievances filed annually	0	0
Number of appellate actions	78	104
Number of 3.851 filings	26	31
Number of signed death warrants	5	3
Number of court decisions to release a death row inmate, grant a new trial, grant a new sentencing hearing or grant other appeals	5	13
Number of active cases	171	179
Number of evidentiary hearings	16	29
Number of federal court actions	42	90

## EXHIBIT II – PERFORMANCE MEASURES AND STANDARDS

Department: Justice Administration Department No.: 21	
Program: Capital Collateral Regional Counsel	Code: 21.70.00.00
Service/Budget Entity: CCRC, <b>Middle Region</b>	Code: 21.70.20.01

**NOTE: Approved primary service outcomes must be listed first.**

Approved Performance Measures for FY 2009-10 (Words)	Approved Prior Year Standards FY 2008-09 (Numbers)	Prior Year Actual FY 2008-09 (Numbers)	Approved Standards for FY 2009-10 (Numbers)	Requested Standards for FY 2010-11 (Numbers)
Percent of cases in which post-conviction motion, post-conviction appeal, federal habeas corpus motion or federal appeal is timely filed, without extension		100%		90
Number of substantiated Bar grievances filed annually		0		0
Number of appellate actions		53		42
Number of 3.851 filings		10		10
Number of signed death warrants		2		3
Number of court decisions to release a death row inmate, grant a new trial, grant a new sentencing hearing, or grant other appeals		3		2
Number of active cases		102		98
Number of evidentiary hearings		20		11
Number of federal court actions		42		30

## EXHIBIT II – PERFORMANCE MEASURES AND STANDARDS

Department: Justice Administration Department No.: 21	
Program: Capital Collateral Regional Counsel	Code: 21.70.00.00
Service/Budget Entity: CCRC, <b>South Region</b>	Code: 21.70.30.01

**NOTE: Approved primary service outcomes must be listed first.**

Approved Performance Measures for FY 2009-10 (Words)	Approved Prior Year Standards FY 2008-09 (Numbers)	Prior Year Actual FY 2008-09 (Numbers)	Approved Standards for FY 2009-10 (Numbers)	Requested Standards for FY 2010-11 (Numbers)
Percent of cases in which post-conviction motion, post-conviction appeal, federal habeas corpus motion or federal appeal is timely filed, without extension		93.2%		90
Number of substantiated Bar grievances filed annually		0		0
Number of appellate actions		51		42
Number of 3.851 filings		21		11
Number of signed death warrants		1		3
Number of court decisions to release a death row inmate, grant a new trial, grant a new sentencing hearing, or grant other appeals		10		2
Number of active cases		77		74
Number of evidentiary hearings		9		7
Number of federal court actions		48		30

## EXHIBIT II – PERFORMANCE MEASURES AND STANDARDS

Department: Justice Administration	Department No.: 21
------------------------------------	--------------------

Program: Criminal Conflict and Civil Regional Counsels	Code: 21.80.00.00	
Service/Budget Entity: Regional Counsels, 1 <sup>st</sup> – 5 <sup>th</sup> Regions	Code: 21.80.00.00	

*NOTE: Approved primary service outcomes must be listed first.*

<b><u>Proposed</u> Performance Measures for FY 2009-10 (Words)</b>	<b>Approved Prior Year Standards FY 2008-09 (Numbers)</b>	<b>Actual Prior Year Standards FY 2008-09 (Numbers)</b>	<b><u>Proposed</u> Standards for FY 2009-10 (Numbers)</b>	<b>Requested Standards for FY 2010-11 (Numbers)</b>
“New Measure” – Number of non-appellate cases appointed	N/A	59,265		61,681
“New Measure” – Number of non-appellate cases open	N/A	31,784		40,781
“New Measure” - Number of non-appellate cases closed	N/A	36,217		38,553
“New Measure” – Number of appellate cases appointed	N/A	615		717
“New Measure” – Number of appellate cases open	N/A	397		506
“New Measure” – Number of appellate cases closed	N/A	326		376

## EXHIBIT II – PERFORMANCE MEASURES AND STANDARDS

Department: Justice Administration	Department No.: 21
------------------------------------	--------------------

Program: Criminal Conflict and Civil Regional Counsels	Code: 21.80.00.00	
Service/Budget Entity: Regional Counsels, 1 <sup>st</sup> Region	Code: 21.80.01.00	

**NOTE: Approved primary service outcomes must be listed first.**

<b>Proposed Performance Measures for FY 2009-10 (Words)</b>	<b>Approved Prior Year Standards FY 2008-09 (Numbers)</b>	<b>Actual Prior Year Standards FY 2008-09 (Numbers)</b>	<b>Proposed Standards for FY 2009-10 (Numbers)</b>	<b>Requested Standards for FY 2010-11 (Numbers)</b>
“New Measure” – Number of non-appellate cases appointed	N/A	13,152		14,499
“New Measure” – Number of non-appellate cases open	N/A	4,414		4,866
“New Measure” - Number of non-appellate cases closed	N/A	8,606		9,488
“New Measure” – Number of appellate cases appointed	N/A	182		200
“New Measure” – Number of appellate cases open	N/A	100		110
“New Measure” – Number of appellate cases closed	N/A	82		90

## EXHIBIT II – PERFORMANCE MEASURES AND STANDARDS

Department: Justice Administration	Department No.: 21
------------------------------------	--------------------

Program: Criminal Conflict and Civil Regional Counsels	Code: 21.80.00.00	
Service/Budget Entity: Regional Counsels, 2 <sup>nd</sup> Region	Code: 21.80.02.00	

*NOTE: Approved primary service outcomes must be listed first.*

<b>Proposed Performance Measures for FY 2009-10 (Words)</b>	<b>Approved Prior Year Standards FY 2008-09 (Numbers)</b>	<b>Actual Prior Year Standards FY 2008-09 (Numbers)</b>	<b>Proposed Standards for FY 2009-10 (Numbers)</b>	<b>Requested Standards for FY 2010-11 (Numbers)</b>
“New Measure” – Number of non-appellate cases appointed	N/A	15,783		17,401
“New Measure” – Number of non-appellate cases open	N/A	7,853		8,658
“New Measure” - Number of non-appellate cases closed	N/A	11,631		12,823
“New Measure” – Number of appellate cases appointed	N/A	171		189
“New Measure” – Number of appellate cases open	N/A	117		129
“New Measure” – Number of appellate cases closed	N/A	131		145

## EXHIBIT II – PERFORMANCE MEASURES AND STANDARDS

Department: Justice Administration	Department No.: 21
------------------------------------	--------------------

Program: Criminal Conflict and Civil Regional Counsels	Code: 21.80.00.00	
Service/Budget Entity: Regional Counsels, 3 <sup>rd</sup> Region	Code: 21.80.03.00	

**NOTE: Approved primary service outcomes must be listed first.**

<b>Proposed Performance Measures for FY 2009-10 (Words)</b>	<b>Approved Prior Year Standards FY 2008-09 (Numbers)</b>	<b>Actual Prior Year Standards FY 2008-09 (Numbers)</b>	<b>Proposed Standards for FY 2009-10 (Numbers)</b>	<b>Requested Standards for FY 2010-11 (Numbers)</b>
“New Measure” – Number of non-appellate cases appointed	N/A	10,652		9,236
“New Measure” – Number of non-appellate cases open	N/A	8,028		14,932
“New Measure” - Number of non-appellate cases closed	N/A	4,332		4,016
“New Measure” – Number of appellate cases appointed	N/A	48		104
“New Measure” – Number of appellate cases open	N/A	24		101
“New Measure” – Number of appellate cases closed	N/A	13		37

## EXHIBIT II – PERFORMANCE MEASURES AND STANDARDS

Department: Justice Administration	Department No.: 21
------------------------------------	--------------------

Program: Criminal Conflict and Civil Regional Councils	Code: 21.80.00.00	
Service/Budget Entity: Regional Councils, 4 <sup>th</sup> Region	Code: 21.80.04.00	

**NOTE: Approved primary service outcomes must be listed first.**

<b>Proposed Performance Measures for FY 2009-10 (Words)</b>	<b>Approved Prior Year Standards FY 2008-09 (Numbers)</b>	<b>Actual Prior Year Standards FY 2008-09 (Numbers)</b>	<b>Proposed Standards for FY 2009-10 (Numbers)</b>	<b>Requested Standards for FY 2010-11 (Numbers)</b>
“New Measure” – Number of non-appellate cases appointed	N/A	9,454		9,454
“New Measure” – Number of non-appellate cases open	N/A	3,326		3,326
“New Measure” - Number of non-appellate cases closed	N/A	5,986		5,986
“New Measure” – Number of appellate cases appointed	N/A	106		106
“New Measure” – Number of appellate cases open	N/A	52		52
“New Measure” – Number of appellate cases closed	N/A	54		54



## EXHIBIT II – PERFORMANCE MEASURES AND STANDARDS

Department: Justice Administration	Department No.: 21
------------------------------------	--------------------

Program: Criminal Conflict and Civil Regional Counsels	Code: 21.80.00.00	
Service/Budget Entity: Regional Counsels, 5 <sup>th</sup> Region	Code: 21.80.05.00	

**NOTE: Approved primary service outcomes must be listed first.**

<b>Proposed Performance Measures for FY 2009-10 (Words)</b>	<b>Approved Prior Year Standards FY 2008-09 (Numbers)</b>	<b>Actual Prior Year Standards FY 2008-09 (Numbers)</b>	<b>Proposed Standards for FY 2009-10 (Numbers)</b>	<b>Requested Standards for FY 2010-11 (Numbers)</b>
“New Measure” – Number of non-appellate cases appointed	N/A	10,224		11,271
“New Measure” – Number of non-appellate cases open	N/A	8,163		8,999
“New Measure” - Number of non-appellate cases closed	N/A	5,662		6,240
“New Measure” – Number of appellate cases appointed	N/A	108		118
“New Measure” – Number of appellate cases open	N/A	104		114
“New Measure” – Number of appellate cases closed	N/A	46		50

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

## EXHIBIT III – ASSESSMENT OF PERFORMANCE MEASURES

<b>Department:</b> Justice Administration <b>Program:</b> Justice Administrative Commission <b>Service/Budget Entity:</b> Executive Direction/Support Services <b>Measure:</b> Number of budget, payroll, disbursement, revenue and financial reports transactions processed													
<b>Action:</b> <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													
<b>Approved Standard</b>	<b>Actual Performance Results</b>	<b>Difference (Over/Under)</b>	<b>Percentage Difference</b>										
375,000	333,710	-41,290	-11%										
<b>Factors Accounting for the Difference:</b> <b>Internal Factors</b> (check all that apply): <table style="width: 100%; border: none;"> <tr> <td><input type="checkbox"/> Personnel Factors</td> <td><input type="checkbox"/> Staff Capacity</td> </tr> <tr> <td><input type="checkbox"/> Competing Priorities</td> <td><input type="checkbox"/> Level of Training</td> </tr> <tr> <td><input type="checkbox"/> Previous Estimate Incorrect</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td><input type="checkbox"/> Other (Identify)</td> <td></td> </tr> </table>				<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)			
<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)													
<b>Explanation:</b>  <b>External Factors</b> (check all that apply): <table style="width: 100%; border: none;"> <tr> <td><input type="checkbox"/> Resources Unavailable</td> <td><input type="checkbox"/> Technological Problems</td> </tr> <tr> <td><input type="checkbox"/> Legal/Legislative Change</td> <td><input type="checkbox"/> Natural Disaster</td> </tr> <tr> <td><input type="checkbox"/> Target Population Change</td> <td><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other (Identify)</td> </tr> <tr> <td><input type="checkbox"/> This Program/Service Cannot Fix The Problem</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td><input type="checkbox"/> Current Laws Are Working Against The Agency Mission</td> <td></td> </tr> </table>				<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	
<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													
<b>Explanation:</b> Due to budget reductions, fewer invoices were presented to JAC by client agencies for processing.													
<b>Management Efforts to Address Differences/Problems</b> (check all that apply): <table style="width: 100%; border: none;"> <tr> <td><input type="checkbox"/> Training</td> <td><input type="checkbox"/> Technology</td> </tr> <tr> <td><input type="checkbox"/> Personnel</td> <td><input type="checkbox"/> Other (Identify)</td> </tr> </table>				<input type="checkbox"/> Training	<input type="checkbox"/> Technology	<input type="checkbox"/> Personnel	<input type="checkbox"/> Other (Identify)						
<input type="checkbox"/> Training	<input type="checkbox"/> Technology												
<input type="checkbox"/> Personnel	<input type="checkbox"/> Other (Identify)												
<b>Recommendations:</b> Change measure to align standard with most recent actual performance results.													

## EXHIBIT III – ASSESSMENT OF PERFORMANCE MEASURES

**Department:** Justice Administration  
**Program:** Justice Administrative Commission  
**Service/Budget Entity:** Executive Direction/Support Services  
**Measure:** Number of court appointed attorney and due process vendor invoices processed  
**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
65,000	63,913	-1,087	-1.67%

**Factors Accounting for the Difference:**

**Internal Factors** (check all that apply):

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

**Explanation:**

**External Factors** (check all that apply):

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

**Explanation:**

Performance is dependant upon the number of payment requests received.

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

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

**Recommendations:**

**EXHIBIT III – ASSESSMENT OF PERFORMANCE MEASURES**

**Department:** Justice Administration  
**Program:** Justice Administrative Commission  
**Service/Budget Entity:** Executive Direction/Support Services  
**Measure:** Number of public records requests

**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
150	189	39	26%

**Factors Accounting for the Difference:**  
**Internal Factors** (check all that apply):  
 Personnel Factors                                     Staff Capacity  
 Competing Priorities                                 Level of Training  
 Previous Estimate Incorrect  
 Other (Identify)

**Explanation:**

**External Factors** (check all that apply):  
 Resources Unavailable                                 Technological Problems  
 Legal/Legislative Change                              Natural Disaster  
 Target Population Change                             Other (Identify)  
 This Program/Service Cannot Fix The Problem  
 Current Laws Are Working Against The Agency Mission

**Explanation:**  
Performance is dependant upon the number of records requests received.

**Management Efforts to Address Differences/Problems** (check all that apply):  
 Training      Technology  
 Personnel      Other (Identify)

**Recommendations:**

# EXHIBIT III – ASSESSMENT OF PERFORMANCE MEASURES

**Department:** Justice Administration  
**Program:** Justice Administrative Commission  
**Service/Budget Entity:** Executive Direction/Support Services  
**Measure:** Percent of invoices processed within statutory time frames

**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
95.00%	93.74%	-1.26	-1.32%

**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:**

Compliance has been impacted by the addition of new agencies for which JAC provides administrative services.

**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:**

\*JAC continues to provide guidance and training to the accounting staff of these agencies to assist in timely processing of invoices.

## EXHIBIT III – ASSESSMENT OF PERFORMANCE MEASURES

**Department:** Justice Administration  
**Program:** Justice Administrative Commission  
**Service/Budget Entity:** Executive Direction/Support Services  
**Measure:** Number of cases where registry lawyers request fees above statutory caps

**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
2,500	1,552	-948	-38%

**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:**

The number of requests for fees above statutory caps fluctuates annually.

**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:**

Change measure to align standard with most recent actual performance results.

## EXHIBIT III – ASSESSMENT OF PERFORMANCE MEASURES

<b>Department:</b>	<b>Justice Administration</b>		
<b>Program:</b>	<b>Justice Administrative Commission</b>		
<b>Service/Budget Entity:</b>	<b>Executive Direction/Support Services</b>		
<b>Measure:</b>	<b>Number of cases where the court orders fees above the statutory caps</b>		
<b>Action:</b>			
<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
2,000	1,460	-540	-27%

**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:**  
The number of cases where the court orders fees above the cap fluctuates annually.

**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:**  
Change measure to align standard with most recent actual performance results.



## EXHIBIT III – ASSESSMENT OF PERFORMANCE MEASURES

**Department:** Justice Administration  
**Program:** Justice Administrative Commission  
**Service/Budget Entity:** Executive Direction/Support Services  
**Measure:** Total amount of excess fees awarded by the court per circuit

**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
\$6,000,000	\$11,486,799	\$5,486,799	91.45%

**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:**

The number of excess fees awarded by the court fluctuates annually.

**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:**

Change measure to align standard with most recent actual performance results.

## EXHIBIT III – ASSESSMENT OF PERFORMANCE MEASURES

**Department:** Justice Administration  
**Program:** Statewide Guardian ad Litem  
**Service/Budget Entity:** Statewide Guardian ad Litem  
**Measure:** Average Number of Children Represented  
**Action:**  
 Performance Assessment of Outcome Measure     Revision of Measure  
 Performance Assessment of Output Measure     Deletion of Measure  
 Adjustment of GAA Performance Standards

**Average Number of Children Represented standard not met. All other standards exceeded.**

Approved Standard	Actual Performance Results	Difference (Over/Under)	Percentage Difference
26,500	26,419	81	(.0031%)

**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:**

  

**External Factors** (check all that apply):

<input checked="" 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other (Identify)

**Recommendations:**

The Program historically included children appointed to the Program that were not actively assigned to a Guardian or Staff Advocate in the average number of children represented standard. The current administration has stopped this practice. The Program instituted an aggressive campaign to attract new volunteers and a training program for the staff to represent more children in an effective manner.

**EXHIBIT III – ASSESSMENT OF PERFORMANCE MEASURES**

**Department:** Justice Administration  
**Program:** Clerks of Court  
**Service/Budget Entity:** Clerks of Court Operations Corporation  
**Measure:**

**Exhibit III is not applicable.**

**Action:**

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| <input 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

**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 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:**

**EXHIBIT III – ASSESSMENT OF PERFORMANCE MEASURES**

**Department:** Justice Administration  
**Program:** State Attorneys  
**Service/Budget Entity:** First – Twentieth Judicial Circuits  
**Measure:** Number of dispositions by trial verdicts

**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
14,004	13,365	-639	-4.6%

**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:** These numbers and/or percentages measure the performance of the criminal justice system that includes the State Attorney, Public Defender, private defense lawyers, Clerk of the Court and Judiciary. The disposition of a case requires the negotiation and agreement of all parties to a crime or specific civil matter.

**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:**

## EXHIBIT III – ASSESSMENT OF PERFORMANCE MEASURES

**Department:** Justice Administration  
**Program:** State Attorneys  
**Service/Budget Entity:** First – Twentieth Judicial Circuits  
**Measure:** Number of dispositions by otherwise

**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
439,795	394,668	-45,127	-10.3%

**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 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:** These numbers and/or percentages measure the performance of the criminal justice system that includes the State Attorney, Public Defender, private defense lawyers, Clerk of the Court and Judiciary. The disposition of a case requires the negotiation and agreement of all parties to a crime or specific civil matter.

**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:**

**EXHIBIT III – ASSESSMENT OF PERFORMANCE MEASURES**

**Department:** Justice Administration  
**Program:** State Attorneys  
**Service/Budget Entity:** First – Twentieth Judicial Circuits  
**Measure:** Percent of dispositions by trial verdicts

**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
1.05%	0.95%	-0.10	-9.5%

**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 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:** These numbers and/or percentages measure the performance of the criminal justice system that includes the State Attorney, Public Defender, private defense lawyers, Clerk of the Court and Judiciary. The disposition of a case requires the negotiation and agreement of all parties to a crime or specific civil matter.

**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:**

**EXHIBIT III – ASSESSMENT OF PERFORMANCE MEASURES**

**Department:** Justice Administration  
**Program:** State Attorneys  
**Service/Budget Entity:** First – Twentieth Judicial Circuits  
**Measure:** Percent of dispositions by pleas  
**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
54.30%	54.18%	-.12	-0.22%

**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:** These numbers and/or percentages measure the performance of the criminal justice system that includes the State Attorney, Public Defender, private defense lawyers, Clerk of the Court and Judiciary. The disposition of a case requires the negotiation and agreement of all parties to a crime or specific civil matter.

**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:**

**EXHIBIT III – ASSESSMENT OF PERFORMANCE MEASURES**

**Department:** Justice Administration  
**Program:** State Attorneys  
**Service/Budget Entity:** First – Twentieth Judicial Circuits  
**Measure:** Percent of dispositions by otherwise

**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
32.84%	27.93%	-4.91	-14.9%

**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:** These numbers and/or percentages measure the performance of the criminal justice system that includes the State Attorney, Public Defender, private defense lawyers, Clerk of the Court and Judiciary. The disposition of a case requires the negotiation and agreement of all parties to a crime or specific civil matter.

**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:**



**EXHIBIT III – ASSESSMENT OF PERFORMANCE MEASURES**

**Department:** Justice Administration  
**Program:** State Attorneys  
**Service/Budget Entity:** First – Twentieth Judicial Circuits  
**Measure:** Number of misdemeanor criminal case referrals  
**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
1,183,597	1,096,627	-86,970	-7.4%

**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:** These numbers are a measure of workload, not of performance. The fact that they rise or fall may be a reflection of the number of crimes, arrests by police and citizen complaints not of the performance of the State Attorney’s Office in its duties.

**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:**

**EXHIBIT III – ASSESSMENT OF PERFORMANCE MEASURES**

<b>Department:</b>	<b>Justice Administration</b>
<b>Program:</b>	<b>State Attorneys</b>
<b>Service/Budget Entity:</b>	<b>First – Twentieth Judicial Circuits</b>
<b>Measure:</b>	<b>Number of felony criminal case referrals</b>
<b>Action:</b>	
<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
490,965	472,296	-18,669	-3.8%

**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 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:** These numbers are a measure of workload, not of performance. The fact that they rise or fall may be a reflection of the number of crimes, arrests by police and citizen complaints not of the performance of the State Attorney’s Office in its duties.

**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:**

## EXHIBIT III – ASSESSMENT OF PERFORMANCE MEASURES

**Department:** Justice Administration  
**Program:** State Attorneys  
**Service/Budget Entity:** First – Twentieth Judicial Circuits  
**Measure:** Number of juvenile criminal case referrals

**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
197,338	166,172	-31,166	-15.8%

**Factors Accounting for the Difference:**

**Internal Factors** (check all that apply):

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

**Explanation:**

**External Factors** (check all that apply):

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

**Explanation:** These numbers are a measure of workload, not of performance. The fact that they rise or fall may be a reflection of the number of crimes, arrests by police and citizen complaints not of the performance of the State Attorney's Office in its duties.

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

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

**Recommendations:**

**EXHIBIT III – ASSESSMENT OF PERFORMANCE MEASURES**

**Department:** Justice Administration  
**Program:** State Attorneys  
**Service/Budget Entity:** First – Twentieth Judicial Circuits  
**Measure:** Number of misdemeanor filings  
**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
792,393	778,270	-14,123	-1.8%

**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 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:** These numbers are a measure of workload, not of performance. The fact that they rise or fall may be a reflection of the number of crimes, arrests by police and citizen complaints not of the performance of the State Attorney’s Office in its duties.

**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:**

**EXHIBIT III – ASSESSMENT OF PERFORMANCE MEASURES**

**Department:** Justice Administration  
**Program:** State Attorneys  
**Service/Budget Entity:** First – Twentieth Judicial Circuits  
**Measure:** Number of felony filings  
**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
219,752	213,835	-5,917	-2.7%

**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 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:** These numbers are a measure of workload, not of performance. The fact that they rise or fall may be a reflection of the number of crimes, arrests by police and citizen complaints not of the performance of the State Attorney’s Office in its duties.

**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:**

---

**EXHIBIT III – ASSESSMENT OF PERFORMANCE MEASURES**

**Department:** Justice Administration  
**Program:** State Attorneys  
**Service/Budget Entity:** First – Twentieth Judicial Circuits  
**Measure:** Number of juvenile filings  
**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
83,616	69,069	-14,547	-17.4%

**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:** These numbers are a measure of workload, not of performance. The fact that they rise or fall may be a reflection of the number of crimes, arrests by police and citizen complaints not of the performance of the State Attorney’s Office in its duties.

**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:**

---

## EXHIBIT III – ASSESSMENT OF PERFORMANCE MEASURES

**Department:** Justice Administration  
**Program:** State Attorneys  
**Service/Budget Entity:** First – Twentieth Judicial Circuits  
**Measure:** Number of post conviction relief responses or Habeas Corpus responses

**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
22,391	9,617	-12,774	-57%

**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:** These numbers and/or percentages measure the performance of the criminal justice system that includes the State Attorney, Public Defender, private defense lawyers, Clerk of the Court and Judiciary. The disposition of a case requires the negotiation and agreement of all parties to a crime or specific civil matter.

**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:**

**EXHIBIT III – ASSESSMENT OF PERFORMANCE MEASURES**

**Department:** Justice Administration  
**Program:** State Attorneys  
**Service/Budget Entity:** First – Twentieth Judicial Circuits  
**Measure:** Number of Baker Act hearings  
**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
27,686	15,160	-12,526	-45%

**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:** These numbers are a measure of workload, not of performance. The fact that they rise or fall may be a reflection of the number of crimes, arrests by police and citizen complaints not of the performance of the State Attorney’s Office in its duties.

**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:**



## EXHIBIT III – ASSESSMENT OF PERFORMANCE MEASURES

**Department:** \_\_\_\_\_ Justice Administration \_\_\_\_\_

**Program:** \_\_\_\_\_ Public Defenders \_\_\_\_\_

**Service/Budget Entity:** Public Defenders \_\_\_\_\_

**Measure: Percent of Public Defender Clients in Custody Contacted Within 72 Hours After Appointment**

**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
98.80%	98%	-.8%	-.8%

**Factors Accounting for the Difference:**

**Internal Factors** (check all that apply):

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

**Explanation:** Budget cuts suffered in the last two fiscal years have forced staffing cuts in all areas resulting in inadequate staffing for all duties and responsibilities. This makes it difficult to interview all clients in 72 hours, and still perform other tasks.

**External Factors** (check all that apply):

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| <input checked="" 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:** Inadequate staffing for all duties and responsibilities make it difficult to interview all clients in 72 hours, and still perform other tasks.

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

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

**Recommendations:**

Adequate staffing must be provided.

## EXHIBIT III – ASSESSMENT OF PERFORMANCE MEASURES

**Department:** \_\_\_\_\_ Justice Administration \_\_\_\_\_

**Program:** \_\_\_\_\_ Public Defenders \_\_\_\_\_

**Service/Budget Entity:** Public Defenders \_\_\_\_\_

**Measure:** **Percent of felony and misdemeanor cases resolved within speedy trial rule unless dismissed**

**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
96.50%	96.23%	-.27%	-.27%

**Factors Accounting for the Difference:**

**Internal Factors** (check all that apply):

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

**Explanation:** Budget cuts suffered in the last two fiscal years have forced staffing cuts in all areas resulting in inadequate staffing for all duties and responsibilities. Factors outside our control often make this measure difficult to predict. The different practice patterns of the prosecution influence this measure.

**External Factors** (check all that apply):

- |  |  |
|--|--|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Resources Unavailable                    | <input type="checkbox"/> Technological Problems      |
| <input checked="" 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:** Continued work on attaining this measure standard made it possible to exceed the approved standard.

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

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

**Recommendations:**

Adequate staffing must be provided.

## EXHIBIT III – ASSESSMENT OF PERFORMANCE MEASURES

**Department:** \_\_\_\_\_ Justice Administration \_\_\_\_\_  
**Program:** \_\_\_\_\_ Public Defenders \_\_\_\_\_  
**Service/Budget Entity:** Public Defenders \_\_\_\_\_  
**Measure:** Number of substantiated Bar grievances filed annually

**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
0	0	0	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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Level of Training |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Previous Estimate Incorrect |   |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Other (Identify)            |   |

**Explanation:** The Florida Public Defender Association provides sufficient training for Assistant Public Defenders which seems to keep bar grievances at a minimum.

**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:**

## EXHIBIT III – ASSESSMENT OF PERFORMANCE MEASURES

**Department:** \_\_\_\_\_ Justice Administration \_\_\_\_\_  
**Program:** \_\_\_\_\_ Public Defenders \_\_\_\_\_  
**Service/Budget Entity:** Public Defenders \_\_\_\_\_  
**Measure:** Number of appointed cases

**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
835,319	834,130	-1,189	-14.2%

**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:** Budget cuts suffered in the last two fiscal years have forced staffing cuts in all areas resulting in inadequate staffing for all duties and responsibilities. Public Defenders have no control over the number of cases assigned.

**External Factors** (check all that apply):

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| <input checked="" 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:**

Even at a caseload less than projected, the public defenders are inadequately funded.

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

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

**Recommendations:**

Adequate staffing must be provided.

## EXHIBIT III – ASSESSMENT OF PERFORMANCE MEASURES

**Department:** \_\_\_\_\_ Justice Administration \_\_\_\_\_

**Program:** \_\_\_\_\_ Public Defenders \_\_\_\_\_

**Service/Budget Entity:** Public Defenders \_\_\_\_\_

**Measure:** Number of criminal cases closed

**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
732,475	747,585	15,110	2.06%

**Factors Accounting for the Difference:**

**Internal Factors** (check all that apply):

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

**Explanation:** Budget cuts suffered in the last two fiscal years have forced staffing cuts in all areas resulting in inadequate staffing for all duties and responsibilities. Public Defenders have no control over the number of cases assigned and can only close what they have staffing to process.

**External Factors** (check all that apply):

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| <input checked="" 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:** Because all Public Defender offices are severely understaffed, some offices are stretched too thin to be able to meet all goals and objectives. Even at a caseload less than projected, the public defenders are inadequately funded.

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

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

**Recommendations:**

Adequate staffing must be provided.

## EXHIBIT III – ASSESSMENT OF PERFORMANCE MEASURES

**Department:** \_\_\_\_\_ Justice Administration \_\_\_\_\_  
**Program:** \_\_\_\_\_ Public Defenders \_\_\_\_\_  
**Service/Budget Entity:** Public Defenders \_\_\_\_\_  
**Measure:** Number of civil cases closed

**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
17,925	21,965	4,038	22.5%

**Factors Accounting for the Difference:**

**Internal Factors** (check all that apply):

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

**Explanation:** Budget cuts suffered in the last two fiscal years have forced staffing cuts in all areas resulting in inadequate staffing for all duties and responsibilities. While the number of civil cases continues to increase, the ability to keep pace with the dispositions is more difficult because of the severe staffing problems.

**External Factors** (check all that apply):

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| <input checked="" 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:** Because all Public Defender offices are severely understaffed, some offices are stretched too thin to be able to meet all goals and objectives.

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

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

**Recommendations:**

Adequate staffing must be provided.

## EXHIBIT III – ASSESSMENT OF PERFORMANCE MEASURES

**Department:** \_\_\_\_\_ Justice Administration \_\_\_\_\_  
**Program:** \_\_\_\_\_ Public Defenders \_\_\_\_\_  
**Service/Budget Entity:** Public Defenders \_\_\_\_\_  
**Measure:** Number of cases nolle processed or dismissed

**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
72,387	86,980	14,593	20.1%

**Factors Accounting for the Difference:**

**Internal Factors** (check all that apply):

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

**Explanation:** Public Defenders have no control over nolle processed or dismissed cases. It is the discretion of the prosecution or the judge.

**External Factors** (check all that apply):

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| <input checked="" 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:** Because all Public Defender offices are severely understaffed, some offices are stretched too thin to be able to meet all goals and objectives.

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

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

**Recommendations:**

Adequate staffing must be provided.

## EXHIBIT III – ASSESSMENT OF PERFORMANCE MEASURES

**Department:** \_\_\_\_\_ Justice Administration \_\_\_\_\_  
**Program:** \_\_\_\_\_ Public Defenders \_\_\_\_\_  
**Service/Budget Entity:** Public Defenders \_\_\_\_\_  
**Measure:** Number of pleas

**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
384,827	379,484	-5,343	-1.38%

**Factors Accounting for the Difference:**

**Internal Factors** (check all that apply):

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

**Explanation:** Budget cuts suffered in the last two fiscal years have forced staffing cuts in all areas resulting in inadequate staffing for all duties and responsibilities. The number of pleas is less than expected, as the number of total cases was lightly lower than projected.

**External Factors** (check all that apply):

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| <input checked="" 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:** Because all Public Defender offices are severely understaffed, some offices are stretched too thin to be able to meet all goals and objectives.

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

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

**Recommendations:**

Adequate staffing must be provided.



## EXHIBIT III – ASSESSMENT OF PERFORMANCE MEASURES

**Department:** \_\_\_\_\_ Justice Administration \_\_\_\_\_  
**Program:** \_\_\_\_\_ Public Defenders \_\_\_\_\_  
**Service/Budget Entity:** Public Defenders \_\_\_\_\_  
**Measure:** Number of trials

**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
9,987	8,542	-1,445	-14.4%

**Factors Accounting for the Difference:**

**Internal Factors** (check all that apply):

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

**Explanation:** Budget cuts suffered in the last two fiscal years have forced staffing cuts in all areas resulting in inadequate staffing for all duties and responsibilities.

**External Factors** (check all that apply):

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

**Explanation:** Because all Public Defender offices are severely understaffed, some offices are stretched too thin to be able to meet all goals and objectives.

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

- Training      Technology  
 Personnel      Other (Identify)

**Recommendations:**

Adequate staffing must be provided.

---

## EXHIBIT III – ASSESSMENT OF PERFORMANCE MEASURES

---

**Department:** \_\_\_\_\_ Justice Administration \_\_\_\_\_  
**Program:** \_\_\_\_\_ Public Defenders \_\_\_\_\_  
**Service/Budget Entity:** Public Defenders \_\_\_\_\_  
**Measure:** Number of clients represented

**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
710,052	671,487	-38,565	-5.43%

**Factors Accounting for the Difference:**

**Internal Factors** (check all that apply):

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

**Explanation:** Public Defenders have no control over the number of cases or clients to which we're appointed. However with case numbers slightly less than projected, clients numbers would be down as well.

**External Factors** (check all that apply):

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| <input checked="" 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:** Because all Public Defender offices are severely understaffed, some offices are stretched too thin to be able to meet all goals and objectives.

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

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

**Recommendations:**

Adequate staffing must be provided.

## EXHIBIT III – ASSESSMENT OF PERFORMANCE MEASURES

**Department:** Justice Administration

**Program:** Public Defenders

**Service/Budget Entity:** Public Defenders

**Measure:** Number of contested violation of probation hearings

**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
13,531	7,761	-5,770	-42%

**Factors Accounting for the Difference:**

**Internal Factors** (check all that apply):

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

**Explanation:** It seems that errors in data collections for this measure have contributed to artificially high estimates and the projections have been scaled back based on improved actual data. The title of this measure is also incorrect. It is only supposed to be contested violation of probation or evidentiary hearings, not all violation of probation hearings. It appears now that there is more accurate reporting of this output. And the standards have not changed in three years.

**External Factors** (check all that apply):

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

**Explanation:** Because all Public Defender offices are severely understaffed, some offices are stretched too thin to be able to meet all goals and objectives.

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

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

**Recommendations:**

Adequate staffing must be provided.

## EXHIBIT III – ASSESSMENT OF PERFORMANCE MEASURES

**Department:** \_\_\_\_\_ Justice Administration \_\_\_\_\_

**Program:** \_\_\_\_\_ Public Defenders \_\_\_\_\_

**Service/Budget Entity:** Public Defenders \_\_\_\_\_

**Measure:** **Number of initial interviews for assigned cases held for initial appointment**

**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
467,946	477,640	9,694	2%

**Factors Accounting for the Difference:**

**Internal Factors** (check all that apply):

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

**Explanation:** There being fewer cases and fewer clients than projected, actual performance is much lower than the previous year. Standards have not been changed in 3 years.

**External Factors** (check all that apply):

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| <input checked="" 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:** Because all Public Defender offices are severely understaffed, some offices are stretched too thin to be able to meet all goals and objectives.

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

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

**Recommendations:**

Adequate staffing must be provided.

**EXHIBIT III – ASSESSMENT OF PERFORMANCE MEASURES**

**Department:** \_\_\_\_\_ Justice Administration \_\_\_\_\_  
**Program:** \_\_\_\_\_ Public Defender, Appellate \_\_\_\_\_  
**Service/Budget Entity:** \_\_\_\_\_ Public Defender, Appellate \_\_\_\_\_  
**Measure:** Percent of appeals resolved

**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
99%	99.44%	.44%	.44%

**Factors Accounting for the Difference:**

**Internal Factors** (check all that apply):

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| <input checked="" 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:** Budget cuts suffered in the last two fiscal years have forced staffing cuts in all areas resulting in inadequate staffing for all duties and responsibilities. Factors outside our control often make this measure difficult to predict.

**External Factors** (check all that apply):

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| <input checked="" 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:**

Acquire additional resources to provide adequate staffing.

---

**EXHIBIT III – ASSESSMENT OF PERFORMANCE MEASURES**

---

**Department:** \_\_\_\_\_ Justice Administration \_\_\_\_\_  
**Program:** \_\_\_\_\_ Public Defender, Appellate \_\_\_\_\_  
**Service/Budget Entity:** \_\_\_\_\_ Public Defender, Appellate \_\_\_\_\_  
**Measure:** **Number of appointed cases**

**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
5,339	5,375	36	.67%

**Factors Accounting for the Difference:**

**Internal Factors** (check all that apply):

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| <input checked="" 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:**

Public Defenders have no control over the number of cases that are appointed.

**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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> This Program/Service Cannot Fix The Problem |   |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Current Laws Are Working Against The Agency Mission    |   |

**Explanation:**

Public Defenders have no control over the number of cases that are appointed.

**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:**

**EXHIBIT III – ASSESSMENT OF PERFORMANCE MEASURES**

**Department:** \_\_\_\_\_ Justice Administration \_\_\_\_\_  
**Program:** \_\_\_\_\_ Public Defender, Appellate \_\_\_\_\_  
**Service/Budget Entity:** \_\_\_\_\_ Public Defender, Appellate \_\_\_\_\_  
**Measure:** Number of clients represented

**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
5,461	5,533	72	1.31%

**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:**

Public Defenders have no control over the number of cases or clients that are appointed.

**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:**

Public Defenders have no control over the number of cases that are appointed.

**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:**

Acquire additional resources to provide adequate staffing.

## EXHIBIT III – ASSESSMENT OF PERFORMANCE MEASURES

**Department:** \_\_\_\_\_ Justice Administration \_\_\_\_\_  
**Program:** \_\_\_\_\_ Public Defender, Appellate \_\_\_\_\_  
**Service/Budget Entity:** \_\_\_\_\_ Public Defender, Appellate \_\_\_\_\_  
**Measure:** **Number of briefs filed**

**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
5,285	5,684	399	7.55%

**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:**

Public Defenders have no control over the number of cases that are appointed. The number of briefs filed correlates to the number of cases appointed.

**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:**

Public Defenders have no control over the number of cases that are appointed.

**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:**

Acquire additional resources to provide adequate staffing.



**EXHIBIT III – ASSESSMENT OF PERFORMANCE MEASURES**

**Department:** \_\_\_\_\_ Justice Administration \_\_\_\_\_  
**Program:** \_\_\_\_\_ Public Defender, Appellate \_\_\_\_\_  
**Service/Budget Entity:** \_\_\_\_\_ Public Defender, Appellate \_\_\_\_\_  
**Measure:** Number of writs filed

**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
130	101	-29	22.31%

**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:**

Public Defenders have no control over the number of cases that are appointed.

**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:**

Public Defenders have no control over the number of cases that are appointed.

**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:**

Acquire additional resources to provide adequate staffing.

**EXHIBIT III – ASSESSMENT OF PERFORMANCE MEASURES**

**Department:** Justice Administration  
**Program:** Public Defender, Appellate  
**Service/Budget Entity:** Public Defender, Appellate  
**Measure:** Number of cases closed

**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
5,726	5,345	-381	6.6%

**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:** Budget cuts suffered in the two fiscal years have forced staffing cuts in all areas resulting in inadequate staffing for all duties and responsibilities. Factors outside our control often make this measure difficult to predict. An increase of new appointed cases makes it more difficult to close a higher number of cases.

**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:** Additional resources are required to keep up with the demand of increased cases.

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

- Training
- Personnel
- Technology
- Other (Identify)

**Recommendations:**

Adequate staffing

## EXHIBIT III – ASSESSMENT OF PERFORMANCE MEASURES

**Department:** Capital Collateral Regional Counsels

**Program:** Legal Representation

**Service/Budget Entity:** Legal Representation

**Measure:** # of signed death warrants

**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
5	3	-2	40%

**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:** The Governor only signed three (3) Death Warrant in FY 2008-09

**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:**

**EXHIBIT III – ASSESSMENT OF PERFORMANCE MEASURES**

**Department:** Justice Administration  
**Program:** Criminal Conflict and Civil Regional Councils  
**Service/Budget Entity:** Regional Councils, 1<sup>st</sup> – 5<sup>th</sup> Regions  
**Measure:**

**Exhibit III is not applicable.**

**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

**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:**

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

- Training
- Personnel
- Technology
- Other (Identify)

**Recommendations:**

**PERFORMANCE MEASURE VALIDITY AND RELIABILITY  
– LRPP EXHIBIT IV**

---

**EXHIBIT IV – PERFORMANCE MEASURE VALIDITY AND  
RELIABILITY**

---

**Department:** Justice Administration  
**Program:** Justice Administrative Commission  
**Service/Budget Entity:** Executive Direction/Support Services  
**Measure:** Number of budget, payroll, disbursement, revenue and financial report transactions 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:**

BAPS, People First and FLAIR

**Validity:**

The budget, payroll, disbursement and revenue transactions are processed through BAPS, People First and FLAIR.

**Reliability:**

The number of transactions processed in each of these systems for budget, payroll and accounting can be queried each year.

---

**EXHIBIT IV – PERFORMANCE MEASURE VALIDITY AND  
RELIABILITY**

---

**Department:** Justice Administration  
**Program:** Justice Administrative Commission  
**Service/Budget Entity:** Executive Direction/Support Services  
**Measure:** Number of cases where the registry lawyers request fees above the statutory caps

**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 Justice Administrative Commission's Court Appointed Attorney Tracking System (CAATS).

**Validity:**

Court appointed attorney and due process vendor invoices are processed in CAATS.

**Reliability:**

The number of transactions processed in CAATS can be queried each year.

---

**EXHIBIT IV – PERFORMANCE MEASURE VALIDITY AND  
RELIABILITY**

---

**Department:** Justice Administration  
**Program:** Justice Administrative Commission  
**Service/Budget Entity:** Executive Direction/Support Services  
**Measure:** Number of cases where the court orders fees above the statutory cap

**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 Justice Administrative Commission’s Court Appointed Attorney Tracking System (CAATS).

**Validity:**

Court appointed attorney and due process vendor invoices are processed in CAATS.

**Reliability:**

The number of transactions processed in CAATS can be queried each year.



---

**EXHIBIT IV – PERFORMANCE MEASURE VALIDITY AND  
RELIABILITY**

---

**Department:** Justice Administration  
**Program:** Justice Administrative Commission  
**Service/Budget Entity:** Executive Direction/Support Services  
**Measure:** Total amount of excess fees awarded by the court per  
Circuit

**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 Justice Administrative Commission’s Court Appointed Attorney Tracking System (CAATS).

**Validity:**

Court appointed attorney and due process vendor invoices are processed in CAATS.

**Reliability:**

The number of transactions processed in CAATS can be queried each year.

---

**EXHIBIT IV – PERFORMANCE MEASURE VALIDITY AND  
RELIABILITY**

---

**Department:** \_\_\_\_\_ Justice Administration \_\_\_\_\_  
**Program:** \_\_\_\_\_ Statewide Guardian ad Litem \_\_\_\_\_  
**Service/Budget Entity:** \_\_\_\_\_ Statewide Guardian ad Litem \_\_\_\_\_  
**Measure:** \_\_\_\_\_ All Performance Measures \_\_\_\_\_

**Action** (check one):

- Requesting revision to approved performance measure.
- Change in data sources or measurement methodologies.
- Requesting new measure.
- Backup for performance measure not previously approved or for which validity, reliability and/or methodology information has not been provided.

**Data Sources and Methodology:**

The data source for these measures are numbers tracked by each of the 20 Guardian ad Litem offices residing in the 20 judicial circuits. Each office records and reports, as of the last day of the month, data needed to assess Program performance and to determine whether standards are met.

**Validity:**

The methodology for collecting and reporting the data supporting all performance measures is an accurate approach to data collection.

**Reliability:**

The methodology is sound and consistent. Although minor issues remain regarding data collection, the Program feels confident that the process is dependable and will result in consistent information from year to year.

---

**EXHIBIT IV – PERFORMANCE MEASURE VALIDITY AND  
RELIABILITY**

---

**Department:** \_\_\_\_\_ **Justice Administration** \_\_\_\_\_

**Program:** \_\_\_\_\_ **Clerks of Court** \_\_\_\_\_

**Service/Budget Entity:** \_\_ **Clerks of Court Operations Corporation (CCOC)**

**Measure: Number of Clerk Budget Requests Analyzed for Inclusion in the Clerks’  
Legislative Budget Request Plus Number of Final Appropriation Allocations to  
Florida’s Clerks of the Court.**

**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 for this measure is Senate Bill 2108 which changed the Clerks’ budgeting system from previous legislation.

**Validity:**

The CCOC receives 67 Clerks’ office “Budget Requests” which must be analyzed and approved for inclusion in a Legislative Budget Request; and then, following Legislative Appropriation action, the CCOC must allocate the total funds authorized among 67 Clerks’ offices. These are two major workload requirements.

**Reliability:**

The workload numbers are authorized in law, considering the fact that there are Clerks’ offices in the State of Florida which have a responsibility to produce budget requests for CCOC consideration and the CCOC responsibility to propose a budget and then implement a final appropriation to those 67 Clerks’ offices.

---

**EXHIBIT IV – PERFORMANCE MEASURE VALIDITY AND  
RELIABILITY**

---

**Department:** \_\_\_\_\_ **Justice Administration** \_\_\_\_\_

**Program:** \_\_\_\_\_ **Clerks of Court** \_\_\_\_\_

**Service/Budget Entity:** \_\_ **Clerks of Court Operations Corporation (CCOC)**

**Measure: Number of CCOC Budget Analysis and Related Reports Produced Plus  
Trust Fund and Clerk Budget Related Issues Worked and Resolved.**

**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 for this measure is Senate Bill 2108 which increased the CCOC authority and responsibility to analyze and report on budget related conditions and work with Clerks' offices to resolve budget related issues as they arise during the fiscal year.

**Validity:**

After CCOC workloads related to producing a Legislative Budget Request and allocation final appropriations, the CCOC operates during the fiscal year to monitor, analyze and respond to Trust Fund and Clerk budget related issues to provide assurances that the Clerks offices will be functional and perform as needed in Florida's judicial system. This output measure essentially identifies key workloads other than budget request and allocation responsibilities and general education and training responsibilities.

**Reliability:**

Workload estimates for this measure will be determined in Fiscal Year 2009-10 and the method of reliably collecting the measurement data will be developed in consultation with the Legislature.

---

**EXHIBIT IV – PERFORMANCE MEASURE VALIDITY AND  
RELIABILITY**

---

**Department:** \_\_\_\_\_ **Justice Administration** \_\_\_\_\_

**Program:** \_\_\_\_\_ **Clerks of Court** \_\_\_\_\_

**Service/Budget Entity:** \_\_ **Clerks of Court Operations Corporation (CCOC)**

**Measure: Number of Education and Training Programs, Workshops, Events and  
Other Opportunities Provided to Clerks' Offices During the Budget Year.**

**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 for this measure is Senate Bill 2108 which requires the CCOC to provide education and training for Florida's Clerks' offices.

**Validity:**

This is the third major work function responsibility for the CCOC. The Legislative requirement for new budgeting processes necessitates significant education and training, plus general office administration related education that is provided routinely every year.

**Reliability:**

Workload estimates for this measure will be determined in Fiscal Year 2009-10 and the method of reliably collecting the measurement data will be developed in consultation with the Legislature and Department of Financial Services.

---

## EXHIBIT IV – PERFORMANCE MEASURE VALIDITY AND RELIABILITY

---

**Department:** Justice Administration  
**Program:** State Attorneys, First - Twentieth Judicial Circuits  
**Service/Budget Entity:** State Attorneys, First - Twentieth Judicial Circuits  
**Measure:** Percent of offenders who qualify for enhanced sentencing for whom state attorneys requested enhanced sentencing

**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:**

1. List and describe the data source(s) for the performance measure.
2. Provide description of the methodology used to collect the data and calculate the result.
3. Provide explanation of the procedure used for measurement.

The State Attorneys use case management databases to capture information from source documents for all referrals received. New case information is entered in the system and updated, as the cases move forward, to automatically record and track the information used to compute this measure. Files are maintained for each case record along with the original source documents, allowing the database information to be verified against the source documentation. The resulting number is calculated by taking the number of offenders whose sentences are enhanced by the court and dividing by the number of offenders for whom the State Attorney requested enhanced sentencing.

**Validity:**

*Provide explanation of the validity of the performance measure, including an explanation of the methodology used to determine validity and the reason such methodology was used.*

Case management systems are enhanced as needed to ensure that all necessary information is captured and can be audited for accuracy. The number reported is accurate; however, it is statistically insignificant when considered in the totality of State Attorney workload, and if reported alone, has no meaning.

**Reliability:**

*Provide explanation of the methodology used to determine reliability and the reason such methodology was used. Include a statement of the reliability of the performance measure (the extent to which the measuring procedure yields the same results on repeated trials ensuring data is complete and sufficiently error free).*

Data entered into the case management system is continually updated and monitored for accuracy. Audit reports are run on a regular basis to ensure reliability of data. The same data entered into the case management system is checked for results consistent with source documents.

---

## EXHIBIT IV – PERFORMANCE MEASURE VALIDITY AND RELIABILITY

---

<b>Department:</b>	<b>Justice Administration</b>
<b>Program:</b>	<b>State Attorneys, First - Twentieth Judicial Circuits</b>
<b>Service/Budget Entity:</b>	<b>State Attorneys, First - Twentieth Judicial Circuits</b>
<b>Measure:</b>	<b>Total number of dispositions</b>

**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:**

1. List and describe the data source(s) for the performance measure.
2. Provide description of the methodology used to collect the data and calculate the result.
3. Provide explanation of the procedure used for measurement.

The State Attorneys use case management databases to capture information from source documents for all referrals received. New case information is entered in the system and updated, as the cases move forward, to automatically record and track the information used to compute this measure. Files are maintained for each case record along with the original source documents, allowing the database information to be verified against the source documentation. The number of dispositions is derived from the total number recorded in the case management system.

**Validity:**

*Provide explanation of the validity of the performance measure, including an explanation of the methodology used to determine validity and the reason such methodology was used.*

Case management systems are enhanced as needed to ensure that all necessary information is captured and can be audited for accuracy. The number reported is accurate; however, it is statistically insignificant when considered in the totality of State Attorney workload, and if reported alone, has no meaning.

**Reliability:**

*Provide explanation of the methodology used to determine reliability and the reason such methodology was used. Include a statement of the reliability of the performance measure (the extent to which the measuring procedure yields the same results on repeated trials ensuring data is complete and sufficiently error free).*

Data entered into the case management system is continually updated and monitored for accuracy. Audit reports are run on a regular basis to ensure reliability of data. The same data entered into the case management system is checked for results consistent with source documents.

---

## EXHIBIT IV – PERFORMANCE MEASURE VALIDITY AND RELIABILITY

---

<b>Department:</b>	<b>Justice Administration</b>
<b>Program:</b>	<b>State Attorneys, First - Twentieth Judicial Circuits</b>
<b>Service/Budget Entity:</b>	<b>State Attorneys, First – Twentieth Judicial Circuits</b>
<b>Measure:</b>	<b>Number of dispositions by trial verdicts</b>

**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:**

1. List and describe the data source(s) for the performance measure.
2. Provide description of the methodology used to collect the data and calculate the result.
3. Provide explanation of the procedure used for measurement.

The State Attorneys use case management databases to capture information from source documents for all referrals received. New case information is entered in the system and updated, as the cases move forward, to automatically record and track the information used to compute this measure. Files are maintained for each case record along with the original source documents, allowing the database information to be verified against the source documentation. The number of dispositions by trial verdicts is derived from the total number recorded in the case management system.

**Validity:**

*Provide explanation of the validity of the performance measure, including an explanation of the methodology used to determine validity and the reason such methodology was used.*

Case management systems are enhanced as needed to ensure that all necessary information is captured and can be audited for accuracy. The number reported is accurate; however, it is statistically insignificant when considered in the totality of State Attorney workload, and if reported alone, has no meaning.

**Reliability:**

*Provide explanation of the methodology used to determine reliability and the reason such methodology was used. Include a statement of the reliability of the performance measure (the extent to which the measuring procedure yields the same results on repeated trials ensuring data is complete and sufficiently error free).*

Data entered into the case management system is continually updated and monitored for accuracy. Audit reports are run on a regular basis to ensure reliability of data. The same data entered into the case management system is checked for results consistent with source documents.



---

## EXHIBIT IV – PERFORMANCE MEASURE VALIDITY AND RELIABILITY

---

<b>Department:</b>	<b>Justice Administration</b>
<b>Program:</b>	<b>State Attorneys, First - Twentieth Judicial Circuits</b>
<b>Service/Budget Entity:</b>	<b>State Attorneys, First - Twentieth Judicial Circuits</b>
<b>Measure:</b>	<b>Number of dispositions by pleas</b>

**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:**

1. List and describe the data source(s) for the performance measure.
2. Provide description of the methodology used to collect the data and calculate the result.
3. Provide explanation of the procedure used for measurement.

The State Attorneys use case management databases to capture information from source documents for all referrals received. New case information is entered in the system and updated, as the cases move forward, to automatically record and track the information used to compute this measure. Files are maintained for each case record along with the original source documents, allowing the database information to be verified against the source documentation. The number of dispositions by pleas is derived from the total number recorded in the case management system.

**Validity:**

*Provide explanation of the validity of the performance measure, including an explanation of the methodology used to determine validity and the reason such methodology was used.*

Case management systems are enhanced as needed to ensure that all necessary information is captured and can be audited for accuracy. The number reported is accurate; however, it is statistically insignificant when considered in the totality of State Attorney workload, and if reported alone, has no meaning.

**Reliability:**

*Provide explanation of the methodology used to determine reliability and the reason such methodology was used. Include a statement of the reliability of the performance measure (the extent to which the measuring procedure yields the same results on repeated trials ensuring data is complete and sufficiently error free).*

Data entered into the case management system is continually updated and monitored for accuracy. Audit reports are run on a regular basis to ensure reliability of data. The same data entered into the case management system is checked for results consistent with source documents.

---

## EXHIBIT IV – PERFORMANCE MEASURE VALIDITY AND RELIABILITY

---

<b>Department:</b>	<b>Justice Administration</b>
<b>Program:</b>	<b>State Attorneys, First – Twentieth Judicial Circuits</b>
<b>Service/Budget Entity:</b>	<b>State Attorneys, First – Twentieth Judicial Circuits</b>
<b>Measure:</b>	<b>Number of dispositions by non trial</b>

**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:**

1. List and describe the data source(s) for the performance measure.
2. Provide description of the methodology used to collect the data and calculate the result.
3. Provide explanation of the procedure used for measurement.

The State Attorneys use case management databases to capture information from source documents for all referrals received. New case information is entered in the system and updated, as the cases move forward, to automatically record and track the information used to compute this measure. Files are maintained for each case record along with the original source documents, allowing the database information to be verified against the source documentation. The number of dispositions by non-trial is derived from the total number recorded in the case management system.

**Validity:**

*Provide explanation of the validity of the performance measure, including an explanation of the methodology used to determine validity and the reason such methodology was used.*

Case management systems are enhanced as needed to ensure that all necessary information is captured and can be audited for accuracy. The number reported is accurate; however, it is statistically insignificant when considered in the totality of State Attorney workload, and if reported alone, has no meaning.

**Reliability:**

*Provide explanation of the methodology used to determine reliability and the reason such methodology was used. Include a statement of the reliability of the performance measure (the extent to which the measuring procedure yields the same results on repeated trials ensuring data is complete and sufficiently error free).*

Data entered into the case management system is continually updated and monitored for accuracy. Audit reports are run on a regular basis to ensure reliability of data. The same data entered into the case management system is checked for results consistent with source documents.

---

## EXHIBIT IV – PERFORMANCE MEASURE VALIDITY AND RELIABILITY

---

<b>Department:</b>	<b>Justice Administration</b>
<b>Program:</b>	<b>State Attorneys, First – Twentieth Judicial Circuits</b>
<b>Service/Budget Entity:</b>	<b>State Attorneys, First – Twentieth Judicial Circuits</b>
<b>Measure:</b>	<b>Number of dispositions by otherwise</b>

**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:**

1. List and describe the data source(s) for the performance measure.
2. Provide description of the methodology used to collect the data and calculate the result.
3. Provide explanation of the procedure used for measurement.

The State Attorneys use case management databases to capture information from source documents for all referrals received. New case information is entered in the system and updated, as the cases move forward, to automatically record and track the information used to compute this measure. Files are maintained for each case record along with the original source documents, allowing the database information to be verified against the source documentation. The number of dispositions by otherwise is derived from the total number recorded in the case management system.

**Validity:**

*Provide explanation of the validity of the performance measure, including an explanation of the methodology used to determine validity and the reason such methodology was used.*

Case management systems are enhanced as needed to ensure that all necessary information is captured and can be audited for accuracy. The number reported is accurate; however, it is statistically insignificant when considered in the totality of State Attorney workload, and if reported alone, has no meaning.

**Reliability:**

*Provide explanation of the methodology used to determine reliability and the reason such methodology was used. Include a statement of the reliability of the performance measure (the extent to which the measuring procedure yields the same results on repeated trials ensuring data is complete and sufficiently error free).*

Data entered into the case management system is continually updated and monitored for accuracy. Audit reports are run on a regular basis to ensure reliability of data. The same data entered into the case management system is checked for results consistent with source documents.

---

## EXHIBIT IV – PERFORMANCE MEASURE VALIDITY AND RELIABILITY

---

<b>Department:</b>	<b>Justice Administration</b>
<b>Program:</b>	<b>State Attorneys, First - Twentieth Judicial Circuits</b>
<b>Service/Budget Entity:</b>	<b>State Attorneys, First – Twentieth Judicial Circuits</b>
<b>Measure:</b>	<b>Percent of dispositions by trial verdicts</b>

**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:**

1. List and describe the data source(s) for the performance measure.
2. Provide description of the methodology used to collect the data and calculate the result.
3. Provide explanation of the procedure used for measurement.

The State Attorneys use case management databases to capture information from source documents for all referrals received. New case information is entered in the system and updated, as the cases move forward, to automatically record and track the information used to compute this measure. Files are maintained for each case record along with the original source documents, allowing the database information to be verified against the source documentation. The resulting number is calculated by taking the number of trial dispositions and dividing by the total number of criminal case dispositions.

**Validity:**

*Provide explanation of the validity of the performance measure, including an explanation of the methodology used to determine validity and the reason such methodology was used.*

Case management systems are enhanced as needed to ensure that all necessary information is captured and can be audited for accuracy. The number reported is accurate; however, it is statistically insignificant when considered in the totality of State Attorney workload, and if reported alone, has no meaning.

**Reliability:**

*Provide explanation of the methodology used to determine reliability and the reason such methodology was used. Include a statement of the reliability of the performance measure (the extent to which the measuring procedure yields the same results on repeated trials ensuring data is complete and sufficiently error free).*

Data entered into the case management system is continually updated and monitored for accuracy. Audit reports are run on a regular basis to ensure reliability of data. The same data entered into the case management system is checked for results consistent with source documents.

---

## EXHIBIT IV – PERFORMANCE MEASURE VALIDITY AND RELIABILITY

---

<b>Department:</b>	<b>Justice Administration</b>
<b>Program:</b>	<b>State Attorneys, First – Twentieth Judicial Circuits</b>
<b>Service/Budget Entity:</b>	<b>State Attorneys, First – Twentieth Judicial Circuits</b>
<b>Measure:</b>	<b>Percent of dispositions by pleas</b>

**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:**

1. List and describe the data source(s) for the performance measure.
2. Provide description of the methodology used to collect the data and calculate the result.
3. Provide explanation of the procedure used for measurement.

The State Attorneys use case management databases to capture information from source documents for all referrals received. New case information is entered in the system and updated, as the cases move forward, to automatically record and track the information used to compute this measure. Files are maintained for each case record along with the original source documents, allowing the database information to be verified against the source documentation. The resulting number is calculated by taking the number of plea dispositions and dividing by the total number of criminal case dispositions.

**Validity:**

*Provide explanation of the validity of the performance measure, including an explanation of the methodology used to determine validity and the reason such methodology was used.*

Case management systems are enhanced as needed to ensure that all necessary information is captured and can be audited for accuracy. The number reported is accurate; however, it is statistically insignificant when considered in the totality of State Attorney workload, and if reported alone, has no meaning.

**Reliability:**

*Provide explanation of the methodology used to determine reliability and the reason such methodology was used. Include a statement of the reliability of the performance measure (the extent to which the measuring procedure yields the same results on repeated trials ensuring data is complete and sufficiently error free).*

Data entered into the case management system is continually updated and monitored for accuracy. Audit reports are run on a regular basis to ensure reliability of data. The same data entered into the case management system is checked for results consistent with source documents.

---

## EXHIBIT IV – PERFORMANCE MEASURE VALIDITY AND RELIABILITY

---

<b>Department:</b>	<b>Justice Administration</b>
<b>Program:</b>	<b>State Attorneys, First – Twentieth Judicial Circuits</b>
<b>Service/Budget Entity:</b>	<b>State Attorneys, First – Twentieth Judicial Circuits</b>
<b>Measure:</b>	<b>Percent of dispositions by non trial</b>

**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:**

1. List and describe the data source(s) for the performance measure.
2. Provide description of the methodology used to collect the data and calculate the result.
3. Provide explanation of the procedure used for measurement.

The State Attorneys use case management databases to capture information from source documents for all referrals received. New case information is entered in the system and updated, as the cases move forward, to automatically record and track the information used to compute this measure. Files are maintained for each case record along with the original source documents, allowing the database information to be verified against the source documentation. The resulting number is calculated by taking the number of non-trial dispositions and dividing by the total number of criminal case dispositions.

**Validity:**

*Provide explanation of the validity of the performance measure, including an explanation of the methodology used to determine validity and the reason such methodology was used.*

Case management systems are enhanced as needed to ensure that all necessary information is captured and can be audited for accuracy. The number reported is accurate; however, it is statistically insignificant when considered in the totality of State Attorney workload, and if reported alone, has no meaning.

**Reliability:**

*Provide explanation of the methodology used to determine reliability and the reason such methodology was used. Include a statement of the reliability of the performance measure (the extent to which the measuring procedure yields the same results on repeated trials ensuring data is complete and sufficiently error free).*

Data entered into the case management system is continually updated and monitored for accuracy. Audit reports are run on a regular basis to ensure reliability of data. The same data entered into the case management system is checked for results consistent with source documents.

---

## EXHIBIT IV – PERFORMANCE MEASURE VALIDITY AND RELIABILITY

---

<b>Department:</b>	<b>Justice Administration</b>
<b>Program:</b>	<b>State Attorneys, First - Twentieth Judicial Circuits</b>
<b>Service/Budget Entity:</b>	<b>State Attorneys, First – Twentieth Judicial Circuits</b>
<b>Measure:</b>	<b>Percent of dispositions by otherwise</b>

**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:**

1. List and describe the data source(s) for the performance measure.
2. Provide description of the methodology used to collect the data and calculate the result.
3. Provide explanation of the procedure used for measurement.

The State Attorneys use case management databases to capture information from source documents for all referrals received. New case information is entered in the system and updated, as the cases move forward, to automatically record and track the information used to compute this measure. Files are maintained for each case record along with the original source documents, allowing the database information to be verified against the source documentation. The resulting number is calculated by taking the number of other dispositions and dividing by the total number of criminal case dispositions.

**Validity:**

*Provide explanation of the validity of the performance measure, including an explanation of the methodology used to determine validity and the reason such methodology was used.*

Case management systems are enhanced as needed to ensure that all necessary information is captured and can be audited for accuracy. The number reported is accurate; however, it is statistically insignificant when considered in the totality of State Attorney workload, and if reported alone, has no meaning.

**Reliability:**

*Provide explanation of the methodology used to determine reliability and the reason such methodology was used. Include a statement of the reliability of the performance measure (the extent to which the measuring procedure yields the same results on repeated trials ensuring data is complete and sufficiently error free).*

Data entered into the case management system is continually updated and monitored for accuracy. Audit reports are run on a regular basis to ensure reliability of data. The same data entered into the case management system is checked for results consistent with source documents.

---

## EXHIBIT IV – PERFORMANCE MEASURE VALIDITY AND RELIABILITY

---

<b>Department:</b>	<b>Justice Administration</b>
<b>Program:</b>	<b>State Attorneys, First – Twentieth Judicial Circuits</b>
<b>Service/Budget Entity:</b>	<b>State Attorneys, First - Twentieth Judicial Circuits</b>
<b>Measure:</b>	<b>Number of substantiated Bar grievances filed annually</b>

**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:**

1. List and describe the data source(s) for the performance measure.
2. Provide description of the methodology used to collect the data and calculate the result.
3. Provide explanation of the procedure used for measurement.

The data source for this measure is the Florida Bar. When documentation is received from the Florida Bar it is recorded on programmed reports. The grievances are counted when the Assistant State Attorney receives a public sanction.

**Validity:**

*Provide explanation of the validity of the performance measure, including an explanation of the methodology used to determine validity and the reason such methodology was used.*

This measure is not a valid measure. There have been no publicly sanctioned Assistant State Attorneys since the inception of this measure. Therefore, it is statistically insignificant. The measuring instrument is not appropriate in relation to the purpose for which it is being used.

**Reliability:**

*Provide explanation of the methodology used to determine reliability and the reason such methodology was used. Include a statement of the reliability of the performance measure (the extent to which the measuring procedure yields the same results on repeated trials ensuring data is complete and sufficiently error free).*

Manual receipt and notification with documentation from the Florida Bar. Reliability is established through documentation from the Florida Bar and the public sanction.



---

## EXHIBIT IV – PERFORMANCE MEASURE VALIDITY AND RELIABILITY

---

**Department:** Justice Administration  
**Program:** State Attorneys, First – Twentieth Judicial Circuits  
**Service/Budget Entity:** State Attorneys, First – Twentieth Judicial Circuits  
**Measure:** Number of misdemeanor criminal case referrals

**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:**

1. List and describe the data source(s) for the performance measure.
2. Provide description of the methodology used to collect the data and calculate the result.
3. Provide explanation of the procedure used for measurement.

The State Attorneys use case management databases to capture information from source documents for all referrals received. New case information is entered in the system and is updated to automatically record the information used to compute this measure. Files are maintained for each case record along with the original source documents, allowing the database information to be verified against the source documentation. The number of misdemeanor criminal case referrals is derived from the total number recorded in the case management system.

**Validity:**

*Provide explanation of the validity of the performance measure, including an explanation of the methodology used to determine validity and the reason such methodology was used.*

Case management systems are enhanced as needed to ensure that all necessary information is captured and can be audited for accuracy. The number reported is accurate and reflects the workload of the State Attorney for misdemeanor case referrals.

**Reliability:**

*Provide explanation of the methodology used to determine reliability and the reason such methodology was used. Include a statement of the reliability of the performance measure (the extent to which the measuring procedure yields the same results on repeated trials ensuring data is complete and sufficiently error free).*

Data entered into the case management system is continually updated and monitored for accuracy. Audit reports are run on a regular basis to ensure reliability of data. The same data entered into the case management system is checked for results consistent with source documents.

---

## EXHIBIT IV – PERFORMANCE MEASURE VALIDITY AND RELIABILITY

---

<b>Department:</b>	<b>Justice Administration</b>
<b>Program:</b>	<b>State Attorneys, First – Twentieth Judicial Circuits</b>
<b>Service/Budget Entity:</b>	<b>State Attorneys, First – Twentieth Judicial Circuits</b>
<b>Measure:</b>	<b>Number of felony criminal case referrals</b>

**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:**

1. List and describe the data source(s) for the performance measure.
2. Provide description of the methodology used to collect the data and calculate the result.
3. Provide explanation of the procedure used for measurement.

The State Attorneys use case management databases to capture information from source documents for all referrals received. New case information is entered in the system and is updated to automatically record the information used to compute this measure. Files are maintained for each case record along with the original source documents, allowing the database information to be verified against the source documentation. The number of felony criminal case referrals is derived from the total number recorded in the case management system.

**Validity:**

*Provide explanation of the validity of the performance measure, including an explanation of the methodology used to determine validity and the reason such methodology was used.*

Case management systems are enhanced as needed to ensure that all necessary information is captured and can be audited for accuracy. The number reported is accurate and reflects the workload of the State Attorney for felony case referrals.

**Reliability:**

*Provide explanation of the methodology used to determine reliability and the reason such methodology was used. Include a statement of the reliability of the performance measure (the extent to which the measuring procedure yields the same results on repeated trials ensuring data is complete and sufficiently error free).*

Data entered into the case management system is continually updated and monitored for accuracy. Audit reports are run on a regular basis to ensure reliability of data. The same data entered into the case management system is checked for results consistent with source documents.

---

## EXHIBIT IV – PERFORMANCE MEASURE VALIDITY AND RELIABILITY

---

<b>Department:</b>	<b>Justice Administration</b>
<b>Program:</b>	<b>State Attorneys, First - Twentieth Judicial Circuits</b>
<b>Service/Budget Entity:</b>	<b>State Attorneys, First – Twentieth Judicial Circuits</b>
<b>Measure:</b>	<b>Number of juvenile criminal case referrals</b>

**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:**

1. List and describe the data source(s) for the performance measure.
2. Provide description of the methodology used to collect the data and calculate the result.
3. Provide explanation of the procedure used for measurement.

The State Attorneys use case management databases to capture information from source documents for all referrals received. New case information is entered in the system and is updated to automatically record the information used to compute this measure. Files are maintained for each case record along with the original source documents, allowing the database information to be verified against the source documentation. The number of juvenile criminal case referrals is derived from the total number recorded in the case management system.

**Validity:**

*Provide explanation of the validity of the performance measure, including an explanation of the methodology used to determine validity and the reason such methodology was used.*

Case management systems are enhanced as needed to ensure that all necessary information is captured and can be audited for accuracy. The number reported is accurate and reflects the workload of the State Attorney for juvenile case referrals.

**Reliability:**

*Provide explanation of the methodology used to determine reliability and the reason such methodology was used. Include a statement of the reliability of the performance measure (the extent to which the measuring procedure yields the same results on repeated trials ensuring data is complete and sufficiently error free).*

Data entered into the case management system is continually updated and monitored for accuracy. Audit reports are run on a regular basis to ensure reliability of data. The same data entered into the case management system is checked for results consistent with source documents.

---

## EXHIBIT IV – PERFORMANCE MEASURE VALIDITY AND RELIABILITY

---

<b>Department:</b>	<b>Justice Administration</b>
<b>Program:</b>	<b>State Attorneys, First – Twentieth Judicial Circuits</b>
<b>Service/Budget Entity:</b>	<b>State Attorneys, First – Twentieth Judicial Circuits</b>
<b>Measure:</b>	<b>Number of misdemeanor filings</b>

**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:**

1. List and describe the data source(s) for the performance measure.
2. Provide description of the methodology used to collect the data and calculate the result.
3. Provide explanation of the procedure used for measurement.

The State Attorneys use case management databases to capture information from source documents for all referrals received. New case information is entered in the system and updated, as the cases move forward, to automatically record and track the information used to compute this measure. Files are maintained for each case record along with the original source documents, allowing the database information to be verified against the source documentation. The number of misdemeanor filings is derived from the total number recorded in the case management system.

**Validity:**

*Provide explanation of the validity of the performance measure, including an explanation of the methodology used to determine validity and the reason such methodology was used.*

This measure is not considered a valid measure. It cannot be uniformly applied to all circuits. What the measure may reflect in one circuit may not be the same in another in that it cannot reflect local considerations. It is not a meaningful point of comparison. Thus, its applicability is suspect.

**Reliability:**

*Provide explanation of the methodology used to determine reliability and the reason such methodology was used. Include a statement of the reliability of the performance measure (the extent to which the measuring procedure yields the same results on repeated trials ensuring data is complete and sufficiently error free).*

While the measure is not considered valid, the data presented is reliable in the sense that it is accurate, it can be replicated, and it can be reconciled to source documents.

---

## EXHIBIT IV – PERFORMANCE MEASURE VALIDITY AND RELIABILITY

---

**Department:** Justice Administration  
**Program:** State Attorneys, First – Twentieth Judicial Circuits  
**Service/Budget Entity:** State Attorneys, First – Twentieth Judicial Circuits  
**Measure:** Number of felony filings

**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:**

1. List and describe the data source(s) for the performance measure.
2. Provide description of the methodology used to collect the data and calculate the result.
3. Provide explanation of the procedure used for measurement.

The State Attorneys use case management databases to capture information from source documents for all referrals received. New case information is entered in the system and updated, as the cases move forward, to automatically record and track the information used to compute this measure. Files are maintained for each case record along with the original source documents, allowing the database information to be verified against the source documentation. The number of felony filings is derived from the total number recorded in the case management system.

**Validity:**

*Provide explanation of the validity of the performance measure, including an explanation of the methodology used to determine validity and the reason such methodology was used.*

This measure is not considered a valid measure. It cannot be uniformly applied to all circuits. What the measure may reflect in one circuit may not be the same in another in that it cannot reflect local considerations. It is not a meaningful point of comparison. Thus, its applicability is suspect.

**Reliability:**

*Provide explanation of the methodology used to determine reliability and the reason such methodology was used. Include a statement of the reliability of the performance measure (the extent to which the measuring procedure yields the same results on repeated trials ensuring data is complete and sufficiently error free).*

While the measure is not considered valid, the data presented is reliable in the sense that it is accurate, it can be replicated, and it can be reconciled to source documents.

---

## EXHIBIT IV – PERFORMANCE MEASURE VALIDITY AND RELIABILITY

---

**Department:** Justice Administration  
**Program:** State Attorneys, First - Twentieth Judicial Circuits  
**Service/Budget Entity:** State Attorneys, First – Twentieth Judicial Circuits  
**Measure:** Number of juvenile filings

**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:**

1. List and describe the data source(s) for the performance measure.
2. Provide description of the methodology used to collect the data and calculate the result.
3. Provide explanation of the procedure used for measurement.

The State Attorneys use case management databases to capture information from source documents for all referrals received. New case information is entered in the system and updated, as the cases move forward, to automatically record and track the information used to compute this measure. Files are maintained for each case record along with the original source documents, allowing the database information to be verified against the source documentation. The number of juvenile filings is derived from the total number recorded in the case management system.

**Validity:**

*Provide explanation of the validity of the performance measure, including an explanation of the methodology used to determine validity and the reason such methodology was used.*

This measure is not considered a valid measure. It cannot be uniformly applied to all circuits. What the measure may reflect in one circuit may not be the same in another in that it cannot reflect local considerations. It is not a meaningful point of comparison. Thus, its applicability is suspect.

**Reliability:**

*Provide explanation of the methodology used to determine reliability and the reason such methodology was used. Include a statement of the reliability of the performance measure (the extent to which the measuring procedure yields the same results on repeated trials ensuring data is complete and sufficiently error free).*

While the measure is not considered valid, the data presented is reliable in the sense that it is accurate, it can be replicated, and it can be reconciled to source documents.

---

## EXHIBIT IV – PERFORMANCE MEASURE VALIDITY AND RELIABILITY

---

<b>Department:</b>	<b>Justice Administration</b>
<b>Program:</b>	<b>State Attorneys, First – Twentieth Judicial Circuits</b>
<b>Service/Budget Entity:</b>	<b>State Attorneys, First – Twentieth Judicial Circuits</b>
<b>Measure:</b>	<b>Number of post conviction relief responses or Habeas Corpus responses</b>

**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:**

1. List and describe the data source(s) for the performance measure.
2. Provide description of the methodology used to collect the data and calculate the result.
3. Provide explanation of the procedure used for measurement.

The State Attorneys use case management databases to capture information from source documents for all referrals received. New case information is entered in the system and updated, as the cases move forward, to automatically record and track the information used to compute this measure. Files are maintained for each case record along with the original source documents, allowing the database information to be verified against the source documentation. The number of post conviction relief responses is derived from the total number recorded in the case management system.

**Validity:**

*Provide explanation of the validity of the performance measure, including an explanation of the methodology used to determine validity and the reason such methodology was used.*

Case management systems are enhanced as needed to ensure that all necessary information is captured and can be audited for accuracy. The number reported is accurate, however, it is statistically insignificant when considered in the totality of State Attorney workload and if reported alone, has no meaning. This measure should be eliminated as the numbers are captured in cases referred, which better reflect the State Attorney workload.

**Reliability:**

*Provide explanation of the methodology used to determine reliability and the reason such methodology was used. Include a statement of the reliability of the performance measure (the extent to which the measuring procedure yields the same results on repeated trials ensuring data is complete and sufficiently error free).*

Data entered into the case management system is continually updated and monitored for accuracy. Audit reports are run on a regular basis to ensure reliability of data. The same data entered into the case management system is checked for results consistent with source documents.

---

## EXHIBIT IV – PERFORMANCE MEASURE VALIDITY AND RELIABILITY

---

<b>Department:</b>	<b>Justice Administration</b>
<b>Program:</b>	<b>State Attorneys, First - Twentieth Judicial Circuits</b>
<b>Service/Budget Entity:</b>	<b>State Attorneys, First – Twentieth Judicial Circuits</b>
<b>Measure:</b>	<b>Number of sexual predator civil commitment proceedings</b>

**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:**

1. List and describe the data source(s) for the performance measure.
2. Provide description of the methodology used to collect the data and calculate the result.
3. Provide explanation of the procedure used for measurement.

Case management systems capture data relating to referrals from the Department of Corrections which possibly meet the criteria for civil commitment. Information is received and entered into the case management database on an on-going basis throughout the life of the case. The number of cases handled is derived from the total number recorded in the case management system.

**Validity:**

*Provide explanation of the validity of the performance measure, including an explanation of the methodology used to determine validity and the reason such methodology was used.*

Case management systems are enhanced as needed to ensure that all necessary information is captured and can be audited for accuracy. The number reported is accurate, however, it is statistically insignificant when considered in the totality of State Attorney workload and if reported alone, has no meaning.

**Reliability:**

*Provide explanation of the methodology used to determine reliability and the reason such methodology was used. Include a statement of the reliability of the performance measure (the extent to which the measuring procedure yields the same results on repeated trials ensuring data is complete and sufficiently error free).*

Data entered into the case management system is continually updated and monitored for accuracy. Audit reports are run on a regular basis to ensure reliability of data. The same data entered into the case management system is checked for results consistent with source documents.



---

## EXHIBIT IV – PERFORMANCE MEASURE VALIDITY AND RELIABILITY

---

<b>Department:</b>	<b>Justice Administration</b>
<b>Program:</b>	<b>State Attorneys, First – Twentieth Judicial Circuits</b>
<b>Service/Budget Entity:</b>	<b>State Attorneys, First – Twentieth Judicial Circuits</b>
<b>Measure:</b>	<b>Number of Baker Act hearings</b>

**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:**

1. List and describe the data source(s) for the performance measure.
2. Provide description of the methodology used to collect the data and calculate the result.
3. Provide explanation of the procedure used for measurement.

The State Attorneys use case management databases to capture information from source documents for all referrals received. New case information is entered in the system and updated, as the cases move forward, to automatically record and track the information used to compute this measure. Files are maintained for each case record along with the original source documents, allowing the database information to be verified against the source documentation. The number of Baker Act hearings is derived from the total number recorded in the case management system.

**Validity:**

*Provide explanation of the validity of the performance measure, including an explanation of the methodology used to determine validity and the reason such methodology was used.*

Case management systems are enhanced as needed to ensure that all necessary information is captured and can be audited for accuracy. The number reported is accurate, however, it is statistically insignificant when considered in the totality of State Attorney workload and if reported alone, has no meaning.

**Reliability:**

*Provide explanation of the methodology used to determine reliability and the reason such methodology was used. Include a statement of the reliability of the performance measure (the extent to which the measuring procedure yields the same results on repeated trials ensuring data is complete and sufficiently error free).*

Data entered into the case management system is continually updated and monitored for accuracy. Audit reports are run on a regular basis to ensure reliability of data. The same data entered into the case management system is checked for results consistent with source documents.

---

**EXHIBIT IV – PERFORMANCE MEASURE VALIDITY AND  
RELIABILITY**

---

**Department:** \_\_\_\_\_ **Justice Administration** \_\_\_\_\_

**Program:** \_\_\_\_\_ **Public Defenders** \_\_\_\_\_

**Service/Budget Entity:** \_\_\_\_\_ **Public Defenders** \_\_\_\_\_

**Measure:** **Percent of Public Defender Clients in Custody Contacted Within 72  
Hours After Appointment**

**Action** (check one):

- Requesting revision to approved performance measure.
- Change in data sources or measurement methodologies.
- Requesting new measure.
- Backup for performance measure nor previously approved or for which validity, reliability and/or methodology information has not been provided.

**Data Sources and Methodology:**

Each Public Defender Office has a different method of collecting data and caseload numbers. The Florida Public Defender Coordination Office is the data collection point for Public Defenders to submit all the collected data. The data is compiled and reviewed and sent back to each Public Defender office to proof for accuracy. The Florida Public Defender Association (FPDA) has a standing committee charged with developing standards and implementation practices for data collection. As of yet, there is no officially adopted methodology for the association to review the accuracy of the data.

**Validity:** Quality assurance for each office’s data input and reporting has been a priority of the FPDA this past year in order to provide accurate information for all stakeholders.

**Reliability:** Seven years of looking at the compiled data, there is very little variation by year by each circuit.

---

**EXHIBIT IV – PERFORMANCE MEASURE VALIDITY AND  
RELIABILITY**

---

**Department:** \_\_\_\_\_ **Justice Administration** \_\_\_\_\_

**Program:** \_\_\_\_\_ **Public Defenders** \_\_\_\_\_

**Service/Budget Entity:** \_\_\_\_\_ **Public Defenders** \_\_\_\_\_

**Measure: Percent of felony and misdemeanor cases resolved within speedy trial rule unless dismissed**

**Action** (check one):

- Requesting revision to approved performance measure.
- Change in data sources or measurement methodologies.
- Requesting new measure.
- Backup for performance measure nor previously approved or for which validity, reliability and/or methodology information has not been provided.

**Data Sources and Methodology:**

Each Public Defender Office has a different method of collecting data and caseload numbers. The Florida Public Defender Coordination Office is the data collection point for Public Defenders to submit all the collected data. The data is compiled and reviewed and sent back to each Public Defender office to proof for accuracy. The Florida Public Defender Association (FPDA) has a standing committee charged with developing standards and implementation practices for data collection. As of yet, there is no officially adopted methodology for the association to review the accuracy of the data.

**Validity:** Quality assurance for each office’s data input and reporting has been a priority of the FPDA this past year in order to provide accurate information for all stakeholders.

**Reliability:** Seven years of looking at the compiled data, there is very little variation by year by each circuit.

---

**EXHIBIT IV – PERFORMANCE MEASURE VALIDITY AND  
RELIABILITY**

---

**Department:** \_\_\_\_\_ **Justice Administration** \_\_\_\_\_  
**Program:** \_\_\_\_\_ **Public Defenders** \_\_\_\_\_  
**Service/Budget Entity:** \_\_\_\_\_ **Public Defenders** \_\_\_\_\_  
**Measure:** **Number of substantiated Bar grievances filed annually**

**Action** (check one):

- Requesting revision to approved performance measure.
- Change in data sources or measurement methodologies.
- Requesting new measure.
- Backup for performance measure nor previously approved or for which validity, reliability and/or methodology information has not been provided.

**Data Sources and Methodology:**

Each Public Defender Office has a different method of collecting data and caseload numbers. The Florida Public Defender Coordination Office is the data collection point for Public Defenders to submit all the collected data. The data is compiled and reviewed and sent back to each Public Defender office to proof for accuracy. The Florida Public Defender Association (FPDA) has a standing committee charged with developing standards and implementation practices for data collection. As of yet, there is no officially adopted methodology for the association to review the accuracy of the data.

**Validity:** Quality assurance for each office’s data input and reporting has been a priority of the FPDA this past year in order to provide accurate information for all stakeholders.

**Reliability:** Seven years of looking at the compiled data, there is very little variation by year by each circuit.

---

**EXHIBIT IV – PERFORMANCE MEASURE VALIDITY AND  
RELIABILITY**

---

**Department:** \_\_\_\_\_ Justice Administration \_\_\_\_\_  
**Program:** \_\_\_\_\_ Public Defenders \_\_\_\_\_  
**Service/Budget Entity:** \_\_\_\_\_ Public Defenders \_\_\_\_\_  
**Measure:** **Number of appointed cases**

**Action** (check one):

- Requesting revision to approved performance measure.
- Change in data sources or measurement methodologies.
- Requesting new measure.
- Backup for performance measure nor previously approved or for which validity, reliability and/or methodology information has not been provided.

**Data Sources and Methodology:**

Each Public Defender Office has a different method of collecting data and caseload numbers. The Florida Public Defender Coordination Office is the data collection point for Public Defenders to submit all the collected data. The data is compiled and reviewed and sent back to each Public Defender office to proof for accuracy. The Florida Public Defender Association (FPDA) has a standing committee charged with developing standards and implementation practices for data collection. As of yet, there is no officially adopted methodology for the association to review the accuracy of the data.

**Validity:** : Quality assurance for each office’s data input and reporting has been a priority of the FPDA this past year in order to provide accurate information for all stakeholders.

**Reliability:** Seven years of looking at the compiled data, there is very little variation by year by each circuit.

---

**EXHIBIT IV – PERFORMANCE MEASURE VALIDITY AND  
RELIABILITY**

---

**Department:** \_\_\_\_\_ **Justice Administration** \_\_\_\_\_  
**Program:** \_\_\_\_\_ **Public Defenders** \_\_\_\_\_  
**Service/Budget Entity:** \_\_\_\_\_ **Public Defenders** \_\_\_\_\_  
**Measure:** **Number of criminal cases closed**

**Action** (check one):

- Requesting revision to approved performance measure.
- Change in data sources or measurement methodologies.
- Requesting new measure.
- Backup for performance measure nor previously approved or for which validity, reliability and/or methodology information has not been provided.

**Data Sources and Methodology:**

Each Public Defender Office has a different method of collecting data and caseload numbers. The Florida Public Defender Coordination Office is the data collection point for Public Defenders to submit all the collected data. The data is compiled and reviewed and sent back to each Public Defender office to proof for accuracy. The Florida Public Defender Association (FPDA) has a standing committee charged with developing standards and implementation practices for data collection. As of yet, there is no officially adopted methodology for the association to review the accuracy of the data.

**Validity:** : Quality assurance for each office's data input and reporting has been a priority of the FPDA this past year in order to provide accurate information for all stakeholders.

**Reliability:** Seven years of looking at the compiled data, there is very little variation by year by each circuit.

---

## EXHIBIT IV – PERFORMANCE MEASURE VALIDITY AND RELIABILITY

---

**Department:** \_\_\_\_\_ Justice Administration \_\_\_\_\_  
**Program:** \_\_\_\_\_ Public Defenders \_\_\_\_\_  
**Service/Budget Entity:** \_\_\_\_\_ Public Defenders \_\_\_\_\_  
**Measure:** **Number of civil cases closed**

**Action** (check one):

- Requesting revision to approved performance measure.
- Change in data sources or measurement methodologies.
- Requesting new measure.
- Backup for performance measure nor previously approved or for which validity, reliability and/or methodology information has not been provided.

**Data Sources and Methodology:**

Each Public Defender Office has a different method of collecting data and caseload numbers. The Florida Public Defender Coordination Office is the data collection point for Public Defender to submit all the collected data. The data is compiled and reviewed and sent back to each Public Defender office to proof for accuracy. The Florida Public Defender Association (FPDA) has a standing committee charged with developing standards and implementation practices for data collection. As of yet, there is no officially adopted methodology for the association to review the accuracy of the data.

**Validity:** : Quality assurance for each office’s data input and reporting has been a priority of the FPDA this past year in order to provide accurate information for all stakeholders.

**Reliability:** Seven years of looking at the compiled data, there is very little variation by year by each circuit.

---

**EXHIBIT IV – PERFORMANCE MEASURE VALIDITY AND  
RELIABILITY**

---

**Department:** \_\_\_\_\_ Justice Administration \_\_\_\_\_  
**Program:** \_\_\_\_\_ Public Defenders \_\_\_\_\_  
**Service/Budget Entity:** \_\_\_\_\_ Public Defenders \_\_\_\_\_  
**Measure:** **Number of cases nolle processed or dismissed**

**Action** (check one):

- Requesting revision to approved performance measure.
- Change in data sources or measurement methodologies.
- Requesting new measure.
- Backup for performance measure nor previously approved or for which validity, reliability and/or methodology information has not been provided.

**Data Sources and Methodology:**

Each Public Defender Office has a different method of collecting data and caseload numbers. The Florida Public Defender Coordination Office is the data collection point for Public Defenders to submit all the collected data. The data is compiled and reviewed and sent back to each Public Defender office to proof for accuracy. The Florida Public Defender Association (FPDA) has a standing committee charged with developing standards and implementation practices for data collection. As of yet, there is no officially adopted methodology for the association to review the accuracy of the data.

**Validity:** : Quality assurance for each office’s data input and reporting has been a priority of the FPDA this past year in order to provide accurate information for all stakeholders.

**Reliability:** Seven years of looking at the compiled data, there is very little variation by year by each circuit.



---

## EXHIBIT IV – PERFORMANCE MEASURE VALIDITY AND RELIABILITY

---

**Department:** \_\_\_\_\_ Justice Administration \_\_\_\_\_  
**Program:** \_\_\_\_\_ Public Defenders \_\_\_\_\_  
**Service/Budget Entity:** \_\_\_\_\_ Public Defenders \_\_\_\_\_  
**Measure:** Number of pleas

**Action** (check one):

- Requesting revision to approved performance measure.
- Change in data sources or measurement methodologies.
- Requesting new measure.
- Backup for performance measure nor previously approved or for which validity, reliability and/or methodology information has not been provided.

**Data Sources and Methodology:**

Each Public Defender Office has a different method of collecting data and caseload numbers. The Florida Public Defender Coordination Office is the data collection point for Public Defenders to submit all the collected data. The data is compiled and reviewed and sent back to each Public Defender office to proof for accuracy. The Florida Public Defender Association (FPDA) has a standing committee charged with developing standards and implementation practices for data collection. As of yet, there is no officially adopted methodology for the association to review the accuracy of the data.

**Validity:** : Quality assurance for each office’s data input and reporting has been a priority of the FPDA this past year in order to provide accurate information for all stakeholders.

**Reliability:** Seven years of looking at the compiled data, there is very little variation by year by each circuit.

---

**EXHIBIT IV – PERFORMANCE MEASURE VALIDITY AND  
RELIABILITY**

---

**Department:** \_\_\_\_\_ Justice Administration \_\_\_\_\_  
**Program:** \_\_\_\_\_ Public Defenders \_\_\_\_\_  
**Service/Budget Entity:** \_\_\_\_\_ Public Defenders \_\_\_\_\_  
**Measure:** Number of trials

**Action** (check one):

- Requesting revision to approved performance measure.
- Change in data sources or measurement methodologies.
- Requesting new measure.
- Backup for performance measure nor previously approved or for which validity, reliability and/or methodology information has not been provided.

**Data Sources and Methodology:**

Each Public Defender Office has a different method of collecting data and caseload numbers. The Florida Public Defender Coordination Office is the data collection point for Public Defenders to submit all the collected data. The data is compiled and reviewed and sent back to each Public Defender office to proof for accuracy. The Florida Public Defender Association (FPDA) has a standing committee charged with developing standards and implementation practices for data collection. As of yet, there is no officially adopted methodology for the association to review the accuracy of the data.

**Validity:** : Quality assurance for each office’s data input and reporting has been a priority of the FPDA this past year in order to provide accurate information for all stakeholders.

**Reliability:** Seven years of looking at the compiled data, there is very little variation by year by each circuit.

---

## EXHIBIT IV – PERFORMANCE MEASURE VALIDITY AND RELIABILITY

---

**Department:** \_\_\_\_\_ Justice Administration \_\_\_\_\_  
**Program:** \_\_\_\_\_ Public Defenders \_\_\_\_\_  
**Service/Budget Entity:** \_\_\_\_\_ Public Defenders \_\_\_\_\_  
**Measure:** Number of clients represented

**Action** (check one):

- Requesting revision to approved performance measure.
- Change in data sources or measurement methodologies.
- Requesting new measure.
- Backup for performance measure nor previously approved or for which validity, reliability and/or methodology information has not been provided.

**Data Sources and Methodology:**

Each Public Defender Office has a different method of collecting data and caseload numbers. The Florida Public Defender Coordination Office is the data collection point for Public Defenders to submit all the collected data. The data is compiled and reviewed and sent back to each Public Defender office to proof for accuracy. The Florida Public Defender Association (FPDA) has a standing committee charged with developing standards and implementation practices for data collection. As of yet, there is no officially adopted methodology for the association to review the accuracy of the data.

**Validity:** : Quality assurance for each office's data input and reporting has been a priority of the FPDA this past year in order to provide accurate information for all stakeholders.

**Reliability:** Seven years of looking at the compiled data, there is very little variation by year by each circuit.

---

**EXHIBIT IV – PERFORMANCE MEASURE VALIDITY AND  
RELIABILITY**

---

**Department:** \_\_\_\_\_ **Justice Administration** \_\_\_\_\_  
**Program:** \_\_\_\_\_ **Public Defenders** \_\_\_\_\_  
**Service/Budget Entity:** \_\_\_\_\_ **Public Defenders** \_\_\_\_\_  
**Measure:** **Number of contested violation of probation hearings**

**Action** (check one):

- Requesting revision to approved performance measure.
- Change in data sources or measurement methodologies.
- Requesting new measure.
- Backup for performance measure nor previously approved or for which validity, reliability and/or methodology information has not been provided.

**Data Sources and Methodology:**

Each Public Defender Office has a different method of collecting data and caseload numbers. The Florida Public Defender Coordination Office is the data collection point for Public Defenders to submit all the collected data. The data is compiled and reviewed and sent back to each Public Defender office to proof for accuracy. The Florida Public Defender Association (FPDA) has a standing committee charged with developing standards and implementation practices for data collection. As of yet, there is no officially adopted methodology for the association to review the accuracy of the data.

**Validity:** : Quality assurance for each office’s data input and reporting has been a priority of the FPDA this past year in order to provide accurate information for all stakeholders.

**Reliability:** Seven years of looking at the compiled data, there is very little variation by year by each circuit.

---

**EXHIBIT IV – PERFORMANCE MEASURE VALIDITY AND  
RELIABILITY**

---

**Department:** \_\_\_\_\_ **Justice Administration** \_\_\_\_\_

**Program:** \_\_\_\_\_ **Public Defenders** \_\_\_\_\_

**Service/Budget Entity:** \_\_\_\_\_ **Public Defenders** \_\_\_\_\_

**Measure:** **Number of initial interviews for assigned cases held for initial apointment**

**Action** (check one):

- Requesting revision to approved performance measure.
- Change in data sources or measurement methodologies.
- Requesting new measure.
- Backup for performance measure nor previously approved or for which validity, reliability and/or methodology information has not been provided.

**Data Sources and Methodology:**

Each Public Defender Office has a different method of collecting data and caseload numbers. The Florida Public Defender Coordination Office is the data collection point for Public Defenders to submit all the collected data. The data is compiled and reviewed and sent back to each Public Defender office to proof for accuracy. The Florida Public Defender Association (FPDA) has a standing committee charged with developing standards and implementation practices for data collection. As of yet, there is no officially adopted methodology for the association to review the accuracy of the data.

**Validity:** : Quality assurance for each office’s data input and reporting has been a priority of the FPDA this past year in order to provide accurate information for all stakeholders.

**Reliability:** Seven years of looking at the compiled data, there is very little variation by year by each circuit.

---

**EXHIBIT IV – PERFORMANCE MEASURE VALIDITY AND  
RELIABILITY**

---

**Department:** \_\_\_\_\_ **Justice Administration** \_\_\_\_\_  
**Program:** \_\_\_\_\_ **Public Defender, Appellate** \_\_\_\_\_  
**Service/Budget Entity:** \_\_\_\_\_ **Public Defender, Appellate** \_\_\_\_\_  
**Measure:** **Percent of appeals resolved**

**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:**

Each Public Defender Office has a different method of collecting data and caseload numbers. The Florida Public Defender Coordination Office is the data collection point for Public Defenders to submit all the collected data. The data is compiled and reviewed and sent back to each Public Defender office to proof for accuracy. The Florida Public Defender Association has a standing committee charged with developing standards and implementation practices for data collection. As of yet, there is no officially adopted methodology for the association to review the accuracy of the data.

**Validity:** Only as good as the data is input in each office.

**Reliability:** Seven years of looking at the compiled data, there is very little variation by year by each circuit.

---

**EXHIBIT IV – PERFORMANCE MEASURE VALIDITY AND  
RELIABILITY**

---

**Department:** \_\_\_\_\_ **Justice Administration** \_\_\_\_\_  
**Program:** \_\_\_\_\_ **Public Defender, Appellate** \_\_\_\_\_  
**Service/Budget Entity:** \_\_\_\_\_ **Public Defender, Appellate** \_\_\_\_\_  
**Measure:** **Number of substantiated Bar grievances filed annually**

**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:**

Each Public Defender Office has a different method of collecting data and caseload numbers. The Florida Public Defender Coordination Office is the data collection point for Public Defenders to submit all the collected data. The data is compiled and reviewed and sent back to each Public Defender office to proof for accuracy. The Florida Public Defender Association has a standing committee charged with developing standards and implementation practices for data collection. As of yet, there is no officially adopted methodology for the association to review the accuracy of the data.

**Validity:** Only as good as the data is input in each office.

**Reliability:** Seven years of looking at the compiled data, there is very little variation by year by each circuit.

---

**EXHIBIT IV – PERFORMANCE MEASURE VALIDITY AND  
RELIABILITY**

---

**Department:** \_\_\_\_\_ **Justice Administration** \_\_\_\_\_  
**Program:** \_\_\_\_\_ **Public Defender, Appellate** \_\_\_\_\_  
**Service/Budget Entity:** \_\_\_\_\_ **Public Defender, Appellate** \_\_\_\_\_  
**Measure:** **Number of appointed cases**

**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:**

Each Public Defender Office has a different method of collecting data and caseload numbers. The Florida Public Defender Coordination Office is the data collection point for Public Defenders to submit all the collected data. The data is compiled and reviewed and sent back to each Public Defender office to proof for accuracy. The Florida Public Defender Association has a standing committee charged with developing standards and implementation practices for data collection. As of yet, there is no officially adopted methodology for the association to review the accuracy of the data.

**Validity:** Only as good as the data is input in each office.

**Reliability:** Seven years of looking at the compiled data, there is very little variation by year by each circuit.



---

**EXHIBIT IV – PERFORMANCE MEASURE VALIDITY AND  
RELIABILITY**

---

**Department:** \_\_\_\_\_ **Justice Administration** \_\_\_\_\_  
**Program:** \_\_\_\_\_ **Public Defender, Appellate** \_\_\_\_\_  
**Service/Budget Entity:** \_\_\_\_\_ **Public Defender, Appellate** \_\_\_\_\_  
**Measure:** **Number of clients represented**

**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:**

Each Public Defender Office has a different method of collecting data and caseload numbers. The Florida Public Defender Coordination Office is the data collection point for Public Defenders to submit all the collected data. The data is compiled and reviewed and sent back to each Public Defender office to proof for accuracy. The Florida Public Defender Association has a standing committee charged with developing standards and implementation practices for data collection. As of yet, there is no officially adopted methodology for the association to review the accuracy of the data.

**Validity:** Only as good as the data is input in each office.

**Reliability:** Seven years of looking at the compiled data, there is very little variation by year by each circuit.

---

**EXHIBIT IV – PERFORMANCE MEASURE VALIDITY AND  
RELIABILITY**

---

**Department:** \_\_\_\_\_ **Justice Administration** \_\_\_\_\_  
**Program:** \_\_\_\_\_ **Public Defender, Appellate** \_\_\_\_\_  
**Service/Budget Entity:** \_\_\_\_\_ **Public Defender, Appellate** \_\_\_\_\_  
**Measure: Number of briefs filed**

**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:**

Each Public Defender Office has a different method of collecting data and caseload numbers. The Florida Public Defender Coordination Office is the data collection point for Public Defenders to submit all the collected data. The data is compiled and reviewed and sent back to each Public Defender office to proof for accuracy. The Florida Public Defender Association has a standing committee charged with developing standards and implementation practices for data collection. As of yet, there is no officially adopted methodology for the association to review the accuracy of the data.

**Validity:** Only as good as the data is input in each office.

**Reliability:** Seven years of looking at the compiled data, there is very little variation by year by each circuit.

---

**EXHIBIT IV – PERFORMANCE MEASURE VALIDITY AND  
RELIABILITY**

---

**Department:** \_\_\_\_\_ **Justice Administration** \_\_\_\_\_  
**Program:** \_\_\_\_\_ **Public Defender, Appellate** \_\_\_\_\_  
**Service/Budget Entity:** \_\_\_\_\_ **Public Defender, Appellate** \_\_\_\_\_  
**Measure:** **Number of writs filed**

**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:**

Each Public Defender Office has a different method of collecting data and caseload numbers. The Florida Public Defender Coordination Office is the data collection point for Public Defenders to submit all the collected data. The data is compiled and reviewed and sent back to each Public Defender office to proof for accuracy. The Florida Public Defender Association has a standing committee charged with developing standards and implementation practices for data collection. As of yet, there is no officially adopted methodology for the association to review the accuracy of the data.

**Validity:** Only as good as the data is input in each office.

**Reliability:** Seven years of looking at the compiled data, there is very little variation by year by each circuit.

---

**EXHIBIT IV – PERFORMANCE MEASURE VALIDITY AND  
RELIABILITY**

---

**Department:** \_\_\_\_\_ **Justice Administration** \_\_\_\_\_  
**Program:** \_\_\_\_\_ **Public Defender, Appellate** \_\_\_\_\_  
**Service/Budget Entity:** \_\_\_\_\_ **Public Defender, Appellate** \_\_\_\_\_  
**Measure:** **Number of cases closed**

**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:**

Each Public Defender Office has a different method of collecting data and caseload numbers. The Florida Public Defender Coordination Office is the data collection point for Public Defenders to submit all the collected data. The data is compiled and reviewed and sent back to each Public Defender office to proof for accuracy. The Florida Public Defender Association has a standing committee charged with developing standards and implementation practices for data collection. As of yet, there is no officially adopted methodology for the association to review the accuracy of the data.

**Validity:** Only as good as the data is input in each office.

**Reliability:** Seven years of looking at the compiled data, there is very little variation by year by each circuit.

---

**EXHIBIT IV – PERFORMANCE MEASURE VALIDITY AND  
RELIABILITY**

---

**Department:** Justice Administration  
**Program:** Capital Collateral Regional Counsels  
**Service/Budget Entity:** Capital Collateral Regional Counsels  
**Measure:** Percent of cases in which post-conviction motion, post-conviction appeal, federal habeas corpus motion or federal appeal is timely filed, without extension

**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:**

Each case file contains the time that motions and appeals were filed and the statutes indicate time standards for filing.

**Validity:**

This is important data for showing the Governor and Legislature that cases are filed on a timely basis.

**Reliability:**

CCRC case logs with this data are routinely updated by office attorneys and time of motion and appeal filing is verifiable in the court system's records.

---

**EXHIBIT IV – PERFORMANCE MEASURE VALIDITY AND  
RELIABILITY**

---

**Department:** Justice Administration  
**Program:** Capital Collateral Regional Counsels  
**Service/Budget Entity:** Capital Collateral Regional Counsels  
**Measure:** Number of substantiated Bar grievances filed annually

**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 Florida Bar and CCRC files contain all grievance related filings.

**Validity:**

This measure provides information to the Governor and Legislature related to whether a CCRC is involved in actions determined to be unprofessional.

**Reliability:**

The Florida Bar maintains highly reliable records of grievances and the CCRC would maintain any references routinely.

---

**EXHIBIT IV – PERFORMANCE MEASURE VALIDITY AND  
RELIABILITY**

---

**Department:** Justice Administration  
**Program:** Capital Collateral Regional Counsels  
**Service/Budget Entity:** Capital Collateral Regional Counsels  
**Measure:** Number of appellate actions

**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 CCRC and the court system maintain this data.

**Validity:**

This is critical to showing work effort on behalf of CCRC clients and to show case progress in the courts.

**Reliability:**

CCRC and court records are highly reliable recordings.

---

**EXHIBIT IV – PERFORMANCE MEASURE VALIDITY AND  
RELIABILITY**

---

**Department:** Justice Administration  
**Program:** Capital Collateral Regional Counsels  
**Service/Budget Entity:** Capital Collateral Regional Counsels  
**Measure:** Number of 3.850 (3.851) filings

**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:**

CCRC Attorney records clearly indicate when filings occur with the courts. Court records also are available to provide this data.

**Validity:**

This is another key workload indicator and is a major activity for which costs are analyzed.

**Reliability:**

Each attorney routinely updates task logs related to the 3.851 (changed from 3.850) filings. Court records clearly show the filings.



---

**EXHIBIT IV – PERFORMANCE MEASURE VALIDITY AND  
RELIABILITY**

---

**Department:** Justice Administration  
**Program:** Capital Collateral Regional Counsels  
**Service/Budget Entity:** Capital Collateral Regional Counsels  
**Measure:** Number of signed death warrants

**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 CCRC files of official “Death Warrant” letters and Governor’s Office files have this data.

**Validity:**

This is another work effort indicator on behalf of CCRC clients, shows case progress through the court system and is a major cost factor.

**Reliability:**

The Governor’s Office and court system are reliable sources.

---

**EXHIBIT IV – PERFORMANCE MEASURE VALIDITY AND  
RELIABILITY**

---

**Department:** Justice Administration  
**Program:** Capital Collateral Regional Counsels  
**Service/Budget Entity:** Capital Collateral Regional Counsels  
**Measure:** Number of active cases

**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:**

CCRC Attorneys record in their task logs when cases are worked which indicates how many are active.

**Validity:**

This is a key workload indicator and is a major workload measure for which costs are analyzed.

**Reliability:**

Each attorney routinely updates task logs related to the cases worked which provides a total number of cases handled during the year.

---

**EXHIBIT IV – PERFORMANCE MEASURE VALIDITY AND  
RELIABILITY**

---

**Department:** Justice Administration  
**Program:** Capital Collateral Regional Counsels  
**Service/Budget Entity:** Capital Collateral Regional Counsels  
**Measure:** Number of court decisions to release a death row inmate, grant a new trial, grant a new sentencing hearing, or grant other appeals

**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 court system maintains these decisions as does the CCRC.

**Validity:**

This measure is one indicator of whether justice is being served when the death sentence is rendered.

**Reliability:**

---

**EXHIBIT IV – PERFORMANCE MEASURE VALIDITY AND  
RELIABILITY**

---

**Department:** Justice Administration  
**Program:** Capital Collateral Regional Counsels  
**Service/Budget Entity:** Capital Collateral Regional Counsels  
**Measure:** Number of evidentiary hearings

**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 Court system maintains this data base in its official records and the CCRC also records this data in its case related data files when evidentiary hearings are conducted.**

**Validity:**

**This measure is essential to document workload levels and prepare workload related budget requests going from one year to the next.**

**Reliability:**

**The data is highly reliable due to CCRC attorneys record each evidentiary hearing conducted and the courts also can verify evidentiary hearing numbers and dates.**

---

**EXHIBIT IV – PERFORMANCE MEASURE VALIDITY AND  
RELIABILITY**

---

**Department:** Justice Administration  
**Program:** Capital Collateral Regional Counsels  
**Service/Budget Entity:** Capital Collateral Regional Counsels  
**Measure:** Number of federal court actions

**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 Court system maintains this data base in its official records and the CCRC also records this data in its case related data files when federal court actions occur.**

**Validity:**

**This measure is essential to document workload levels and prepare workload related budget requests going from one year to the next.**

**Reliability:**

**The data is highly reliable due to CCRC attorneys record each evidentiary hearing conducted and the courts also can verify court action numbers and dates.**

---

**EXHIBIT IV – PERFORMANCE MEASURE VALIDITY AND  
RELIABILITY**

---

<b>Department:</b>	<b>Justice Administration</b>
<b>Program:</b>	<b>Criminal Conflict and Civil Regional Counsels</b>
<b>Service/Budget Entity:</b>	<b>Regional Conflict Counsels, 1<sup>st</sup> – 5<sup>th</sup> Regions</b>
<b>Measure:</b>	<b>Number of non-appellate cases appointed</b>

**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 Criminal Conflict and Civil Regional Counsels record the number of non-appellate cases appointed in a case management database.

**Validity:** This performance measure produces a valid measurement of the Regional Counsels' workload as the outcome is the actual number of cases appointed to the Counsels.

**Reliability:** The data produced is reliable in that the number of cases appointed are reported accurately in the database.

---

**EXHIBIT IV – PERFORMANCE MEASURE VALIDITY AND  
RELIABILITY**

---

<b>Department:</b>	<b>Justice Administration</b>
<b>Program:</b>	<b>Criminal Conflict and Civil Regional Counsels</b>
<b>Service/Budget Entity:</b>	<b>Regional Conflict Counsels, 1<sup>st</sup> – 5<sup>th</sup> Regions</b>
<b>Measure:</b>	<b>Number of non-appellate cases open</b>

**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 Criminal Conflict and Civil Regional Counsels record the number of non-appellate cases appointed and track the progress of such cases in a case management database.

**Validity:** This performance measure produces a valid measurement of the Regional Counsels' workload as the outcome is the actual number of non-appellate cases open.

**Reliability:** The data produced is reliable in that the number of open cases are reported accurately in the database.

---

**EXHIBIT IV – PERFORMANCE MEASURE VALIDITY AND  
RELIABILITY**

---

<b>Department:</b>	<b>Justice Administration</b>
<b>Program:</b>	<b>Criminal Conflict and Civil Regional Counsels</b>
<b>Service/Budget Entity:</b>	<b>Regional Conflict Counsels, 1<sup>st</sup> – 5<sup>th</sup> Regions</b>
<b>Measure:</b>	<b>Number of non-appellate cases closed</b>

**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 Criminal Conflict and Civil Regional Counsels record the number of non-appellate cases appointed and track the progress of such cases in a case management database.

**Validity:** This performance measure produces a valid measurement of the Regional Counsels' workload as the outcome is the actual number of non-appellate cases closed.

**Reliability:** The data produced is reliable in that the number of closed cases are reported accurately in the database.



---

## EXHIBIT IV – PERFORMANCE MEASURE VALIDITY AND RELIABILITY

---

<b>Department:</b>	<b>Justice Administration</b>
<b>Program:</b>	<b>Criminal Conflict and Civil Regional Counsels</b>
<b>Service/Budget Entity:</b>	<b>Regional Conflict Counsels, 1<sup>st</sup> – 5<sup>th</sup> Regions</b>
<b>Measure:</b>	<b>Number of appellate cases appointed</b>

**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 Criminal Conflict and Civil Regional Counsels record the number of appellate cases appointed in a case management database.

**Validity:** This performance measure produces a valid measurement of the Regional Counsels' workload as the outcome is the actual number of cases appointed to the Counsels.

**Reliability:** The data produced is reliable in that the number of cases appointed are reported accurately in the database.

---

**EXHIBIT IV – PERFORMANCE MEASURE VALIDITY AND  
RELIABILITY**

---

**Department:** Justice Administration  
**Program:** Criminal Conflict and Civil Regional Counsels  
**Service/Budget Entity:** Regional Conflict Counsels, 1<sup>st</sup> – 5<sup>th</sup> Regions  
**Measure:** Number of appellate cases open

**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 Criminal Conflict and Civil Regional Counsels record the number of appellate cases appointed and track the progress of such cases in a case management database.

**Validity:** This performance measure produces a valid measurement of the Regional Counsels' workload as the outcome is the actual number of appellate cases open.

**Reliability:** The data produced is reliable in that the number of open cases are reported accurately in the database.

---

**EXHIBIT IV – PERFORMANCE MEASURE VALIDITY AND  
RELIABILITY**

---

**Department:** Justice Administration  
**Program:** Criminal Conflict and Civil Regional Counsels  
**Service/Budget Entity:** Regional Conflict Counsels, 1<sup>st</sup> – 5<sup>th</sup> Regions  
**Measure:** Number of appellate cases closed

**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 Criminal Conflict and Civil Regional Counsels record the number of appellate cases appointed and track the progress of such cases in a case management database.

**Validity:** This performance measure produces a valid measurement of the Regional Counsels' workload as the outcome is the actual number of appellate cases closed.

**Reliability:** The data produced is reliable in that the number of closed cases are reported accurately in the database.

**ASSOCIATED ACTIVITIES CONTRIBUTING TO PERFORMANCE  
MEASURES – LRPP EXHIBIT V**

**EXHIBIT V – ASSOCIATED ACTIVITIES CONTRIBUTING TO PERFORMANCE MEASURES**

Measure Number	Approved Performance Measures for FY 2009-10 (Words)		Associated Activities Title
1	Number of budget, payroll, disbursement, revenue, and financial reports processed		Executive Direction Pass Through - Due Process and Court Appointed Costs Pass Through - to DMS and DFS
2	Number of court appointed attorney and due process vendor invoices processed		Pass Through - Due Process and Court Appointed Costs
3	Number of public records requests		Executive Direction Pass Through - Due Process and Court Appointed Costs
4	Percent of invoices processed within statutory time frames		Executive Direction Pass Through - Due Process and Court Appointed Costs Pass Through - to DMS and DFS
5	Number of cases where registry lawyers request fees above statutory caps		Pass Through - Due Process and Court Appointed Costs
6	Number of cases where the court orders fees above the statutory caps		Pass Through - Due Process and Court Appointed Costs
7	Total amount of excess fees awarded by the courts per circuit		Pass Through - Due Process and Court Appointed Costs

Office of Policy and Budget – July, 2009

**EXHIBIT V – ASSOCIATED ACTIVITIES CONTRIBUTING TO PERFORMANCE MEASURES**

<b>Measure Number</b>	<b>Approved Performance Measures for FY 2009-10 (Words)</b>		<b>Associated Activities Title</b>
1	Average number of children represented		Represent children
2	Percent of cases discharged after DCF supervision is terminated		Represent children
3	Number of new volunteers certified as a GAL		Represent children
4	Average number of active volunteers		Represent children

**EXHIBIT V – ASSOCIATED ACTIVITIES CONTRIBUTING TO PERFORMANCE MEASURES**

<b>Measure Number</b>	<b>“Proposed” Performance Measures for FY 2009-10 (Words)</b>		<b>“Proposed” Associated Activity Titles</b>
1	“New Measure” - Number of Clerk Budget Requests analyzed for inclusion in the Clerks’ Legislative Budget Request plus Number of final appropriation allocations to Florida’s Clerks of the Court.		“New Activity” - Clerks Legislative Budget Request and Final Appropriation Allocations
2	“New Measure” - Number of CCOC budget analyses and related reports produced plus Trust Fund and Clerk budget related issues worked and resolved.		“New Activity” - Trust Fund and Clerks’ budget status monitoring, analysis, reporting and issues management.
3	“New Measure” - Number of education and training programs, workshops, events and other opportunities provided to Clerks’ offices during the budget year.		“New Activity” - Provide Education & Training to Clerks Offices

**EXHIBIT V – ASSOCIATED ACTIVITIES CONTRIBUTING TO PERFORMANCE MEASURES**

<b>Measure Number</b>	<b>Approved Performance Measures for FY 2009-10 (Words)</b>		<b>Associated Activity Titles (From Exhibit VI)</b>
1	Percent of offenders who qualify for enhanced sentencing for whom state attorneys requested enhanced sentencing		Felony Prosecution Services Misdemeanor Prosecution Services Juvenile Prosecution Services Child Support Enforcement Services Civil Action Services
2	Total number of dispositions		Felony Prosecution Services Misdemeanor Prosecution Services Juvenile Prosecution Services Child Support Enforcement Services Civil Action Services
3	Number of dispositions by trial verdicts		Felony Prosecution Services Misdemeanor Prosecution Services Juvenile Prosecution Services Child Support Enforcement Services Civil Action Services
4	Number of dispositions by pleas		Felony Prosecution Services Misdemeanor Prosecution Services Juvenile Prosecution Services Child Support Enforcement Services Civil Action Services
5	Number of dispositions by non trial		Felony Prosecution Services Misdemeanor Prosecution Services Juvenile Prosecution Services Child Support Enforcement Services Civil Action Services



**EXHIBIT V – ASSOCIATED ACTIVITIES CONTRIBUTING TO PERFORMANCE MEASURES**

<b>Measure Number</b>	<b>Approved Performance Measures for FY 2009-10 (Words)</b>		<b>Associated Activity Titles (From Exhibit VI)</b>
6	Number of dispositions by otherwise		Felony Prosecution Services Misdemeanor Prosecution Services Juvenile Prosecution Services Child Support Enforcement Services Civil Action Services
7	Percent of dispositions by trial verdicts		Felony Prosecution Services Misdemeanor Prosecution Services Juvenile Prosecution Services Child Support Enforcement Services Civil Action Services
8	Percent of dispositions by pleas		Felony Prosecution Services Misdemeanor Prosecution Services Juvenile Prosecution Services Child Support Enforcement Services Civil Action Services
9	Percent of dispositions by non trial		Felony Prosecution Services Misdemeanor Prosecution Services Juvenile Prosecution Services Child Support Enforcement Services Civil Action Services
10	Percent of dispositions by otherwise		Felony Prosecution Services Misdemeanor Prosecution Services Juvenile Prosecution Services Child Support Enforcement Services Civil Action Services

**EXHIBIT V – ASSOCIATED ACTIVITIES CONTRIBUTING TO PERFORMANCE MEASURES**

<b>Measure Number</b>	<b>Approved Performance Measures for FY 2009-10 (Words)</b>		<b>Associated Activity Titles (From Exhibit VI)</b>
11	Number of substantiated Bar grievances filed annually		Felony Prosecution Services Misdemeanor Prosecution Services Juvenile Prosecution Services Child Support Enforcement Services Civil Action Services
12	Number of misdemeanor criminal case referrals		Misdemeanor Prosecution Services
13	Number of felony criminal case referrals		Felony Prosecution Services
14	Number of juvenile criminal case referrals		Juvenile Prosecution Services
15	Number of misdemeanor filings		Misdemeanor Prosecution Services
16	Number of felony filings		Felony Prosecution Services
17	Number of juvenile filings		Juvenile Prosecution Services
18	Number of post conviction relief responses or Habeas Corpus responses		Felony Prosecution Services Misdemeanor Prosecution Services Juvenile Prosecution Services Child Support Enforcement Services Civil Action Services
19	Number of sexual predator civil commitment proceedings		Civil Action Services

---

**EXHIBIT V – ASSOCIATED ACTIVITIES CONTRIBUTING TO PERFORMANCE MEASURES**

---

20	Number of Baker Act hearings		Civil Action Services
----	------------------------------	--	-----------------------

**EXHIBIT V – ASSOCIATED ACTIVITIES CONTRIBUTING TO PERFORMANCE MEASURES**

<b>Measure Number</b>	<b>Approved Performance Measures for FY 2009-10 (Words)</b>		<b>Associated Activity Titles (From Exhibit VI)</b>
1	Percent of Public Defender clients in custody contacted within 72 hours after appointment		Civil Trial Indigent Defense Civil Investigative Services Criminal Trial Indigent Defense Criminal Investigative Services
2	Percent of felony and misdemeanor cases resolved within speedy trial rule unless dismissed		Civil Trial Indigent Defense Civil Investigative Services Criminal Trial Indigent Defense Criminal Investigative Services
3	Number of substantiated Bar grievances filed annually		Civil Trial Indigent Defense Civil Investigative Services Criminal Trial Indigent Defense Criminal Investigative Services
4	Number of appointed cases		Civil Trial Indigent Defense Civil Investigative Services Criminal Trial Indigent Defense Criminal Investigative Services
5	Number of criminal cases closed		Civil Trial Indigent Defense Civil Investigative Services Criminal Trial Indigent Defense Criminal Investigative Services

**EXHIBIT V – ASSOCIATED ACTIVITIES CONTRIBUTING TO PERFORMANCE MEASURES**

<b>Measure Number</b>	<b>Approved Performance Measures for FY 2009-10 (Words)</b>		<b>Associated Activity Titles (From Exhibit VI)</b>
6	Number of civil cases closed		Civil Trial Indigent Defense Civil Investigative Services Criminal Trial Indigent Defense Criminal Investigative Services
7	Number of cases nolle processed or dismissed		Civil Trial Indigent Defense Civil Investigative Services Criminal Trial Indigent Defense Criminal Investigative Services
8	Number of pleas		Civil Trial Indigent Defense Civil Investigative Services Criminal Trial Indigent Defense Criminal Investigative Services
9	Number of trials		Civil Trial Indigent Defense Civil Investigative Services Criminal Trial Indigent Defense Criminal Investigative Services
10	Number of clients represented		Civil Trial Indigent Defense Civil Investigative Services Criminal Trial Indigent Defense Criminal Investigative Services

**EXHIBIT V – ASSOCIATED ACTIVITIES CONTRIBUTING TO PERFORMANCE MEASURES**

<b>Measure Number</b>	<b>Approved Performance Measures for FY 2009-10 (Words)</b>		<b>Associated Activity Titles (From Exhibit VI)</b>
11	Number of violation of probation hearings		Civil Trial Indigent Defense Civil Investigative Services Criminal Trial Indigent Defense Criminal Investigative Services
12	Number of initial interviews for assigned cases held for initial appointment		Civil Trial Indigent Defense Civil Investigative Services Criminal Trial Indigent Defense Criminal Investigative Services

**EXHIBIT V – ASSOCIATED ACTIVITIES CONTRIBUTING TO PERFORMANCE MEASURES**

<b>Measure Number</b>	<b>Approved Performance Measures for FY 2009-10 (Words)</b>		<b>Associated Activity Titles (From Exhibit VI)</b>
1	Percent of appeals resolved		Indigent Appellate Defense
2	Number of substantiated Bar grievances filed annually		Indigent Appellate Defense
3	Number of appointed cases		Indigent Appellate Defense
4	Number of clients represented		Indigent Appellate Defense
5	Number of briefs filed		Indigent Appellate Defense
6	Number of writs filed		Indigent Appellate Defense
7	Number of cases closed		Indigent Appellate Defense

**EXHIBIT V – ASSOCIATED ACTIVITIES CONTRIBUTING TO PERFORMANCE MEASURES**

<b>Measure Number</b>	<b>Approved Performance Measures for FY 2009-10 (Words)</b>		<b>Associated Activities Title</b>
1	Percent of cases in which post-conviction motion, post-conviction appeal, federal habeas corpus motion or federal appeal is timely filed, without extension		Death Penalty Legal Counsel
			Death Row Case Preparation
2	Number of substantiated Bar grievances filed annually		Death Penalty Legal Counsel
3	Number of appellate actions		Death Penalty Legal Counsel
			Death Row Case Preparation
4	Number of 3.850/3.851 filings		Death Penalty Legal Counsel
			Death Row Case Preparation
5	Number of signed death warrants		Death Penalty Legal Counsel
			Death Row Case Preparation
6	Number of court decisions to release a death row inmate, grant a new trial, grant a new sentencing hearing, or grant other appeals		Death Penalty Legal Counsel
			Death Row Case Preparation
7	Number of active cases		Death Penalty Legal Counsel
			Death Row Case Preparation
8	Number of evidentiary hearings		Death Penalty Legal Counsel
			Death Row Case Preparation
9	Number of federal court actions		Death Penalty Legal Counsel
			Death Row Case Preparation



**EXHIBIT V – ASSOCIATED ACTIVITIES CONTRIBUTING TO PERFORMANCE MEASURES**

<b>Measure Number</b>	<b>“Proposed” Performance Measures for FY 2009-10 (Words)</b>		<b>Approved Associated Activity Titles (From Exhibit VI)</b>
1	“New Measure” – Number of non-appellate cases appointed		Regional Counsel Workload
2	“New Measure” – Number of non-appellate cases open		Regional Counsel Workload
3	“New Measure” – Number of non-appellate cases closed		Regional Counsel Workload
4	“New Measure” – Number of appellate cases appointed		Regional Counsel Workload
5	“New Measure” – Number of appellate cases open		Regional Counsel Workload
6	“New Measure” – Number of appellate cases closed		Regional Counsel Workload



---

## 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.

**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.

**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.

**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.

**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.

**Judicial Branch:** All officers, employees, and offices of the Supreme Court, district courts of appeal, circuit courts, county courts, and the Judicial Qualifications Commission.

**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.

---

## GLOSSARY OF TERMS AND ACRONYMS

---

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.

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.

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.

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.

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.

Pass Through: Funds the state distributes directly to other entities, e.g., local governments, without being managed by the agency distributing the funds. These funds flow through the agency's budget; however, the agency has no discretion regarding how the funds are spent, and the activities (outputs) associated with the expenditure of funds are not measured at the state level. ***NOTE: This definition of "pass through" applies ONLY for the purposes of long-range program planning.***

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

---

## GLOSSARY OF TERMS AND ACRONYMS

---

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.

Validity: The appropriateness of the measuring instrument in relation to the purpose for which it is being used.

Unit Cost: The average total cost of producing a single unit of output - goods and services for a specific agency activity.

### EXPLANATION OF ACRONYMS

**CIO** -Chief Information Officer

**CIP** - Capital Improvements Program Plan

**EOG** - Executive Office of the Governor

**FCO** - Fixed Capital Outlay

---

## **GLOSSARY OF TERMS AND ACRONYMS**

---

**FFMIS** - Florida Financial Management Information System

**FLAIR** - Florida Accounting Information Resource Subsystem

**F.S.** - Florida Statutes GAA - General Appropriations Act

**GR** - General Revenue Fund

**IOE** - Itemization of Expenditure

**IT** - Information Technology

**LAN** - Local Area Network

**LAS/PBS** - Legislative Appropriations System/Planning and Budgeting Subsystem

**LBC** - Legislative Budget Commission LBR - Legislative Budget Request

**L.O.F.** - Laws of Florida LRPP - Long-Range Program Plan

**MAN** - metropolitan area network (information technology)

**NASBO** - National Association of State Budget Officers

**OPB** - Office of Policy and Budget, Executive Office of the Governor

**PBPB/PB2** - Performance-Based Program Budgeting

**STO** - State Technology Office

**SWOT** - Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities and Threats

**TCS** - Trends and Conditions Statement

**TF** - Trust Fund

**TRW** - Technology Review Workgroup

**WAGES** - Work and Gain Economic Stability (Agency for Workforce Innovation)

**WAN** - wide area network (information technology)

**ZBB** - Zero-Based Budgeting