



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

Alton L. "Rip" Colvin, Jr.
Executive Director

LONG RANGE PROGRAM PLAN

Justice Administration
Tallahassee, Florida

September 30, 2010

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
221 Capitol
Tallahassee, Florida 32399-1300

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

Dear Directors:

Pursuant to ch. 216, F.S., the Long Range Program Plan (LRPP) for the Department of 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 2011-12 through Fiscal Year 2015-16. This submission is being provided by me as Executive Director of the Justice Administrative Commission on behalf of all agencies within the Department.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Alton L. Colvin, Jr.".

Alton L. "Rip" Colvin, Jr



JUSTICE ADMINISTRATIVE COMMISSION

LONG-RANGE PROGRAM PLAN FY 2011-12 THROUGH 2015-16

September 30, 2010



STATEWIDE GUARDIAN AD LITEM OFFICE

Long Range Program Plan

Fiscal Years 2011-2012 through 2015-2016

September 30, 2010

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 2011-2012 THROUGH FY 2015-2016**

September 30, 2010

Submitted by

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 2011-2012 THROUGH FY 2015-2016

September 30, 2010

**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 2011-2012 THROUGH FY 2015-2016

September 30, 2010

**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 2011-2012 THROUGH FY 2015-2016**

September 30, 2010

**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 2011-12 through 2015-16

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

September 2010



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

**LONG RANGE PROGRAM PLAN
FY 2011-2012 THROUGH FY 2015-2016**

September 30, 2010

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

**John E. Hendry
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 (JAC) 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 of all criminal cases presented to the State Attorney over the next five years in an effective, efficient and timely manner.

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:

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

PUBLIC DEFENDER APPELLATE

Mission: *Protect constitutional rights*

Priority # 1 Goal:

Provide equitable salaries for employees to improve retention.

AGENCY MISSION AND GOALS

PUBLIC DEFENDER APPELLATE

Priority # 2 Goal:

Process appeals in a timely manner.

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 (OCCCRC)

Mission: *Protect constitutional and statutory rights in a cost effective manner.*

Priority # 1* Goal:

Protect constitutional and statutory rights of OCCCRC's clients in a cost effective manner by securing adequate support for leasing, maintenance and operations of facilities located in areas where clients are being serviced while eliminating use of funds allocated to the Contracted Services (Due Process) budget component for that purpose.

Priority # 2* Goal:

Protect constitutional and statutory rights of OCCCRC's clients in a cost effective manner by providing continuity and experience through the creation of an equitable salary structure that reduces attorney turnover.

AGENCY MISSION AND GOALS

OFFICES OF CRIMINAL CONFLICT AND CIVIL REGIONAL COUNSELS (OCCCRC)

Priority # 3* Goal:

Protect constitutional and statutory rights of OCCCRC's clients by securing adequate support for technology requirements needed to provide adequate legal representation while eliminating the use of funds allocated to the Contract Services (Due Process) budget component for that purpose.

Priority # 4* Goal:

Protect constitutional and statutory appellate rights of OCCCRC's clients in a cost effective manner and fulfill OCCCRC's statutory mandate by securing support needed to provide adequate legal appellate representation while eliminating use of funds allocated to the Contracted Services (Due Process) budget component currently used to pay for appellate due process costs and underfunded full-time equivalent (FTE) appellate salaries and benefits.

***While all priorities expressed herein are common to the five OCCCRC's, the reader is reminded that OCCCRC is not a monolithic unit but rather is comprised of five separate regional entities, each with its own unique problems and needs. Particular attention is requested to be paid to the Regional Counsels' Legislative Budget Request where some of these variances are presented.**

AGENCY OBJECTIVES

JUSTICE ADMINISTRATIVE COMMISSION

Goal 1 Objective 1:

Accurately and efficiently process transactions for JAC, and, on behalf of, the 49 agencies we administratively serve.

Goal 1 Objective 2:

Review court-appointed counsel and due process vendor invoices for compliance with contractual and statutory requirements, as well as 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 provide credible justifications for Clerks' Legislative Budget Requests.

STATE ATTORNEY

Goal 1 Objective:

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

AGENCY OBJECTIVES

STATE ATTORNEY

Goal 1 Objective:

Maximize the number and percentage of habitual and violent felony offenders who receive enhanced sentences.

Goal 2 Objective:

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

PUBLIC DEFENDER

Goals 1 – 2 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 – 2 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 (OCCRC)

Goal 1 Objective:

Provide quality representation protecting the rights of appointed clients by securing support for facilities accessible to clients across the region while eliminating use of funds allocated to the Contracted Services (Due Process) budget component for that purpose.

AGENCY OBJECTIVES

OFFICES OF CRIMINAL CONFLICT AND CIVIL REGIONAL COUNSELS (OCCRC)

Goal 2 Objective:

Provide quality representation with adequately experienced personnel to prevent delays and disruptions associated with high attorney turnover by utilizing experience factor to more effectively spend due process funds.

Goal 3 Objective:

Provide quality representation protecting the rights of appointed clients by securing support for needed technology (Sections 29.008 and 28.24 Florida Statutes) to track and monitor clients' cases while eliminating use of funds allocated to the Contracted Services (Due Process) budget component for that purpose.

Goal 4 Objective:

Provide quality appellate representation protecting client's appellate rights and remedies while eliminating use of funds allocated to the Contracted Services (Due Process) budget component for that purpose and underfunded full-time equivalent (FTE) appellate salaries and benefits.

AGENCY SERVICE OUTCOMES AND PERFORMANCE PROJECTION TABLES

JUSTICE ADMINISTRATIVE COMMISSION

Outcome: Number of transactions processed.

Baseline/ Year 2010-11	FY 2011-12	FY 2012-13	FY 2013-14	FY 2014-15	FY 2015-16
346,924	348,659	350,402	352,154	353,915	355,684

Outcome: Number of invoices processed.

Baseline/ Year 2010-11	FY 2011-12	FY 2012-13	FY 2013-14	FY 2014-15	FY 2015-16
50,593	50,846	51,100	51,356	51,613	51,871

STATEWIDE GUARDIAN AD LITEM

PRIMARY SERVICE OUTCOME

Average number of children represented.

<u>Baseline</u>					
FY 2010/11	FY 2011/12	FY 2012/13	FY 2013/14	FY 2014/15	FY 2015/16
80%	81%	82%	83%	84%	85%

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

<u>Baseline</u>					
FY 2010/11	FY 2011/12	FY 2012/13	FY 2013/14	FY 2014/15	FY 2015/16
79%	80%	81%	82%	83%	84%

Outcome: Number of new volunteers certified as a GAL.

<u>Baseline</u>					
FY 2010/11	FY 2011/12	FY 2012/13	FY 2013/14	FY 2014/15	FY 2015/16
2,375	2,400	2,425	2,450	2,475	2,500

Outcome: Average number of active volunteers.

<u>Baseline</u>					
FY 2010/11	FY 2011/12	FY 2012/13	FY 2013/14	FY 2014/15	FY 2015/16
7,000	7,100	7,200	7,300	7,400	7,500

AGENCY SERVICE OUTCOMES AND PERFORMANCE PROJECTION TABLES

CLERKS OF COURT OPERATIONS CORPORATION

Outcome: The percentage of primary* Clerk budget related products required in law, produced on time and in accordance with the requirements of law.

Baseline/ Year 2010	FY 2011-12	FY 2012-13	FY 2013-14	FY 2014-15	FY 2015-16
100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

*Primary products include the Clerks of Court Operations Corporation (CCOC) Legislative Budget Request (LBR), any required Budget Amendment Requests (BARs) to the Legislative Budget Commission and “Summarized Corrective Action Plans” identifying Clerks’ unmet performance standards and response plans.

STATE ATTORNEY STATE ATTORNEY, FIRST JUDICIAL CIRCUIT

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

	FY 2000-01 BASELINE	FY 2011-12	FY 2012-13	FY 2013-14	FY 2014-15	FY 2015-16
Offenders who qualify for enhanced sentence for whom the State requests enhanced sentence	146	389	389	389	389	389
Offenders for whom the Court orders enhanced sentencing	91	389	389	389	389	389
Percentage of offenders sentenced by the Court to an enhanced sentence	62%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

Outcome: Assistant State Attorney turnover rate.

FY 2000-01 BASELINE	FY 2011-12	FY 2012-13	FY 2013-14	FY 2014-15	FY 2015-16
15.6%	14.71%	14.71%	14.71%	14.71%	14.71%

AGENCY SERVICE OUTCOMES AND PERFORMANCE PROJECTION TABLES

STATE ATTORNEY, SECOND JUDICIAL CIRCUIT

Outcome: Number of habitual and violent felony offenders who received enhanced sentences.

	FY 2000-01 BASELINE	FY 2011-12	FY 2012-13	FY 2013-14	FY 2014-15	FY 2015-16
Offenders who qualify for enhanced sentence for whom the State requests enhanced sentence	152	390	400	450	450	450
Offenders for whom the Court orders enhanced sentencing	53	390	400	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 2011-12	FY 2012-13	FY 2013-14	FY 2014-15	FY 2015-16
33.4%	30%	30%	30%	20%	20%

STATE ATTORNEY, THIRD JUDICIAL CIRCUIT

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

	FY 2000-01 BASELINE	FY 2011-12	FY 2012-13	FY 2013-14	FY 2014-15	FY 2015-16
Offenders who qualify for enhanced sentence for whom the State requests enhanced sentence	7	9	10	11	12	13
Offenders for whom the Court orders enhanced sentencing	6	8	9	10	11	12
Percentage of offenders sentenced by the Court to an enhanced sentence	85.7%	88.8%	90%	91%	92%	93%

Outcome: Assistant State Attorney turnover rate.

FY 2000-01 BASELINE	FY 2011-12	FY 2012-13	FY 2013-14	FY 2014-15	FY 2015-16
13.6%	48%	47%	46%	45%	44%

AGENCY SERVICE OUTCOMES AND PERFORMANCE PROJECTION TABLES

STATE ATTORNEY, FOURTH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT

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

	FY 2000-01 BASELINE	FY 2011-12	FY 2012-13	FY 2013-14	FY 2014-15	FY 2015-16
Offenders who qualify for enhanced sentence for whom the State requests enhanced sentence	303	580	570	560	560	570
Offenders for whom the Court orders enhanced sentencing	300	575	565	550	550	565
Percentage of offenders sentenced by the Court to an enhanced sentence	99%	99%	99%	98%	98%	99%

Outcome: Assistant State Attorney turnover rate.

FY 2000-01 BASELINE	FY 2011-12	FY 2012-13	FY 2013-14	FY 2014-15	FY 2015-16
21%	22%	21%	20%	20%	21%

STATE ATTORNEY, FIFTH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT

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

	FY 2001-02 BASELINE	FY 2011-12	FY 2012-13	FY 2013-14	FY 2014-15	FY 2015-16
Offenders who qualify for enhanced sentence for whom the State requests enhanced sentence	320	429	433	436	440	443
Offenders for whom the Court orders enhanced sentencing	168	288	291	294	297	300
Percentage of offenders sentenced by the Court to an enhanced sentence	52.50%	67.13%	67.64%	68.15%	69.17%	70.19%

Outcome: Assistant State Attorney turnover rate.

FY 2000-01 BASELINE	FY 2011-12	FY 2012-13	FY 2013-14	FY 2014-15	FY 2015-16
20.59%	12.79%	12.66%	12.40%	12.20%	12.00%

AGENCY SERVICE OUTCOMES AND PERFORMANCE PROJECTION TABLES

STATE ATTORNEY, SIXTH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT

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

	FY 2000-01 BASELINE	FY 2011-12	FY 2012-13	FY 2013-14	FY 2014-15	FY 2015-16
Offenders who qualify for enhanced sentence for whom the State requests enhanced sentence	508	500	500	490	490	490
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%	61%	61%	61%

Outcome: Assistant State Attorney turnover rate.

FY 2000-01 BASELINE	FY 2011-12	FY 2012-13	FY 2013-14	FY 2014-15	FY 2015-16
15%	15%	15%	15%	14%	14%

STATE ATTORNEY, SEVENTH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT

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

	FY 2000-01 BASELINE	FY 2011-12	FY 2012-13	FY 2013-14	FY 2014-15	FY 2015-16
Offenders who qualify for enhanced sentence for whom the State requests enhanced sentence	223	380	390	400	410	430
Offenders for whom the Court orders enhanced sentencing	90	350	370	380	400	420
Percentage of offenders sentenced by the Court to an enhanced sentence	40.5%	92%	95%	95%	97%	97%

Outcome: Assistant State Attorney turnover rate.

FY 2000-01 BASELINE	FY 2011-12	FY 2012-13	FY 2013-14	FY 2014-15	FY 2015-16
19.8%	20%	22%	23%	24%	25%

AGENCY SERVICE OUTCOMES AND PERFORMANCE PROJECTION TABLES

STATE ATTORNEY, EIGHTH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT

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

	FY 2006-07 BASELINE	FY 2011-12	FY 2012-13	FY 2013-14	FY 2014-15	FY 2015-16
Offenders who qualify for enhanced sentence for whom the State requests enhanced sentence	175	135	137	139	141	143

Outcome: Assistant State Attorney turnover rate.

FY 2006-07 BASELINE	FY 2011-12	FY 2012-13	FY 2013-14	FY 2014-15	FY 2015-16
14.36%	20.10%	20.20%	20.30%	20.40%	20.50%

STATE ATTORNEY, NINTH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT

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

	FY 2000-01 BASELINE	FY 2011-12	FY 2012-13	FY 2013-14	FY 2014-15	FY 2015-16
Offenders who qualify for enhanced sentence for whom the State requests enhanced sentence	634	310	311	312	313	314
Offenders for whom the Court orders enhanced sentencing	148	310	311	312	313	314
Percentage of offenders sentenced by the Court to an enhanced sentence	23%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

Outcome: Assistant State Attorney turnover rate.

FY 2000-01 BASELINE	FY 2011-12	FY 2012-13	FY 2013-14	FY 2014-15	FY 2015-16
28.14%	10%	10%	10%	10%	10%

AGENCY SERVICE OUTCOMES AND PERFORMANCE PROJECTION TABLES

STATE ATTORNEY, TENTH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT

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

	FY 2000-01 BASELINE	FY 2011-12	FY 2012-13	FY 2013-14	FY 2014-15	FY 2015-16
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 2011-12	FY 2012-13	FY 2013-14	FY 2014-15	FY 2015-16
16.7%	25%	25%	25%	50%	25%

STATE ATTORNEY, ELEVENTH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT

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

	FY 2000-01 BASELINE	FY 2011-12	FY 2012-13	FY 2013-14	FY 2014-15	FY 2015-16
Offenders who qualify for enhanced sentence for whom the State requests enhanced sentence	3,683	2,871	3,015	3,166	3,324	3,490

Outcome: Assistant State Attorney turnover rate.

FY 2000-01 BASELINE	FY 2011-12	FY 2012-13	FY 2013-14	FY 2014-15	FY 2015-16
21.85%	15.62%	18%	18%	18%	18%

AGENCY SERVICE OUTCOMES AND PERFORMANCE PROJECTION TABLES

STATE ATTORNEY, TWELFTH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT

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

	FY 2000-01 BASELINE	FY 2011-12	FY 2012-13	FY 2013-14	FY 2014-15	FY 2015-16
Offenders who qualify for enhanced sentence for whom the State requests enhanced sentence	210	107	108	109	110	111
Offenders for whom the Court orders enhanced sentencing	123	43	45	47	49	51
Percentage of offenders sentenced by the Court to an enhanced sentence	58.57%	40%	41%	43%	44%	45%

Outcome: Assistant State Attorney turnover rate.

FY 2000-01 BASELINE	FY 2011-12	FY 2012-13	FY 2013-14	FY 2014-15	FY 2015-16
20.5%	14%	13%	12%	11%	10%

STATE ATTORNEY, THIRTEENTH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT

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

	FY 2000-01 BASELINE	FY 2011-12	FY 2012-13	FY 2013-14	FY 2014-15	FY 2015-16
Offenders who qualify for enhanced sentence for whom the State requests enhanced sentence	210	420	424	428	432	436
Offenders for whom the Court orders enhanced sentencing	203	406	410	414	418	422
Percentage of offenders sentenced by the Court to an enhanced sentence	96.70%	96.70%	96.70%	96.73%	96.76%	96.79%

Outcome: Assistant State Attorney turnover rate.

FY 2000-01 BASELINE	FY 2011-12	FY 2012-13	FY 2013-14	FY 2014-15	FY 2015-16
27.91%	16%	17%	18%	19%	20%

AGENCY SERVICE OUTCOMES AND PERFORMANCE PROJECTION TABLES

STATE ATTORNEY, FOURTEENTH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT

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

	FY 2000-01 BASELINE	FY 2011-12	FY 2012-13	FY 2013-14	FY 2014-15	FY 2015-16
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 2011-12	FY 2012-13	FY 2013-14	FY 2014-15	FY 2015-16
12.50%	30%	30%	30%	30%	30%

STATE ATTORNEY, FIFTEENTH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT

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

	FY 2000-01 BASELINE	FY 2011-12	FY 2012-13	FY 2013-14	FY 2014-15	FY 2015-16
Offenders who qualify for enhanced sentence for whom the State requests enhanced sentence	313	225	230	235	240	245
Offenders for whom the Court orders enhanced sentencing	164	225	230	235	240	245
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 2011-12	FY 2012-13	FY 2013-14	FY 2014-15	FY 2015-16
24.15%	13%	13%	12%	12%	12%

AGENCY SERVICE OUTCOMES AND PERFORMANCE PROJECTION TABLES

STATE ATTORNEY, SIXTEENTH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT

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

	FY 2000-01 BASELINE	FY 2011-12	FY 2012-13	FY 2013-14	FY 2014-15	FY 2015-16
Offenders who qualify for enhanced sentence for whom the State requests enhanced sentence	44	44	44	44	44	44
Offenders for whom the Court orders enhanced sentencing	42	42	42	42	42	42
Percentage of offenders sentenced by the Court to an enhanced sentence	95%	95%	95%	95%	95%	95%

Outcome: Assistant State Attorney turnover rate.

FY 2000-01 BASELINE	FY 2011-12	FY 2012-13	FY 2013-14	FY 2014-15	FY 2015-16
77%	25%	25%	20%	20%	20%

STATE ATTORNEY, SEVENTEENTH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT

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

	FY 2001-02 BASELINE	FY 2011-12	FY 2012-13	FY 2013-14	FY 2014-15	FY 2015-16
Offenders who qualify for enhanced sentence for whom the State requests enhanced sentence	849	902	902	902	902	902
Offenders for whom the Court orders enhanced sentencing	501	490	490	490	490	490
Percentage of offenders sentenced by the Court to an enhanced sentence	59%	54%	54%	54%	54%	54%

Outcome: Assistant State Attorney turnover rate.

FY 2000-01 BASELINE	FY 2011-12	FY 2012-13	FY 2013-14	FY 2014-15	FY 2015-16
18%	14.5%	14.5%	14.5%	14.5%	14.5%

AGENCY SERVICE OUTCOMES AND PERFORMANCE PROJECTION TABLES

STATE ATTORNEY, EIGHTEENTH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT

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

	FY 2000-01 BASELINE	FY 2011-12	FY 2012-13	FY 2013-14	FY 2014-15	FY 2015-16
Offenders who qualify for enhanced sentence for whom the State requests enhanced sentence	121	150	152	154	156	158
Offenders for whom the Court orders enhanced sentencing	97	150	152	154	156	158
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 2011-12	FY 2012-13	FY 2013-14	FY 2014-15	FY 2015-16
27.2%	12.00%	11.75%	11.50%	11.25%	11.00%

STATE ATTORNEY, NINETEENTH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT

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

	FY 2000-01 BASELINE	FY 2011-12	FY 2012-13	FY 2013-14	FY 2014-15	FY 2015-16
Offenders who qualify for enhanced sentence for whom the State requests enhanced sentence	69	25	26	27	28	29
Offenders for whom the Court orders enhanced sentencing	28	25	26	27	28	29
Percentage of offenders sentenced by the Court to an enhanced sentence	41%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

Outcome: Assistant State Attorney turnover rate.

FY 2000-01 BASELINE	FY 2011-12	FY 2012-13	FY 2013-14	FY 2014-15	FY 2015-16
17.67%	15%	15%	15%	15%	15%

AGENCY SERVICE OUTCOMES AND PERFORMANCE PROJECTION TABLES

STATE ATTORNEY, TWENTIETH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT

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

	FY 2000-01 BASELINE	FY 2011-12	FY 2012-13	FY 2013-14	FY 2014-15	FY 2015-16
Offenders who qualify for enhanced sentence for whom the State requests enhanced sentence	257	550	550	550	550	550
Offenders for whom the Court orders enhanced sentencing	105	437	437	437	437	437
Percentage of offenders sentenced by the Court to an enhanced sentence	41.00%	79.45%	79.45%	79.45%	79.45%	79.45%

Outcome: Assistant State Attorney turnover rate.

FY 2000-01 BASELINE	FY 2011-12	FY 2012-13	FY 2013-14	FY 2014-15	FY 2015-16
27.00%	14.42%	14.42%	14.42%	14.42%	14.42%

PUBLIC DEFENDER PUBLIC DEFENDER, FIRST THROUGH TWENTIETH CIRCUITS

Outcome: Percent of attorney turnover rates.

FY 2000-01 BASELINE	FY 2011-12	FY 2012-13	FY 2013-14	FY 2014-15	FY 2015-16
23.47%	15.01%	14.26%	13.55%	12.87%	12.23%

Outcome: Number of cases per attorney.

FY 2009-10 BASELINE	FY 2011-12	FY 2012-13	FY 2013-14	FY 2014-15	FY 2015-16
547	520	494	469	445	423

AGENCY SERVICE OUTCOMES AND PERFORMANCE PROJECTION TABLES

PUBLIC DEFENDER APPELLATE

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

Outcome: Percent of attorney turnover rates.

FY 2000-01 BASELINE	FY 2011-12	FY 2012-13	FY 2013-14	FY 2014-15	FY 2015-16
8.1%	3.5%	3.4%	3.3%	3.2%	3.1%

Outcome: Percent of appeals resolved annually.

FY 2000-01 BASELINE	FY 2011-12	FY 2012-13	FY 2013-14	FY 2014-15	FY 2015-16
95.8%	94.86%	99.6%	99.7%	99.8%	99.9%

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 2011-12	FY 2012-13	FY 2013-14	FY 2014-15	FY 2015-16
3	5	6	6	6	5

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 2011-12	FY 2012-13	FY 2013-14	FY 2014-15	FY 2015-16
3	6	6	5	5	5

AGENCY SERVICE OUTCOMES AND PERFORMANCE PROJECTION TABLES

OFFICES OF CRIMINAL CONFLICT AND CIVIL REGIONAL COUNSELS

CRIMINAL CONFLICT AND CIVIL REGIONAL COUNSEL, FIRST DISTRICT

Outcome: Percent of Contracted Services (Due Process) budget utilized to pay rent.

FY 2009-10 BASELINE	FY 2011-12	FY 2012-13	FY 2013-14	FY 2014-15	FY 2015-16
44.7%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

Outcome: Annual percentage of attorney turnover.

FY 2009-10 BASELINE	FY 2011-12	FY 2012-13	FY 2013-14	FY 2014-15	FY 2015-16
18.11%	18.06%	18.01%	17.96%	17.91%	17.86%

Outcome: Percent of Contracted Services (Due Process) budget component utilized to pay for technology.

FY 2009-10 BASELINE	FY 2011-12	FY 2012-13	FY 2013-14	FY 2014-15	FY 2015-16
6.73%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

Outcome: Percent of Contracted Services (Due Process) budget component utilized for appeals.

FY 2009-10 BASELINE	FY 2011-12	FY 2012-13	FY 2013-14	FY 2014-15	FY 2015-16
7.74%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

Outcome: Percent of Salaries and Benefits allocated for unallocated and underfunded appellate full-time equivalent (FTE) positions.

FY 2009-10 BASELINE	FY 2011-12	FY 2012-13	FY 2013-14	FY 2014-15	FY 2015-16
1.01%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

AGENCY SERVICE OUTCOMES AND PERFORMANCE PROJECTION TABLES

CRIMINAL CONFLICT AND CIVIL REGIONAL COUNSEL, SECOND DISTRICT

Outcome: Percent of Contracted Services (Due Process) budget utilized to pay for leasing, maintenance and operations of facilities.

FY 2009-10 BASELINE	FY 2011-12	FY 2012-13	FY 2013-14	FY 2014-15	FY 2015-16
34.75%	34.75%	0%	0%	0%	0%

Outcome: Annual percentage of attorney turnover.

FY 2009-10 BASELINE	FY 2011-12	FY 2012-13	FY 2013-14	FY 2014-15	FY 2015-16
30.07%	28.43%	27.03%	26.6%	25.6%	24.01%

Outcome: Percent of Contracted Services (Due Process) budget component utilized to pay for technology.

FY 2009-10 BASELINE	FY 2011-12	FY 2012-13	FY 2013-14	FY 2014-15	FY 2015-16
11.55%	12.12%	12.72%	0%	0%	0%

Outcome: Percent of Contracted Services (Due Process) budget component utilized for appeals.

FY 2009-10 BASELINE	FY 2011-12	FY 2012-13	FY 2013-14	FY 2014-15	FY 2015-16
20.7%	22.7%	23.8%	0%	0%	0%

Outcome: Percent of Salaries and Benefits allocated for unallocated and underfunded appellate full-time equivalent (FTE) positions.

FY 2009-10 BASELINE	FY 2011-12	FY 2012-13	FY 2013-14	FY 2014-15	FY 2015-16
2.0%	2.0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

AGENCY SERVICE OUTCOMES AND PERFORMANCE PROJECTION TABLES

CRIMINAL CONFLICT AND CIVIL REGIONAL COUNSEL, THIRD DISTRICT

Outcome: Percent of Contracted Services (Due Process) budget utilized to pay for facilities.

FY 2009-10 BASELINE	FY 2011-12	FY 2012-13	FY 2013-14	FY 2014-15	FY 2015-16
23.51%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

Outcome: Annual percentage of attorney turnover.

FY 2009-10 BASELINE	FY 2011-12	FY 2012-13	FY 2013-14	FY 2014-15	FY 2015-16
27.125%	27.075%	27.025%	26.975%	26.925%	26.875%

Outcome: Percent of Contracted Services (Due Process) budget component utilized to pay for technology.

FY 2009-10 BASELINE	FY 2011-12	FY 2012-13	FY 2013-14	FY 2014-15	FY 2015-16
10.77%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

Outcome: Percent of Contracted Services (Due Process) budget component utilized for appeals.

FY 2009-10 BASELINE	FY 2011-12	FY 2012-13	FY 2013-14	FY 2014-15	FY 2015-16
6.93%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

Outcome: Percent of Salaries and Benefits allocated for unallocated and underfunded appellate full-time equivalent (FTE) positions.

FY 2009-10 BASELINE	FY 2011-12	FY 2012-13	FY 2013-14	FY 2014-15	FY 2015-16
2.88%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

AGENCY SERVICE OUTCOMES AND PERFORMANCE PROJECTION TABLES

CRIMINAL CONFLICT AND CIVIL REGIONAL COUNSEL, FOURTH DISTRICT

Outcome: Percent of Contracted Services (Due Process) budget utilized to pay for leasing, maintenance and operations of facilities.

FY 2009-10 BASELINE	FY 2011-12	FY 2012-13	FY 2013-14	FY 2014-15	FY 2015-16
30.51%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

Outcome: Annual percentage of attorney turnover.

FY 2009-10 BASELINE	FY 2011-12	FY 2012-13	FY 2013-14	FY 2014-15	FY 2015-16
30.95%	30.70%	30.45%	30.20%	29.95%	29.70%

Outcome: Percent of Contracted Services (Due Process) budget component utilized to pay for technology.

FY 2009-10 BASELINE	FY 2011-12	FY 2012-13	FY 2013-14	FY 2014-15	FY 2015-16
4.75%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

Outcome: Percent of Contracted Services (Due Process) budget component utilized for appeals.

FY 2009-10 BASELINE	FY 2011-12	FY 2012-13	FY 2013-14	FY 2014-15	FY 2015-16
8.43%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

Outcome: Percent of Salaries and Benefits allocated for unallocated and underfunded appellate full-time equivalent (FTE) positions.

FY 2009-10 BASELINE	FY 2011-12	FY 2012-13	FY 2013-14	FY 2014-15	FY 2015-16
12.05%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

AGENCY SERVICE OUTCOMES AND PERFORMANCE PROJECTION TABLES

CRIMINAL CONFLICT AND CIVIL REGIONAL COUNSEL, FIFTH DISTRICT

Outcome: Percent of Contracted Services (Due Process) budget utilized to pay for leasing, maintenance and operations of facilities.

FY 2009-10 BASELINE	FY 2011-12	FY 2012-13	FY 2013-14	FY 2014-15	FY 2015-16
29%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

Outcome: Annual percentage of attorney turnover.

FY 2009-10 BASELINE	FY 2011-12	FY 2012-13	FY 2013-14	FY 2014-15	FY 2015-16
25.46%	24.18%	22.97%	21.82%	20.73%	19.69%

Outcome: Percent of Contracted Services (Due Process) budget component utilized to pay for technology.

FY 2009-10 BASELINE	FY 2011-12	FY 2012-13	FY 2013-14	FY 2014-15	FY 2015-16
15.22%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

Outcome: Percent of Contracted Services (Due Process) budget component utilized for appeals.

FY 2009-10 BASELINE	FY 2011-12	FY 2012-13	FY 2013-14	FY 2014-15	FY 2015-16
9.06%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

Outcome: Percent of Salaries and Benefits allocated for unallocated and underfunded appellate full-time equivalent (FTE) positions.

FY 2009-10 BASELINE	FY 2011-12	FY 2012-13	FY 2013-14	FY 2014-15	FY 2015-16
0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

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 49 agencies administratively served: State Attorneys, Public Defenders, Capital Collateral Regional Councils, Criminal Conflict and Civil Regional Councils, 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, as well as 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)

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 of all criminal cases presented to the State Attorney over the next five years in an effective, efficient and timely manner.

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: Provide quality representation to all appointees.

PUBLIC DEFENDERS APPELLATE

Goal 2: Process appeals in a timely manner.

LINKAGE TO GOVERNOR'S PRIORITIES

PRIORITY #1 – PROTECTING OUR COMMUNITIES

CAPITAL COLLATERAL REGIONAL COUNSELS (CCRC)

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.

CLERKS OF COURT OPERATIONS CORPORATION

Working with Clerks to develop budgets that adequately fund domestic divisions.

PRIORITY #3 – KEEPING FLORIDA'S ECONOMY VIBRANT

CLERKS OF COURT OPERATIONS CORPORATION

Working with Clerks to develop collections processes and innovative programs to ensure collections for the state are maximized. Amounts collected by Clerks assist multiple state and local agencies.

PRIORITY #4 – SUCCESS FOR EVERY STUDENT

CLERKS OF COURT OPERATIONS CORPORATION

Working with Clerks to develop budgets that adequately fund juvenile divisions.

LINKAGE TO GOVERNOR'S PRIORITIES

PRIORITY #5 – KEEPING FLORIDIANS HEALTHY

PRIORITY #6 – PROTECTING FLORIDA'S NATURAL RESOURCES

CLERKS OF COURT OPERATIONS CORPORATION

Working with Clerks and the state to develop Efiling initiatives which eliminates paper and required travel to Clerks offices.

Using best practices from Clerks offices in promoting electronic payment means for customers, which results in less travel on roads, lower use of fossil fuels and less air pollution.

TRENDS AND CONDITIONS STATEMENTS

JUSTICE ADMINISTRATIVE COMMISSION

Pursuant to s. 43.16, F.S., the Justice Administrative Commission's (JAC) maintains a central state office providing administrative services and assistance to Florida's Offices of State Attorney, Public Defender, Capital Collateral Regional Counsel, and Criminal Conflict and Civil Regional Counsel. The JAC also provides administrative services and assistance to Florida's Guardian ad Litem Program and the Clerks of Court Operations Corporation.

Additionally, the JAC is 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, productive, and ethical. JAC's core values are teamwork, efficiency, accuracy, and customer service.

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, 2010. 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.

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

TRENDS AND CONDITIONS STATEMENTS

STATEWIDE GUARDIAN AD LITEM

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:

- Since the 2007/08 fiscal year, the Program's budget has been reduced over 14%. 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 also experiencing 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)

Agency Primary Responsibilities Required In Law Trends and Conditions and 5 Year Strategies

CCOC PRIMARY ACTIVITIES: These are tied to the CCOC's Legislative Budget Request for its Corporation operations. The Corporation has three (3) primary activities / responsibilities.

Activity 1: Develop and justify a CCOC Legislative Budget Request (LBR) and allocate annual Appropriation Act budget authority to 67 Clerks' offices.

Activity 2: During each fiscal year, monitor, analyze and respond to Clerks' Trust Fund and Clerks' approved budget and performance results issues.

Activity 3: Provide budget related education, training and technical assistance to Clerks' Offices.

Qualifier: The CCOC was not in the Appropriations process previous to SFY 2009-10. Due to the passage of a new unit-cost based budgeting system and associated requirements in law for SFY 2010-11, the CCOC did not have approved performance standards for SFY 2009-10.

TRENDS AND CONDITIONS STATEMENTS

CLERKS OF COURT OPERATIONS CORPORATION (CCOC)

This SFY 2011-12 LRPP (Exhibit II) and LBR requires the calculation of “unit costs” using output standards and actual expenditures for SFY 2009-10. The CCOC estimated the units worked for each of its three “activities” for SFY 2009-10 in order to allow the state system to calculate unit costs for SFY 2009-10. The CCOC began its official units worked record keeping in SFY 2010-11.

CCOC ACTIVITY / RESPONSIBILITY 1.0

Develop and justify a CCOC Legislative Budget Request (LBR) and allocate annual Appropriation Act budget authority to 67 Clerks offices.

Trends & Conditions:

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 total and unit of service 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 the State of Florida’s budget process. 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 in State of Florida budgeting.

The CCOC is developing a professional budget process in response to requirements 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 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 CCOC 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 Court Administration.

TRENDS AND CONDITIONS STATEMENTS

CLERKS OF COURT OPERATIONS CORPORATION (CCOC)

The CCOC began building the basics for newly required budgeting capacities in 2009, resulting in a SFY 2010-11 budget for Clerks that, for the first time, was based on unit costs for each of their core services.

The Legislature, CCOC and Clerks are studying improvement options to the unit-cost based SFY 2010-11 Appropriations Act budgets for 67 Clerks.

Activity 1.0: Five Year LBR-Related CCOC Strategies

Year 1: SFY 2011-12

The CCOC is focused on the following five strategies:

1. Following a review of the 2010-11 unit-based Legislative Budget Request (LBR) process and possible 2011 Session changes to its unit cost-based budgeting process, implement a SFY 2011-12 budget with credibility to the Legislature and successfully manage issues that arise during the fiscal year.
2. Incorporate redefined Clerk Peer Groups into the CCOC budgeting process in a way that allows more sophisticated Peer Group county comparisons of revenue collections, total and unit of service costs, workloads, and performance outcomes.
3. Incorporate the “Unit Cost Analysis (UCA) System” into the CCOC budgeting system. The UCA system identifies projected and actual Clerks’ office workloads, factors affecting total and unit costs, and performance results within Peer Groups. This will help Clerks to manage their budgets with critical data, provide budget comparison data to the CCOC to produce even more credible CCOC LBRs, and provide support to the CCOC for answering key Legislative questions during the Appropriations process each year. It will also provide the CCOC with budget issue analyses during a fiscal year.
4. Incorporate refined “Business Rules” for key service “outputs” (e.g. different types of cases) to provide greater assurance that comparative data and unit costs in Peer Groups is relevant for analyzing unit cost differences.
5. Continue to develop and utilize an integrated SQL server database that will support Clerks,

TRENDS AND CONDITIONS STATEMENTS

CLERKS OF COURT OPERATIONS CORPORATION (CCOC)

the CCOC and the Legislature. This sophisticated database will support a better understanding and ability to discuss Clerk revenues, expenditures, workloads, unit costs, and performance standard compliance. This capacity will be fundamental to the CCOC in regards to its preparation of a Legislative Budget Request, supporting the LBR during the Legislative Session and managing budget and Trust Fund issues as they arise during the fiscal year.

Year 2: SFY 2012-13

The CCOC will focus primarily on the following strategies:

1. Continue to develop and refine the CCOC SQL database to produce critical Trust Fund and Clerk budget related data/information that will enhance LBR credibility and provide critical answers during each Legislative Session.
2. Further develop the CCOC staff capacities to support CCOC Council members and Clerks as the 67 Clerk budgets are submitted, approved and submitted to the Legislature as a Legislative Budget Request.
3. Further develop the CCOC's "Unit-Cost Analysis" System to understand why individual Clerk's Office unit costs are significantly higher or lower than averages for a Clerk's Peer Groups; and to use UCA information in the CCOC's LBR process.
4. Further develop CCOC "Budget Trend Reports (BTRs)" that will assist the CCOC and Clerk's Offices to observe and respond to budget trends that affect Clerk budget requests and managing changing budget conditions during a fiscal year.
5. Further develop the CCOC web-site to make the CCOC Budget Request process more efficient for Clerks via on-line, interactive transmissions to and from the CCOC and discuss budget condition change issues and options during a fiscal year.

Year 3: SFY 2013-14

The CCOC will focus primarily on the following strategies:

TRENDS AND CONDITIONS STATEMENTS

CLERKS OF COURT OPERATIONS CORPORATION (CCOC)

1. Continue to develop the SQL server database capacities to anticipate budget related trends and prepare CCOC LBRs that are increasingly credible and useful to the Legislature in its budget deliberations.
2. Continue to create and use enhanced CCOC web-site capacities to communicate more efficiently with state stakeholders and Clerks on budget related issues and issue resolution options.
3. Develop more sophisticated budget trend analysis models to be better able to justify LBRs to the Legislature and manage changing budget conditions over time.
4. Continue to develop CCOC staff capacities to support the Council and Clerks in preparing and approving budgets.

Year 4: SFY 2014-15

The CCOC will focus primarily on the following strategies:

1. Continue to enhance the SQL server database to provide functional data to Clerks and the CCOC and the Legislature as issues evolve and new and different types of data/information is requested.
2. Better understand and incorporate conclusions on the impact of actors outside the control of the Clerks' offices on budget revenue collections and spending pressures.
3. Continue to develop the CCOC web-site to be more functional and efficient in the development and implementation of LBRs and Appropriations Act authority.
4. Continue to develop CCOC staff capacities to support the Council and Clerks in preparing and approving budgets.

Year 5: SFY 2015-16

The CCOC will focus primarily on the following strategies:

1. Continue to add sophistication to the SQL server database system.

TRENDS AND CONDITIONS STATEMENTS

CLERKS OF COURT OPERATIONS CORPORATION (CCOC)

2. Continue to improve the CCOC LBR process based on Legislative feed-back and expectations.
3. Continue to develop CCOC staff capacities to support the Council and Clerks in preparing and approving budgets.

CCOC Activity / Responsibility 2.0

During each fiscal year, monitor, analyze and respond to Clerks' Trust Fund and approved budget implementation issues.

Trends & Conditions

The revenue sources that fund the Clerks' 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.

Economic conditions indicate a slow recovery over the next five years. By 2015-16, Florida's economic indicators are likely to show numbers for housing inventories, personal income growth, gross domestic product for Florida, and unemployment finally reaching pre-Great Recession normal ranges. Over the next five years, the Clerks' revenues will be affected by far fewer foreclosures in the system, upon which filing fees are paid. The Clerks' Operations Trust Fund also must set aside funds for paying the above mentioned 8% administrative fee to the State General Revenue Fund.

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 the Legislative Budget

Requests for SFY 2011-12 through SFY 2015-16. As much time as possible is required to alter Clerk budgets if administrative fee transfers, required reserves or possible revenue shortfalls due

TRENDS AND CONDITIONS STATEMENTS

CLERKS OF COURT OPERATIONS CORPORATION (CCOC)

to economic conditions appear to leave the Trust Fund with insufficient dollars to fully fund approved Clerk budgets.

The CCOC will closely monitor Operations Trust Fund trends to determine whether capacities indicate serious financial problems exist. If the trends indicate a need to increase Trust Fund revenues in the future above Legislative projections, then the CCOC is authorized in law to recommend to the Legislature a fine, fee, court costs, or service charge Schedule change.

The CCOC, additionally, must monitor and analyze Clerk budget expenditures, workloads and court performance standards to assess capacities to efficiently and effectively serve the courts within budget authority. The CCOC is operationally focused on assuring funds are available to provide essential quantity and quality levels of service to the judicial system. The CCOC must be prepared to adjust approved budgets if there are shortfalls in revenue collections below appropriated amounts. Due to the existence of vastly different sized Clerks' budgets, it is imperative to know the impacts of possible spending reductions on the fixed and variable costs of Clerks' offices.

The CCOC is developing continually more sophisticated budget preparation, approval, issue resolution and amendment support systems and processes. Over the next five years, there will be significant increases in the capacities of the CCOC to meet its responsibilities during a fiscal year.

To respond to expected Trust Fund challenges and manage changing budget conditions, the CCOC will focus on the following during the next five years:

Activity 2.0 Five Year Strategy

Year 1: SFY 2011-12

1. Develop CCOC capacities to build a more sophisticated "Revenue Analysis System" (RAS) that interconnects revenue projections and collections with budget spending trends and Trust Fund and fee schedule capacity trends.
2. Develop a "Fee Schedule Analysis" (FSA) system that will provide the CCOC with Trust Fund capacity trends based on current or optional fee schedules and recommend to the Legislature any needed changes.

TRENDS AND CONDITIONS STATEMENTS

CLERKS OF COURT OPERATIONS CORPORATION (CCOC)

3. Study the ability to use e-filing and other automation to lower spending pressures in Clerks' offices over time.

Year 2: SFY 2012-13

1. The CCOC will utilize its database automation capacities to feed it's "Unit Cost Analysis" (UCA) system that monitors and analyzes workload projections, expenditure trends, revenue collections and performance enhancements.

2. E-filing systems will be analyzed for use in Clerks' offices previously unable to implement it, to reduce cost pressures.

Year 3: SFY 2013-14

1. The CCOC will further enhance its budget analysis tools and techniques for use in smaller Clerks' offices that have fewer capacities to amend budgets and respond to workload pressures.

2. CCOC web site will be further enhanced to incorporate integrated and interactive capacities to allow Clerks' offices and the CCOC to coordinate budget preparation, produce budget reports, respond to budget issue needs and coordinate technical assistance initiatives on a more timely and in a more efficient manner.

Year 4: SFY 2014-15

1. Continue building Web-based capacities to collect, retrieve and analyze critical budget and performance related data for minimizing costs and maximizing revenues and meeting performance standards.

2. Continue to develop "Unit Cost Analysis" (UCA) capacities to support Clerks' in the managing of their budgets from year to year and during a fiscal year.

Year 5: SFY 2015-16

1. Continued enhancement of automated tools for Clerks offices to use in managing budgets and achieving output and outcome quantity and quality level objectives.

TRENDS AND CONDITIONS STATEMENTS

CLERKS OF COURT OPERATIONS CORPORATION (CCOC)

2. Further develop automated, integrated web site capacities for supporting CCOC and Clerk budget preparation, management and reporting.

CCOC ACTIVITY/ RESPONSIBILITY 3.0
--

Provide education, training and technical assistance to Clerks' Offices to meet their constitutional duties.

Trends & Conditions

With the 2009 Legislative requirement for Clerks to be part of the Legislative Appropriations process, the CCOC and Clerks had to develop new budgeting processes, responsibilities and professional skills. The Legislature, in the creation of the CCOC also provided that the Corporation would be responsible for all training of the Clerks' offices to better perform their constitutional duties.

Additionally, the 2009 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.

The CCOC process for preparing the SFY 2010-11 Legislative Budget Request included the use of new unit costing related tools, new budget instructions, a budget hearing process and the justification of individual budget requests for 67 Clerks' offices. The new responsibilities required significant education, training and technical assistance for CCOC staff as well as Clerks' office staff.

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.

TRENDS AND CONDITIONS STATEMENTS

CLERKS OF COURT OPERATIONS CORPORATION (CCOC)

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 requires 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.

Activity 3.0 Five Year Strategy

Year 1: SFY 2011-12

1. The CCOC will continue to provide education and training to Clerks' offices for them to more efficiently and effectively meet their constitutional duties and to implement commonly applicable business rules for data used in the CCOC budgeting process to assure data is consistently collected and reported and used in Clerks' office comparisons.
2. Continue to build internal CCOC "Budget Manager" staff skills to better understand revenue, cost and performance information that affects Clerk Budget Requests and to analyze and identify budget related issue resolution options during the fiscal year.
3. Provide Web-X and web site training and education related to Clerks' constitutional duties and increased budget request building skills (e.g. enhanced service unit costing skills and tools and revenue projection skills and tools).
4. Utilize educational "e-forums" related to Clerks' constitutional duties and sharing Clerk and staff strategies for responding to critical issues affecting Clerk budgets, internally or across Peer Groups or across all Clerks' offices.
5. The CCOC will further develop workshop experiences at Clerks' Association meeting to help increase awareness and practitioner knowledge about Clerks' constitutional duties and the Legislative Appropriations process and building credible budgets for presentation to the Legislature.

TRENDS AND CONDITIONS STATEMENTS

CLERKS OF COURT OPERATIONS CORPORATION (CCOC)

6. The CCOC 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 2012-13

1. The CCOC will continue to provide education and training to Clerks and their offices for them to more efficiently and effectively meet their constitutional duties.
2. The CCOC will create more sophisticated Peer Group data and strategy sharing to allow more rapid accumulation of budgeting and performance enhancement skills.
3. 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.

Year 3: SFY 2013-14

1. The CCOC will continue to provide education and training to Clerks and their offices for them to more efficiently and effectively meet their constitutional duties.
2. CCOC "Budget Education and Training" programs will continue to focus on cost minimization and revenue enhancement strategies for Clerks' offices of every size.
3. Peer Group best practice sharing will be emphasized.

Year 4: SFY 2014-15

1. The CCOC will continue to provide education and training to Clerks and their offices for them to more efficiently and effectively meet their constitutional duties.
2. 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.
3. The CCOC will continue to provide education and training on the CCOC budgeting tools, systems and processes developed in previous years.
4. The CCOC will identify critical budget issues and provide education and training on how to

TRENDS AND CONDITIONS STATEMENTS

CLERKS OF COURT OPERATIONS CORPORATION (CCOC)

resolve them in some/all Clerks' offices.

Year 5: SFY 2015-16

1. The CCOC will continue to provide education and training to Clerks and their offices for them to more efficiently and effectively meet their constitutional duties.
2. The CCOC will further develop 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.
2. The CCOC will continue to identify critical constitutional issues and budget related issues and provide education and training on resolution options.

OTHER EXTERNAL ISSUES

The budget related skill sets required to do CCOC work are quite sophisticated. The CCOC is the first state funded organization to implement a true unit-cost budgeting system. Preparation of unit cost-based Legislative Budget Requests, justifying them and then implementing the Appropriations Act requirements and authorizations, meeting Legislative expectations for budget system implementation and then administering the Clerks' Trust Fund and responding to budget condition changes during a fiscal year is quite challenging.

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.

TRENDS AND CONDITIONS STATEMENTS

STATE ATTORNEYS

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, and juvenile delinquency cases referred by law enforcement, other state, county and municipal agencies and the general public. In addition, the State Attorney must provide personnel and procedures for the orderly, efficient and effective intake and processing of several statutorily mandated civil actions.

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, these priorities include representing the State of Florida efficiently and effectively in all civil suits, motions or actions in which the state is a party or civil actions which are mandated 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.

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.

TRENDS AND CONDITIONS STATEMENTS

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. time of case resolution, 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 misdemeanor attorneys of 400 cases per year.
3. Establish standard caseload for felony attorneys of 200 cases per year.
4. Establish standard caseload for juvenile attorneys at 250 cases per year.
5. 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.

TRENDS AND CONDITIONS STATEMENTS

PUBLIC DEFENDER APPELLATE

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.

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.

TRENDS AND CONDITIONS STATEMENTS

CAPITAL COLLATERAL REGIONAL COUNSELS

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 responsibilities and challenges.

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

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

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

TRENDS AND CONDITIONS STATEMENTS

CAPITAL COLLATERAL REGIONAL COUNSELS

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.

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 three years have reduced CCRCs' budget approximately 16% below FY 2007-08. If additional budget reductions of 15% occur in SFY 2011-12, it is likely that ten (10) lawyers and nine (9) investigators will be laid off (about 30% of CCRC case staffing). The loss of highly experienced and competent lawyers and investigators reduces the capacity of the CCRC offices to handle workloads. The mandate to cut the CCRC budgets by 15% would severely compromise CCRCs' ability to meet court standards. Additionally, the resulting loss of positions would require the CCRCs to reduce the number of cases in Middle and South regional offices by 30%. These cases would be transferred to the Registry, which results in a cost shift instead of a savings. The costs per case are unlimited when conducted by Registry lawyers, which may off-set the 15% cut "savings" for CCRC budgets.

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, 80% of attorneys have greater than three years experience in post conviction law. Almost 60% of attorneys have greater than five years experience. Lowering staff turnover rates has been a priority; however, recent budget cuts have caused the CCRCs to reduce staffing levels.

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 2009-10, for instance, the CCRCs worked on 176 cases. In FY 2010-11, the caseload is expected to be 178. .

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. This trend is expected to continue into FY 2010-11 and into FY 2011-12.

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 perform 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 trends faced by CCRCs going into FY 2011-12 are as follows:

	The Change in 2008-09	in 2009-10	in 2010-11
Evidentiary hearings in court:	25	21	20
Federal court actions:	83	93	96
Death warrants:	1	1	2

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 FY 2008-09 over 97% of all motions filed during the process were timely filed without requests for extensions. However, the latest Auditor General's Report to the Legislature comparing CCRCs with the private Registry, indicated that the private registry attorneys timely filed their motions 63% of the time.

TRENDS AND CONDITIONS STATEMENTS

CAPITAL COLLATERAL REGIONAL COUNSELS

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 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 two to three 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.

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.

TRENDS AND CONDITIONS STATEMENTS

CAPITAL COLLATERAL REGIONAL COUNSELS

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

On July 10, 2010, the Florida Supreme Court expanded filing requirements for the CCRC cases in federal court. This adds to CCRC workload pressures.

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 was 12 in FY 2009-10. In FY 2010-11 it is about 13 with present staff levels. The Spangenburg Report of 1999 and the American Bar Association recommended a caseload of less than six 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. .

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 is likely that today's circumstances remain similar.

TRENDS AND CONDITIONS STATEMENTS

CAPITAL COLLATERAL REGIONAL COUNSELS

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 178 cases in FY 2010-11, while the estimate for the Registry is likely to be closer to 125.

These cost/case ratios appear relatively consistent from year to year. Since 2007-08, state appropriations for most state agencies including CCRCs resulted in budget reductions, but reimbursement levels for private Registry attorneys remained unchanged.

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 are costly. There was one death warrant issued in FY 2007-08 and five in FY 2008-09. Many more are possible in the future. Each death warrant response costs CCRC \$ 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 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

TRENDS AND CONDITIONS STATEMENTS

CAPITAL COLLATERAL REGIONAL COUNSELS

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 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.

TRENDS AND CONDITIONS STATEMENTS

CAPITAL COLLATERAL REGIONAL COUNSELS

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 2010-11, the CCRCs, combined, have 30 lawyers, 20 investigators, eight (8) case processing staff and five (5) administrative staff.

The turnover rate for both offices, combined, was about 3% 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. Three years of budget cuts may impact CCRCs' ability to retain experienced employees when economic conditions improve.

CCRC FOCUS AREA 5: CCRC Operational Improvements

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 2010-11 and into FY 2011-12, the CCRCs will continue to introduce technology enhancements such as installing search engines that can help scan records for client

TRENDS AND CONDITIONS STATEMENTS

CAPITAL COLLATERAL REGIONAL COUNSELS

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

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

TRENDS AND CONDITIONS STATEMENTS

CAPITAL COLLATERAL REGIONAL COUNSELS

- 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 2010-11 and into FY 2011-12, the CCRCs will be implementing additional budget management capacities that will allow “unit cost” efficiency analysis and performance evaluations. In FY 2011-12, Middle and South CCRCs plan to further develop their “unit costing” budget systems to build in automatic management reports that will document cost trends, help identify efficiency improvement candidates and better manage scarce resources needed to perform effectively and meet judicial system standards.

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.

OFFICES OF CRIMINAL CONFLICT AND CIVIL REGIONAL COUNSELS

The Offices of Criminal Conflict and Civil Regional Counsels (“the Office of Regional Counsel”) 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 Regional Counsel carries out its mission to provide legal representation of court appointed clients in four (4) specific areas:

- A. CRIMINAL TRIAL COURT** – The Office of Regional Counsel represents 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

TRENDS AND CONDITIONS STATEMENTS

OFFICES OF CRIMINAL CONFLICT AND CIVIL REGIONAL COUNSELS

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. Additionally, The Office of Regional Counsel represents appointed clients seeking correction, reduction, or modification of a sentence under 3.800, Florida Rules of Criminal Procedure and appointed clients seeking post conviction relief under rule 3.850, Florida Rules of Criminal Procedure when the Public Defender has declared a conflict of interest or is otherwise prohibited by law from representation.

B. CIVIL TRIAL COURT – The Office of Regional Counsel represents appointed clients pursuant to Chapter 39, Florida Statutes, where a petition seeks a dependency or termination of parental rights action. The Office of Regional Counsel also represents appointed clients pursuant to Chapter 63, Florida Statutes, where a petition seeks a termination of parental rights action.

C. CIVIL (PROBATE, GUARDIANSHIP and MENTAL HEALTH DIVISIONS) TRIAL COURT – The Regional Counsels provide representation to:

- Clients subject to the Tuberculosis Control Act pursuant to Chapter 392, Florida Statutes
- Clients subject to the developmental disabilities law pursuant to Chapter 393, Florida Statutes
- Clients subject to the Florida Mental Health Act (“Baker Act”) proceedings regarding involuntary civil commitment pursuant to Chapter 394, Florida Statutes, when the public defender has a conflict
- 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 Act of 1993 (“Marchman Act”) pursuant to Chapter 397, Florida Statutes
- Clients subject to involuntary civil commitment and removal of civil rights pursuant to the Adjust 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
- Children and families in need of state services pursuant to Chapter 984, Florida Statutes

D. CRIMINAL AND CIVIL APPELLATE COURTS – The Office of Regional Counsel represents appointed clients on appeals. These appeals result from cases where the Office of Public Defender had a conflict, from cases handled by court-appointed counsel, or from cases handled by the Office of Regional Counsel at the trial court level.

TRENDS AND CONDITIONS STATEMENTS

OFFICES OF CRIMINAL CONFLICT AND CIVIL REGIONAL COUNSELS

The goal of the Office of Regional Counsel 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 Office of Regional Counsel is proposing performance measures that are designed to determine the quality of the work in other ways.

The performance measures proposed address that the Florida Association of Counties (FAC) objects to funding the office space and communication needs of the Regional Conflict Councils. Litigation brought by FAC and currently pending before the Florida Supreme Court remains unresolved. The FAC’s position has been upheld at the trial court and district court of appeal levels. As of this September 16, 2010, most counties have declined to provide the support contemplated by provisions of F.S. 29.008 and F.S. 28.24 regarding facility and technological support. This has resulted in a drain on the Regional Councils’ Contracted Services budget components of approximately fifty percent, thereby reducing Regional Counsel’s ability to provide adequate resources to properly represent its assigned clients within the confines of current budget limits.

The following goals have been established in an effort to carry out the Offices of Criminal Conflict and Civil Regional Councils’ mission:

1. Reduction in percentage of Contracted Services budget component utilized for rent.
2. Reduction in percentage of Contracted Services budget component utilized for technology.
3. Reduction in percentage of annual attorney turnover rate.
4. Reduction in percentage of Contracted Services budget component utilized for appeals.
5. Reduction in percentage of Salaries and Benefits budget component used for appeals.

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 FY2010-11 (Words)	Approved Prior Year Standard FY2009-10 (Numbers)	Prior Year Actual FY2009-10 (Numbers)	*Approved Standards for FY2010-11 (Numbers)	Requested FY2011-12 Standard (Numbers)
Percent of invoices processed within statutory time frames	95.00%	94.04%	95.00%	95.00%
Number of public records requests	150	133	150	150
Number of cases where registry lawyers request fees above the statutory caps	2,500	999	2,500	1,000
Number of cases where the court orders fees above the statutory cap	2,000	972	2,000	1,000
Total amount of excess fees awarded by the court per circuit	\$6,000,000	\$9,728,077	\$6,000,000	\$10,000,000
Number of budget, payroll, disbursement, revenue and financial report transactions processed	375,000	359,804	375,000	350,000
Number of court-appointed attorney and due process vendor invoices processed	65,000	50,593	65,000	51,000

*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.

Approved Performance Measures for FY2010-11 (Words)	Approved Prior Year Standard FY2009-10 (Numbers)	Prior Year Actual FY2009-10 (Numbers)	Approved Standards for FY2010-11 (Numbers)	Requested FY2011-12 Standard (Numbers)
Average number of children represented	26,500	23,804	26,500	24,000 or 80%
Percent of cases discharged after DCF supervision is terminated	45 %	80%	45%	80%
Number of new volunteers certified as a GAL	1,464	2,827	1,464	2,850
Average number of active volunteers*	5,057	7,445	5,057	7,500
* - 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.

<u>Proposed</u> Performance Measures for FY 2010-11 (Words)	Approved Prior Year Standards FY 2009-10 (Numbers)	Actual Prior Year Standards FY 2009-10 (Numbers)	<u>Proposed</u> Standards for FY 2010-11 (Numbers)	Requested Standards for FY 2011-12 (Numbers)
“New Measure” - # of work products produced in support of Clerks’ Budget Requests analyses and CCOC Legislative Budget Requests.	N/A	291		299
“New Measure” - # of CCOC technical and analytical products produced in support of implementing Clerks’ approved budgets.	N/A	1,100		1,530
“New Measure” - # of CCOC education and training programs and opportunities provided to Clerks’ offices during the fiscal year.	NA	35		70

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 2010-11 (Words)	Approved Prior Year Standard FY 2009-10 (Numbers)	Actual Prior Year Standard FY 2009-10 (Numbers)
Percent of offenders who qualify for enhanced sentencing for whom state attorneys requested enhanced sentencing	92.00%	93.87%
Total number of dispositions	1,339,035	1,386,362
Number of dispositions by trial verdicts	14,004	37,153
Number of dispositions by pleas	727,246	732,981
Number of dispositions by non trial	157,990	232,360
Number of dispositions by otherwise	439,795	383,868
Percent of dispositions by trial verdicts	1.05%	2.68%
Percent of dispositions by pleas	54.30%	52.87%
Percent of dispositions by non trial	11.80%	16.76%
Percent of dispositions by otherwise	32.84%	27.69%
Number of substantiated Bar grievances filed annually	0	0
Number of misdemeanor criminal case referrals	1,183,597	1,147,172
Number of felony criminal case referrals	490,965	441,325
Number of juvenile criminal case referrals	197,338	151,236
Number of misdemeanor filings	792,393	812,346
Number of felony filings	219,752	208,171
Number of juvenile filings	83,616	65,042
Number of post conviction relief responses or Habeas Corpus responses	22,391	14,091
Number of sexual predator civil commitment proceedings	TBD	3,342
Number of Baker Act hearings	27,686	16,530

EXHIBIT II – PERFORMANCE MEASURES AND STANDARDS

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

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

NOTE: Approved primary service outcomes must be listed first.

Approved Performance Measures for FY 2010-11 (Words)	Approved Prior Year Standard FY 2009-10 (Numbers)	Actual Prior Year Standard FY 2009-10 (Numbers)	Approved Standards for FY 2010-11 (Numbers)	Requested Standards for FY 2011-12 (Numbers)
Percent of offenders who qualify for enhanced sentencing for whom state attorneys requested enhanced sentencing		100.00%		100.00%
Total number of dispositions		64,784		64,784
Number of dispositions by trial verdicts		612		612
Number of dispositions by pleas		33,708		33,708
Number of dispositions by non trial		5,176		5,176
Number of dispositions by otherwise		25,288		25,288
Percent of dispositions by trial verdicts		.94%		.94%
Percent of dispositions by pleas		52.03%		52.03%
Percent of dispositions by non trial		8.00%		8.00%
Percent of dispositions by otherwise		39.03%		39.03%
Number of substantiated Bar grievances filed annually		0		0
Number of misdemeanor criminal case referrals		42,205		42,205
Number of felony criminal case referrals		16,656		16,656
Number of juvenile criminal case referrals		6,452		6,452
Number of misdemeanor filings		21,116		21,116
Number of felony filings		11,375		11,375
Number of juvenile filings		3,255		3,255
Number of post conviction relief responses or Habeas Corpus responses		658		658
Number of sexual predator civil commitment proceedings		207		207
Number of Baker Act hearings		1,283		1,283

EXHIBIT II – PERFORMANCE MEASURES AND STANDARDS

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

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

NOTE: Approved primary service outcomes must be listed first.

Approved Performance Measures for FY 2010-11 (Words)	Approved Prior Year Standard FY 2009-10 (Numbers)	Actual Prior Year Standard FY 2009-10 (Numbers)	Approved Standards for FY 2010-11 (Numbers)	Requested Standards for FY 2011-12 (Numbers)
Percent of offenders who qualify for enhanced sentencing for whom state attorneys requested enhanced sentencing				N/A
Total number of dispositions		30,429		33,000
Number of dispositions by trial verdicts		434		425
Number of dispositions by pleas		14,425		15,000
Number of dispositions by non trial		1,542		1,400
Number of dispositions by otherwise		14,028		16,000
Percent of dispositions by trial verdicts		1.43%		1.3%
Percent of dispositions by pleas		47.41%		45.5%
Percent of dispositions by non trial		5.07%		2.7%
Percent of dispositions by otherwise		46.10%		50.5%
Number of substantiated Bar grievances filed annually		0		0
Number of misdemeanor criminal case referrals		19,695		21,000
Number of felony criminal case referrals		7,646		8,000
Number of juvenile criminal case referrals		1,884		2,100
Number of misdemeanor filings		15,905		16,000
Number of felony filings		4,467		4,800
Number of juvenile filings		1,331		1,500
Number of post conviction relief responses or Habeas Corpus responses		41		40
Number of sexual predator civil commitment proceedings		97		95
Number of Baker Act hearings		21		30

EXHIBIT II – PERFORMANCE MEASURES AND STANDARDS

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

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

NOTE: Approved primary service outcomes must be listed first.

Approved Performance Measures for FY 2010-11 (Words)	Approved Prior Year Standard FY 2009-10 (Numbers)	Actual Prior Year Standard FY 2009-10 (Numbers)	Approved Standards for FY 2010-11 (Numbers)	Requested Standards for FY 2011-12 (Numbers)
Percent of offenders who qualify for enhanced sentencing for whom state attorneys requested enhanced sentencing		100.00%		100.00%
Total number of dispositions		17,051		17,051
Number of dispositions by trial verdicts		142		142
Number of dispositions by pleas		7,351		7,351
Number of dispositions by non trial		1,816		1,816
Number of dispositions by otherwise		7,742		7,742
Percent of dispositions by trial verdicts		.84%		.84%
Percent of dispositions by pleas		43.11%		43.11%
Percent of dispositions by non trial		10.65%		10.65%
Percent of dispositions by otherwise		45.40%		45.40%
Number of substantiated Bar grievances filed annually		0		0
Number of misdemeanor criminal case referrals		9,584		9,584
Number of felony criminal case referrals		5,803		5,803
Number of juvenile criminal case referrals		1,126		1,126
Number of misdemeanor filings		6,966		6,966
Number of felony filings		3,229		3,229
Number of juvenile filings		697		697
Number of post conviction relief responses or Habeas Corpus responses		7		7
Number of sexual predator civil commitment proceedings		0		0
Number of Baker Act hearings		297		297

EXHIBIT II – PERFORMANCE MEASURES AND STANDARDS

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

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

NOTE: Approved primary service outcomes must be listed first.

Approved Performance Measures for FY 2010-11 (Words)	Approved Prior Year Standard FY 2009-10 (Numbers)	Actual Prior Year Standard FY 2009-10 (Numbers)	Approved Standards for FY 2010-11 (Numbers)	Requested Standards for FY 2011-12 (Numbers)
Percent of offenders who qualify for enhanced sentencing for whom state attorneys requested enhanced sentencing		94.86%		94.86%
Total number of dispositions		109,159		109,159
Number of dispositions by trial verdicts		628		628
Number of dispositions by pleas		59,851		59,851
Number of dispositions by non trial		15,136		15,136
Number of dispositions by otherwise		33,544		33,544
Percent of dispositions by trial verdicts		.06%		.06%
Percent of dispositions by pleas		55%		55%
Percent of dispositions by non trial		14%		14%
Percent of dispositions by otherwise		31%		31%
Number of substantiated Bar grievances filed annually		0		0
Number of misdemeanor criminal case referrals		64,415		64,415
Number of felony criminal case referrals		19,294		19,294
Number of juvenile criminal case referrals		6,860		6,860
Number of misdemeanor filings		55,456		55,456
Number of felony filings		13,204		13,204
Number of juvenile filings		4,071		4,071
Number of post conviction relief responses or Habeas Corpus responses		2,101		2,101
Number of sexual predator civil commitment proceedings		299		299
Number of Baker Act hearings		16		16

EXHIBIT II – PERFORMANCE MEASURES AND STANDARDS

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

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

NOTE: Approved primary service outcomes must be listed first.

Approved Performance Measures for FY 2010-11 (Words)	Approved Prior Year Standard FY 2009-10 (Numbers)	Actual Prior Year Standard FY 2009-10 (Numbers)	Approved Standards for FY 2010-11 (Numbers)	Requested Standards for FY 2011-12 (Numbers)
Percent of offenders who qualify for enhanced sentencing for whom state attorneys requested enhanced sentencing		67.13%		67.13%
Total number of dispositions		54,383		54,383
Number of dispositions by trial verdicts		32,650		32,650
Number of dispositions by pleas		352		352
Number of dispositions by non trial		2,323		2,323
Number of dispositions by otherwise		19,058		19,058
Percent of dispositions by trial verdicts		60.04%		60.04%
Percent of dispositions by pleas		0.65%		0.65%
Percent of dispositions by non trial		4.27%		4.27%
Percent of dispositions by otherwise		35.04%		35.04%
Number of substantiated Bar grievances filed annually		0		0
Number of misdemeanor criminal case referrals		35,706		35,706
Number of felony criminal case referrals		21,919		21,919
Number of juvenile criminal case referrals		5,841		5,841
Number of misdemeanor filings		18,135		18,135
Number of felony filings		11,406		11,406
Number of juvenile filings		3,149		3,149
Number of post conviction relief responses or Habeas Corpus responses		164		164
Number of sexual predator civil commitment proceedings		219		219
Number of Baker Act hearings		203		203

EXHIBIT II – PERFORMANCE MEASURES AND STANDARDS

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

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

NOTE: Approved primary service outcomes must be listed first.

Approved Performance Measures for FY 2010-11 (Words)	Approved Prior Year Standard FY 2009-10 (Numbers)	Actual Prior Year Standard FY 2009-10 (Numbers)	Approved Standards for FY 2010-11 (Numbers)	Requested Standards for FY 2011-12 (Numbers)
Percent of offenders who qualify for enhanced sentencing for whom state attorneys requested enhanced sentencing		100.00%		100.00%
Total number of dispositions		114,391		114,391
Number of dispositions by trial verdicts		828		828
Number of dispositions by pleas		83,162		83,162
Number of dispositions by non trial		4,041		4,041
Number of dispositions by otherwise		26,360		26,360
Percent of dispositions by trial verdicts		0.72%		0.72%
Percent of dispositions by pleas		72.70%		72.70%
Percent of dispositions by non trial		3.54%		3.54%
Percent of dispositions by otherwise		23.04%		23.04%
Number of substantiated Bar grievances filed annually		0		0
Number of misdemeanor criminal case referrals		82,611		82,611
Number of felony criminal case referrals		38,493		38,493
Number of juvenile criminal case referrals		11,217		11,217
Number of misdemeanor filings		51,425		51,425
Number of felony filings		17,878		17,878
Number of juvenile filings		4,050		4,050
Number of post conviction relief responses or Habeas Corpus responses		91		91
Number of sexual predator civil commitment proceedings		229		229
Number of Baker Act hearings		1,449		1,449

EXHIBIT II – PERFORMANCE MEASURES AND STANDARDS

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

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

NOTE: Approved primary service outcomes must be listed first.

Approved Performance Measures for FY 2010-11 (Words)	Approved Prior Year Standard FY 2009-10 (Numbers)	Actual Prior Year Standard FY 2009-10 (Numbers)	Approved Standards for FY 2010-11 (Numbers)	Requested Standards for FY 2011-12 (Numbers)
Percent of offenders who qualify for enhanced sentencing for whom state attorneys requested enhanced sentencing		96.69%		96.69%
Total number of dispositions		73,584		73,584
Number of dispositions by trial verdicts		296		296
Number of dispositions by pleas		32,996		32,996
Number of dispositions by non trial		12,940		12,940
Number of dispositions by otherwise		27,252		27,252
Percent of dispositions by trial verdicts		1%		1%
Percent of dispositions by pleas		47%		47%
Percent of dispositions by non trial		8%		8%
Percent of dispositions by otherwise		43%		43%
Number of substantiated Bar grievances filed annually		0		0
Number of misdemeanor criminal case referrals		63,587		63,587
Number of felony criminal case referrals		20,387		20,387
Number of juvenile criminal case referrals		6,844		6,844
Number of misdemeanor filings		23,184		23,184
Number of felony filings		9,325		9,325
Number of juvenile filings		2,655		2,655
Number of post conviction relief responses or Habeas Corpus responses		5		5
Number of sexual predator civil commitment proceedings		160		160
Number of Baker Act hearings		398		398

EXHIBIT II – PERFORMANCE MEASURES AND STANDARDS

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

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

NOTE: Approved primary service outcomes must be listed first.

Approved Performance Measures for FY 2010-11 (Words)	Approved Prior Year Standard FY 2009-10 (Numbers)	Actual Prior Year Standard FY 2009-10 (Numbers)	Approved Standards for FY 2010-11 (Numbers)	Requested Standards for FY 2011-12 (Numbers)
Percent of offenders who qualify for enhanced sentencing for whom state attorneys requested enhanced sentencing		100.00%		100.00%
Total number of dispositions		33,367		31,826
Number of dispositions by trial verdicts		113		120
Number of dispositions by pleas		13,543		13,003
Number of dispositions by non trial		6,003		6,219
Number of dispositions by otherwise		13,708		12,484
Percent of dispositions by trial verdicts		0.34%		0.38%
Percent of dispositions by pleas		40.59%		40.86%
Percent of dispositions by non trial		17.99%		19.54%
Percent of dispositions by otherwise		41.08%		39.22%
Number of substantiated Bar grievances filed annually		0		0
Number of misdemeanor criminal case referrals		24,998		23,865
Number of felony criminal case referrals		9,366		8,614
Number of juvenile criminal case referrals		2,709		2,420
Number of misdemeanor filings		15,361		15,733
Number of felony filings		4,773		4,671
Number of juvenile filings		1,244		1,049
Number of post conviction relief responses or Habeas Corpus responses		344		325
Number of sexual predator civil commitment proceedings		161		174
Number of Baker Act hearings		1,577		1,452

EXHIBIT II – PERFORMANCE MEASURES AND STANDARDS

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

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

NOTE: Approved primary service outcomes must be listed first.

Approved Performance Measures for FY 2010-11 (Words)	Approved Prior Year Standard FY 2009-10 (Numbers)	Actual Prior Year Standard FY 2009-10 (Numbers)	Approved Standards for FY 2010-11 (Numbers)	Requested Standards for FY 2011-12 (Numbers)
Percent of offenders who qualify for enhanced sentencing for whom state attorneys requested enhanced sentencing		100.00%		100.00%
Total number of dispositions		85,952		88,530
Number of dispositions by trial verdicts		1,168		1,203
Number of dispositions by pleas		42,225		43,492
Number of dispositions by non trial		9,746		10,038
Number of dispositions by otherwise		32,813		33,797
Percent of dispositions by trial verdicts		1.67%		1.72%
Percent of dispositions by pleas		45.25%		46.60%
Percent of dispositions by non trial		12.55%		12.92%
Percent of dispositions by otherwise		40.53%		41.74%
Number of substantiated Bar grievances filed annually		0		0
Number of misdemeanor criminal case referrals		50,831		52,356
Number of felony criminal case referrals		28,313		29,162
Number of juvenile criminal case referrals		8,742		9,004
Number of misdemeanor filings		36,817		37,921
Number of felony filings		15,334		15,794
Number of juvenile filings		5,288		5,447
Number of post conviction relief responses or Habeas Corpus responses		380		391
Number of sexual predator civil commitment proceedings		223		230
Number of Baker Act hearings		1,055		1,087

EXHIBIT II – PERFORMANCE MEASURES AND STANDARDS

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

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

NOTE: Approved primary service outcomes must be listed first.

Approved Performance Measures for FY 2010-11 (Words)	Approved Prior Year Standard FY 2009-10 (Numbers)	Actual Prior Year Standard FY 2009-10 (Numbers)	Approved Standards for FY 2010-11 (Numbers)	Requested Standards for FY 2011-12 (Numbers)
Percent of offenders who qualify for enhanced sentencing for whom state attorneys requested enhanced sentencing		100.00%		100.00%
Total number of dispositions		46,986		47,456
Number of dispositions by trial verdicts		422		426
Number of dispositions by pleas		29,517		29,812
Number of dispositions by non trial		4,489		4,534
Number of dispositions by otherwise		12,558		12,684
Percent of dispositions by trial verdicts		1%		1%
Percent of dispositions by pleas		63%		63%
Percent of dispositions by non trial		9%		9%
Percent of dispositions by otherwise		27%		27%
Number of substantiated Bar grievances filed annually		0		0
Number of misdemeanor criminal case referrals		38,736		39,123
Number of felony criminal case referrals		12,597		12,723
Number of juvenile criminal case referrals		5,435		5,488
Number of misdemeanor filings		27,648		27,924
Number of felony filings		10,219		10,321
Number of juvenile filings		7,338		7,411
Number of post conviction relief responses or Habeas Corpus responses		214		216
Number of sexual predator civil commitment proceedings		313		316
Number of Baker Act hearings		2,072		2,093

EXHIBIT II – PERFORMANCE MEASURES AND STANDARDS

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

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

NOTE: Approved primary service outcomes must be listed first.

Approved Performance Measures for FY 2010-11 (Words)	Approved Prior Year Standard FY 2009-10 (Numbers)	Actual Prior Year Standard FY 2009-10 (Numbers)	Approved Standards for FY 2010-11 (Numbers)	Requested Standards for FY 2011-12 (Numbers)
Percent of offenders who qualify for enhanced sentencing for whom state attorneys requested enhanced sentencing		100.00%		100.00%
Total number of dispositions		255,845		268,637
Number of dispositions by trial verdicts		26,816		28,157
Number of dispositions by pleas		77,182		81,041
Number of dispositions by non trial		99,422		104,393
Number of dispositions by otherwise		52,425		55,046
Percent of dispositions by trial verdicts		10%		10%
Percent of dispositions by pleas		30%		30%
Percent of dispositions by non trial		39%		39%
Percent of dispositions by otherwise		20%		20%
Number of substantiated Bar grievances filed annually		0		0
Number of misdemeanor criminal case referrals		208,797		219,237
Number of felony criminal case referrals		66,759		70,097
Number of juvenile criminal case referrals		17,877		18,771
Number of misdemeanor filings		208,797		219,237
Number of felony filings		24,612		25,843
Number of juvenile filings		5,644		5,926
Number of post conviction relief responses or Habeas Corpus responses		2,445		2,567
Number of sexual predator civil commitment proceedings		652		685
Number of Baker Act hearings		0		0

EXHIBIT II – PERFORMANCE MEASURES AND STANDARDS

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

Program: State Attorney, _12 th _ Judicial Circuit	Code: 21.50.12.00
Service/Budget Entity: State Attorney, _12 th _ Judicial Circuit	Code: 21.50.12.00

NOTE: Approved primary service outcomes must be listed first.

Approved Performance Measures for FY 2010-11 (Words)	Approved Prior Year Standard FY 2009-10 (Numbers)	Actual Prior Year Standard FY 2009-10 (Numbers)	Approved Standards for FY 2010-11 (Numbers)	Requested Standards for FY 2011-12 (Numbers)
Percent of offenders who qualify for enhanced sentencing for whom state attorneys requested enhanced sentencing		100.00%		100.00%
Total number of dispositions		41,419		41,833
Number of dispositions by trial verdicts		385		389
Number of dispositions by pleas		24,165		24,407
Number of dispositions by non trial		1,217		1,229
Number of dispositions by otherwise		15,652		15,808
Percent of dispositions by trial verdicts		1%		1%
Percent of dispositions by pleas		58.3%		58.3%
Percent of dispositions by non trial		2.9%		2.9%
Percent of dispositions by otherwise		37.8%		37.8%
Number of substantiated Bar grievances filed annually		0		0
Number of misdemeanor criminal case referrals		29,295		29,588
Number of felony criminal case referrals		14,781		14,929
Number of juvenile criminal case referrals		4,075		4,115
Number of misdemeanor filings		16,703		16,870
Number of felony filings		7,008		7,078
Number of juvenile filings		1,623		1,639
Number of post conviction relief responses or Habeas Corpus responses		86		87
Number of sexual predator civil commitment proceedings		80		81
Number of Baker Act hearings		242		244

EXHIBIT II – PERFORMANCE MEASURES AND STANDARDS

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

Program: State Attorney, _13 th _ Judicial Circuit	Code: 21.50.13.00
Service/Budget Entity: State Attorney, _13 th _ Judicial Circuit	Code: 21.50.13.00

NOTE: Approved primary service outcomes must be listed first.

Approved Performance Measures for FY 2010-11 (Words)	Approved Prior Year Standard FY 2009-10 (Numbers)	Actual Prior Year Standard FY 2009-10 (Numbers)	Approved Standards for FY 2010-11 (Numbers)	Requested Standards for FY 2011-12 (Numbers)
Percent of offenders who qualify for enhanced sentencing for whom state attorneys requested enhanced sentencing		62.89%		92.00%
Total number of dispositions		102,457		103,482
Number of dispositions by trial verdicts		1,288		1,301
Number of dispositions by pleas		56,640		57,206
Number of dispositions by non trial		20,952		21,162
Number of dispositions by otherwise		23,577		23,813
Percent of dispositions by trial verdicts		1.26%		1.26%
Percent of dispositions by pleas		55.28%		55.28%
Percent of dispositions by non trial		20.45%		20.45%
Percent of dispositions by otherwise		23.01%		23.01%
Number of substantiated Bar grievances filed annually		0		0
Number of misdemeanor criminal case referrals		66,805		67,473
Number of felony criminal case referrals		36,244		36,606
Number of juvenile criminal case referrals		10,475		10,579
Number of misdemeanor filings		59,060		59,651
Number of felony filings		14,266		14,409
Number of juvenile filings		4,460		4,505
Number of post conviction relief responses or Habeas Corpus responses		871		880
Number of sexual predator civil commitment proceedings		203		205
Number of Baker Act hearings		2,311		2,334

EXHIBIT II – PERFORMANCE MEASURES AND STANDARDS

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

Program: State Attorney, _14 th _ Judicial Circuit	Code: 21.50.14.00
Service/Budget Entity: State Attorney, _14 th _ Judicial Circuit	Code: 21.50.14.00

NOTE: Approved primary service outcomes must be listed first.

Approved Performance Measures for FY 2010-11 (Words)	Approved Prior Year Standard FY 2009-10 (Numbers)	Actual Prior Year Standard FY 2009-10 (Numbers)	Approved Standards for FY 2010-11 (Numbers)	Requested Standards for FY 2011-12 (Numbers)
Percent of offenders who qualify for enhanced sentencing for whom state attorneys requested enhanced sentencing		97.83%		92%
Total number of dispositions		35,752		32,000
Number of dispositions by trial verdicts		286		300
Number of dispositions by pleas		20,783		18,900
Number of dispositions by non trial		1,977		1,600
Number of dispositions by otherwise		12,706		10,000
Percent of dispositions by trial verdicts		80%		1%
Percent of dispositions by pleas		58.13%		63%
Percent of dispositions by non trial		5.53%		5%
Percent of dispositions by otherwise		35.54%		31%
Number of substantiated Bar grievances filed annually		0		0
Number of misdemeanor criminal case referrals		22,602		25,000
Number of felony criminal case referrals		9,619		9,500
Number of juvenile criminal case referrals		3,953		3,500
Number of misdemeanor filings		17,278		14,000
Number of felony filings		6,548		5,000
Number of juvenile filings		1,884		1,600
Number of post conviction relief responses or Habeas Corpus responses		858		700
Number of sexual predator civil commitment proceedings		87		15
Number of Baker Act hearings		314		250

EXHIBIT II – PERFORMANCE MEASURES AND STANDARDS

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

Program: State Attorney, _15 th _ Judicial Circuit	Code: 21.50.15.00
Service/Budget Entity: State Attorney, _15 th _ Judicial Circuit	Code: 21.50.15.00

NOTE: Approved primary service outcomes must be listed first.

Approved Performance Measures for FY 2010-11 (Words)	Approved Prior Year Standard FY 2009-10 (Numbers)	Actual Prior Year Standard FY 2009-10 (Numbers)	Approved Standards for FY 2010-11 (Numbers)	Requested Standards for FY 2011-12 (Numbers)
Percent of offenders who qualify for enhanced sentencing for whom state attorneys requested enhanced sentencing		100.00%		100.00%
Total number of dispositions		62,977		64,237
Number of dispositions by trial verdicts		821		838
Number of dispositions by pleas		36,492		37,222
Number of dispositions by non trial		11,542		11,773
Number of dispositions by otherwise		14,122		14,405
Percent of dispositions by trial verdicts		1.30%		1.30%
Percent of dispositions by pleas		57.95%		58.00%
Percent of dispositions by non trial		18.33%		18.30%
Percent of dispositions by otherwise		22.42%		22.40%
Number of substantiated Bar grievances filed annually		0		0
Number of misdemeanor criminal case referrals		100,205		102,209
Number of felony criminal case referrals		22,849		22,401
Number of juvenile criminal case referrals		9,006		9,186
Number of misdemeanor filings		85,863		87,580
Number of felony filings		11,224		11,448
Number of juvenile filings		2,907		2,965
Number of post conviction relief responses or Habeas Corpus responses		896		914
Number of sexual predator civil commitment proceedings		17		18
Number of Baker Act hearings		932		951

EXHIBIT II – PERFORMANCE MEASURES AND STANDARDS

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

Program: State Attorney, _16 th _ Judicial Circuit	Code: 21.50.16.00
Service/Budget Entity: State Attorney, _16 th _ Judicial Circuit	Code: 21.50.16.00

NOTE: Approved primary service outcomes must be listed first.

Approved Performance Measures for FY 2010-11 (Words)	Approved Prior Year Standard FY 2009-10 (Numbers)	Actual Prior Year Standard FY 2009-10 (Numbers)	Approved Standards for FY 2010-11 (Numbers)	Requested Standards for FY 2011-12 (Numbers)
Percent of offenders who qualify for enhanced sentencing for whom state attorneys requested enhanced sentencing		61.29%		75%
Total number of dispositions				
Number of dispositions by trial verdicts		51		55
Number of dispositions by pleas		3,635		3,650
Number of dispositions by non trial		1,980		1,980
Number of dispositions by otherwise		1,379		1,379
Percent of dispositions by trial verdicts		0.72%		0.72%
Percent of dispositions by pleas		51.60%		51.60%
Percent of dispositions by non trial		28.11%		28.11%
Percent of dispositions by otherwise				
Number of substantiated Bar grievances filed annually		0		0
Number of misdemeanor criminal case referrals		4,682		4,682
Number of felony criminal case referrals		2,021		2,021
Number of juvenile criminal case referrals		331		331
Number of misdemeanor filings		3,585		3,585
Number of felony filings		1,196		1,196
Number of juvenile filings		201		201
Number of post conviction relief responses or Habeas Corpus responses		42		42
Number of sexual predator civil commitment proceedings		3		3
Number of Baker Act hearings		38		38

EXHIBIT II – PERFORMANCE MEASURES AND STANDARDS

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

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

NOTE: Approved primary service outcomes must be listed first.

Approved Performance Measures for FY 2010-11 (Words)	Approved Prior Year Standard FY 2009-10 (Numbers)	Actual Prior Year Standard FY 2009-10 (Numbers)	Approved Standards for FY 2010-11 (Numbers)	Requested Standards for FY 2011-12 (Numbers)
Percent of offenders who qualify for enhanced sentencing for whom state attorneys requested enhanced sentencing		100.00%		100.00%
Total number of dispositions		94,695		94,695
Number of dispositions by trial verdicts		998		998
Number of dispositions by pleas		70,852		70,852
Number of dispositions by non trial		9,948		9,948
Number of dispositions by otherwise		12,897		12,897
Percent of dispositions by trial verdicts		1.05%		1.05%
Percent of dispositions by pleas		74.82%		74.82%
Percent of dispositions by non trial		10.51%		10.51%
Percent of dispositions by otherwise		13.62%		13.62%
Number of substantiated Bar grievances filed annually		0		0
Number of misdemeanor criminal case referrals		99,568		99,568
Number of felony criminal case referrals		44,127		44,127
Number of juvenile criminal case referrals		14,882		14,882
Number of misdemeanor filings		65,895		65,895
Number of felony filings		16,963		16,963
Number of juvenile filings		6,674		6,674
Number of post conviction relief responses or Habeas Corpus responses		896		896
Number of sexual predator civil commitment proceedings		118		118
Number of Baker Act hearings		1,577		1,577

EXHIBIT II – PERFORMANCE MEASURES AND STANDARDS

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

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

NOTE: Approved primary service outcomes must be listed first.

Approved Performance Measures for FY 2010-11 (Words)	Approved Prior Year Standard FY 2009-10 (Numbers)	Actual Prior Year Standard FY 2009-10 (Numbers)	Approved Standards for FY 2010-11 (Numbers)	Requested Standards for FY 2011-12 (Numbers)
Percent of offenders who qualify for enhanced sentencing for whom state attorneys requested enhanced sentencing		100.00%		100.00%
Total number of dispositions		50,368		50,915
Number of dispositions by trial verdicts		486		534
Number of dispositions by pleas		29,865		30,164
Number of dispositions by non trial		4,678		4,725
Number of dispositions by otherwise		15,339		15,492
Percent of dispositions by trial verdicts		.97%		1.05%
Percent of dispositions by pleas		59.29%		59.24%
Percent of dispositions by non trial		9.29%		9.28%
Percent of dispositions by otherwise		30.45%		30.43%
Number of substantiated Bar grievances filed annually		0		0
Number of misdemeanor criminal case referrals		38,866		69,255
Number of felony criminal case referrals		19,373		19,567
Number of juvenile criminal case referrals		6,593		6,659
Number of misdemeanor filings		26,255		26,518
Number of felony filings		8,897		8,986
Number of juvenile filings		2,917		2,946
Number of post conviction relief responses or Habeas Corpus responses		758		766
Number of sexual predator civil commitment proceedings		71		72
Number of Baker Act hearings		486		490

EXHIBIT II – PERFORMANCE MEASURES AND STANDARDS

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

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

NOTE: Approved primary service outcomes must be listed first.

Approved Performance Measures for FY 2010-11 (Words)	Approved Prior Year Standard FY 2009-10 (Numbers)	Actual Prior Year Standard FY 2009-10 (Numbers)	Approved Standards for FY 2010-11 (Numbers)	Requested Standards for FY 2011-12 (Numbers)
Percent of offenders who qualify for enhanced sentencing for whom state attorneys requested enhanced sentencing		100%		100%
Total number of dispositions		31,135		33,031
Number of dispositions by trial verdicts		361		383
Number of dispositions by pleas		21,830		23,159
Number of dispositions by non trial		3,980		4,222
Number of dispositions by otherwise		4,964		5,266
Percent of dispositions by trial verdicts		1%		1%
Percent of dispositions by pleas		70%		70%
Percent of dispositions by non trial		13%		13%
Percent of dispositions by otherwise		16%		16%
Number of substantiated Bar grievances filed annually		0		0
Number of misdemeanor criminal case referrals		23,408		24,833
Number of felony criminal case referrals		11,457		12,154
Number of juvenile criminal case referrals		4,550		4,827
Number of misdemeanor filings		15,083		16,001
Number of felony filings		5,895		6,254
Number of juvenile filings		2,365		2,509
Number of post conviction relief responses or Habeas Corpus responses		292		328
Number of sexual predator civil commitment proceedings		90		101
Number of Baker Act hearings		1,128		1,267

EXHIBIT II – PERFORMANCE MEASURES AND STANDARDS

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

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

NOTE: Approved primary service outcomes must be listed first.

Approved Performance Measures for FY 2010-11 (Words)	Approved Prior Year Standard FY 2009-10 (Numbers)	Actual Prior Year Standard FY 2009-10 (Numbers)	Approved Standards for FY 2010-11 (Numbers)	Requested Standards for FY 2011-12 (Numbers)
Percent of offenders who qualify for enhanced sentencing for whom state attorneys requested enhanced sentencing		79.45%		79.45%
Total number of dispositions		74,683		75,430
Number of dispositions by trial verdicts		666		673
Number of dispositions by pleas		42,109		42,530
Number of dispositions by non trial		13,452		13,587
Number of dispositions by otherwise		18,456		18,641
Percent of dispositions by trial verdicts		.89%		.89%
Percent of dispositions by pleas		56.38%		56.38%
Percent of dispositions by non trial		18.01%		18.01%
Percent of dispositions by otherwise		24.71%		24.71%
Number of substantiated Bar grievances filed annually		0		0
Number of misdemeanor criminal case referrals		62,566		63,192
Number of felony criminal case referrals		19,170		19,362
Number of juvenile criminal case referrals		7,781		7,859
Number of misdemeanor filings		41,814		42,232
Number of felony filings		10,352		10,456
Number of juvenile filings		3,289		3,322
Number of post conviction relief responses or Habeas Corpus responses		4		4
Number of sexual predator civil commitment proceedings		113		114
Number of Baker Act hearings		1,131		1,142

EXHIBIT II – PERFORMANCE MEASURES AND STANDARDS

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

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

NOTE: Approved primary service outcomes must be listed first.

Approved Performance Measures for FY 2010-11 (Words)	Approved Prior Year Standards FY 2009-10 (Numbers)	Actual Prior Year Standards FY 2009-10 (Numbers)	Approved Standards for FY 2010-11 (Numbers)	Requested Standards for FY 2011-12 (Numbers)
Annual attorney turnover rate	18%	15.8%	18%	15.01%
Number of appointed & re-opened cases	875,837	796,930	875,837	836,808
Number of cases closed	784,964	728,860	784,964	765,303
Number of clients represented	705,061	681,563	705,061	715,641
Number of cases per attorney	547	588	547	558

**EXHIBIT II PERFORMANCE MEASURES AND STANDARDS – BY CIRCUIT
FY 2009-10 – August 23, 2010**

	1 st	2 nd	3 rd	4 th	5 th	6 th	7 th	8 th	9 th	10 th	11 th	12 th	13 th	14 th	15 th	16 th	17 th	18 th	19 th	20 th	TOTAL	
# CLIENTS	29,208	16,974	8,359	37,951	27,169	82,848	31,360	17,309	50,688	29,640	82,478	13,637	51,261	16,435	38,742	5,209	49,294	29,278	21,239	42,484	681,563	
SPEEDY TRIAL CALCULATION: <u>TOTAL CASES CLOSED FOR YEAR</u>	38,509	17,243	9,045	41,693	31,939	84,956	36,891	18,185	47,669	34,051	81,900	14,090	63,685	17,937	48,844	4,426	44,936	33,120	23,686	36,055	728,860	
SPEEDY TRIAL CALCULATION: <u>TOTAL CASES CLOSED WITHIN SPEEDY TRIAL RULE</u>	38,346	17,243	8,828	41,569	31,939	84,956	35,859	18,157	27,871	28,500	81,880	8,887	63,669	17,937	48,844	4,426	44,936	31,911	23,627	36,055	695,440	
SPEEDY TRIAL CALCULATION: <u>% CASES CLOSED WITHIN SPEEDY TRIAL RULE</u>	99.58%	100.00%	97.60%	99.70%	100.00%	100.00%	97.20%	99.85%	58.47%	83.70%	99.98%	63.07%	99.97%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	96.35%	99.75%	100.00%	95.41%	
# CONTESTED VOP/VOCC HEARINGS	250	116	232	234	309	100	36	113	4,880	222	257	4	535	10	49	2	460	907	12	65	8,793	
72 HOUR INITIAL CONTACT CALCULATION: <u>TOTAL NUMBER OF INCARCERATED CLIENTS TO BE INTERVIEWED</u>	14,607	5,247	2,063	6,195	15,659	72,362	24,812	8,256	42,886	16,423	82,478	9,433	33,855	12,376	43,284	5,079	35,803	13,038	10,047	26,125	480,028	
72 HOUR INITIAL CONTACT CALCULATION: <u>TOTAL NUMBER OF INITIAL CONTACTS COMPLETED WITHIN 72 HOURS</u>	14,519	4,980	2,063	3,844	15,659	72,362	24,812	8,256	42,886	14,621	82,478	9,039	33,855	12,376	43,284	5,079	35,803	10,120	9,452	26,125	471,613	
72 HOUR INITIAL CONTACT CALCULATION: <u>% OF INITIAL CONTACTS W/ INCARCERATED CLIENTS COMPLETED</u>	99.40%	94.91%	100.00%	62.05%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	89.03%	100.00%	95.82%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	77.62%	94.08%	100.00%	98.25%
# 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	54.89%	66.04%	74.29%	35.89%	71.33%	62.15%	78.38%	64.86%	38.52%	75.83%	59.88%	66.02%	53.03%	68.97%	64.16%	64.71%	61.17%	78.69%	39.39%	49.37%	61.64%	
ANNUAL ATTORNEY TURNOVER RATE	18.00%	21.53%	27.12%	27.20%	12.77%	10.85%	9.35%	8.57%	19.81%	6.88%	17.52%	11.98%	30.73%	17.70%	18.82%	6.25%	10.69%	6.61%	27.69%	21.48%	15.80%	
NUMBER OF CASES INVESTIGATED	39,185	21,003	9,210	42,559	32,966	82,848	37,013	22,471	67,178	35,261	88,807	18,591	62,303	21,186	48,332	5,504	58,004	33,079	24,144	47,286	796,930	
NUMBER OF APPOINTED & RE-OPENED CASES	39,185	21,003	9,210	42,559	32,966	82,848	37,013	22,471	67,178	35,261	88,807	18,591	62,303	21,186	48,332	5,504	58,004	33,079	24,144	47,286	796,930	
NUMBER OF CRIMINAL CASES CLOSED	37,473	14,807	8,988	41,084	30,636	82,491	35,867	18,157	46,710	33,196	78,845	13,169	60,906	17,421	48,029	4,408	43,110	32,535	22,531	35,046	705,409	
NUMBER OF CIVIL CASES CLOSED	1,036	2,436	57	609	1,303	2,465	1,024	28	959	855	3,055	921	2,779	516	815	18	1,826	585	1,155	1,009	23,451	
NUMBER OF PLEAS	24,483	10,372	4,596	21,461	18,857	40,280	18,911	7,376	23,647	13,255	32,612	6,783	22,198	11,733	25,236	2,575	21,189	19,755	13,581	16,635	355,535	
NUMBER OF TRIALS	336	528	127	335	136	1,160	184	50	730	753	1,278	195	1,025	87	693	18	418	510	151	352	9,066	
NUMBER OF CASES NOLLE PROSSED OR DISMISSED	3,464	2,523	548	3,131	1,550	2,560	3,235	2,035	6,112	3,662	16,438	914	5,229	861	8,354	673	7,096	3,271	1,897	3,675	77,228	
NUMBER OF CONFLICT HEARINGS	2,515	2,235	705	3,053	1,868	2,790	1,739	2,372	2,021	2,604	4,110	956	629	1,572	1,903	169	3,893	1,105	1,145	2,164	39,548	

EXHIBIT II – PERFORMANCE MEASURES AND STANDARDS

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

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

NOTE: Approved primary service outcomes must be listed first.

Approved Performance Measures for FY 2010-11 (Words)	Approved Prior Year Standards FY 2009-10 (Numbers)	Actual Prior Year Standards FY 2009-10 (Numbers)	Approved Standards for FY 2010-11 (Numbers)	Requested Standards for FY 2011-12 (Numbers)
Annual attorney turnover rate	8%	3.64%	8%	3.5%
Percent of appeals resolved	99.99%	90.35%	99.99%	94.86%
Number of appointed cases	5,643	5,842	5,643	6,134
Number of clients represented	5,810	5,773	5,810	6,062
Number of briefs filed	5,968	5,818	5,968	6,109
Number of writs filed	106	91	106	96
Number of cases closed	5,612	5,278	5,612	5,542

EXHIBIT II – PERFORMANCE MEASURES AND STANDARDS

**Public Defender Appellate Offices
PB2 BASELINE DATA COLLECTION FY 2009-2010 -
8/4/2010**

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

	2nd	7th	10th	11th	15th	Total
ANNUAL ATTORNEY TURNOVER RATES *	0%	0%	8.42%	13.79%	0%	3.64%
PERCENT OF APPEALS RESOLVED	96.32%	90.07%	98.64%	91.78%	70.95%	90.37%
NUMBER OF APPOINTED CASES	1,251	1,269	1,617	608	1,095	5,840
NUMBER OF CLIENTS REPRESENTED	1,263	1,257	1,576	608	1,069	5,773
NUMBER OF BRIEFS FILED	1,285	1,308	1,603	538	1,084	5,818
NUMBER OF WRITS FILED	5	11	24	47	4	91
NUMBER OF CASES CLOSED	1,205	1,143	1,595	558	777	5,278

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

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, Middle & Southern Regions Aggregate	Code: 21.70.00.00

NOTE: Approved primary service outcomes must be listed first.

Approved Performance Measures for FY 2010-11 (Words)	Approved Prior Year Standards FY 2009-10 (Numbers)	Prior Year Actual FY 2009-10 (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%	95%
Number of substantiated Bar grievances filed annually	0	0
Number of appellate actions	78	103
Number of 3.851 filings	26	25
Number of signed death warrants	5	1
Number of court decisions to release a death row inmate, grant a new trial, grant a new sentencing hearing or grant other appeals	5	7
Number of active cases	171	174
Number of evidentiary hearings	16	20
Number of federal court actions	42	83

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, Middle Region	Code: 21.70.20.01

NOTE: Approved primary service outcomes must be listed first.

Approved Performance Measures for FY 2010-11 (Words)	Approved Prior Year Standards FY 2009-10 (Numbers)	Prior Year Actual FY 2009-10 (Numbers)	Approved Standards for FY 2010-11 (Numbers)	Requested Standards for FY 2011-12 (Numbers)
Percent of cases in which post-conviction motion, post-conviction appeal, federal habeas corpus motion or federal appeal is timely filed, without extension		98%		90%
Number of substantiated Bar grievances filed annually		0		0
Number of appellate actions		53		40
Number of 3.851 filings		10		8
Number of signed death warrants		1		2
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		99		100
Number of evidentiary hearings		10		7
Number of federal court actions		49		32

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, South Region	Code: 21.70.30.01

NOTE: Approved primary service outcomes must be listed first.

Approved Performance Measures for FY 2010-11 (Words)	Approved Prior Year Standards FY 2009-10 (Numbers)	Prior Year Actual FY 2009-10 (Numbers)	Approved Standards for FY 2010-11 (Numbers)	Requested Standards for FY 2011-12 (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%		90%
Number of substantiated Bar grievances filed annually		0		0
Number of appellate actions		50		40
Number of 3.851 filings		15		8
Number of signed death warrants		0		2
Number of court decisions to release a death row inmate, grant a new trial, grant a new sentencing hearing, or grant other appeals		4		2
Number of active cases		75		75
Number of evidentiary hearings		10		8
Number of federal court actions		34		32

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 st Region	Code: 21.80.01.00	

NOTE: Approved primary service outcomes must be listed first.

Proposed Performance Measures for FY 2010-11 (Words)	Approved Prior Year Standards FY 2009-10 (Numbers)	Actual Prior Year Standards FY 2009-10 (Numbers)	Proposed Standards for FY 2010-11 (Numbers)	Requested Standards for FY 2011-12 (Numbers)
“New Measure” – Annual percentage of attorney turnover	N/A		18.11%	18.06%
“New Measure” – Percent of Contracted Services (Due Process) budget component utilized to pay for leasing, maintenance and operations of facilities	N/A		39.12%	0
“New Measure” – Percent of Contracted Services (Due Process) budget component utilized to pay for technology	N/A		6.73%	0
“New Measure” – Percent of Contracted Services (Due Process) budget component utilized for appeals	N/A		7.74%	0
“New Measure” – Percent of Salaries and Benefits allocated for unallocated and underfunded appellate full-time equivalent (FTE) positions	N/A		1.01%	0

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 nd Region	Code: 21.80.02.00	

NOTE: Approved primary service outcomes must be listed first.

Proposed Performance Measures for FY 2010-11 (Words)	Approved Prior Year Standards FY 2009-10 (Numbers)	Actual Prior Year Standards FY 2009-10 (Numbers)	Proposed Standards for FY 2010-11 (Numbers)	Requested Standards for FY 2011-12 (Numbers)
“New Measure” – Annual percentage of attorney turnover	N/A	30.07%	TBD	TBD
“New Measure” – Percent of Contracted Services (Due Process) budget component utilized to pay for leasing, maintenance and operations of facilities	N/A	34.75%	TBD	TBD
“New Measure” – Percent of Contracted Services (Due Process) budget component utilized to pay for technology	N/A	11.55%	TBD	TBD
“New Measure” – Percent of Contracted Services (Due Process) budget component utilized for appeals	N/A	20.7%	TBD	TBD
“New Measure” – Percent of Salaries and Benefits allocated for unallocated and underfunded appellate full-time equivalent (FTE) positions	N/A	2%	TBD	TBD

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, 3rd Region	Code: 21.80.03.00	

NOTE: Approved primary service outcomes must be listed first.

Proposed Performance Measures for FY 2010-11 (Words)	Approved Prior Year Standards FY 2009-10 (Numbers)	Actual Prior Year Standards FY 2009-10 (Numbers)	Proposed Standards for FY 2010-11 (Numbers)	Requested Standards for FY 2011-12 (Numbers)
“New Measure” – Annual percentage of attorney turnover	N/A	27.125%	27.075%	27.025%
“New Measure” – Percent of Contracted Services (Due Process) budget component utilized to pay for leasing, maintenance and operations of facilities	N/A	23.51%	0%	0%
“New Measure” – Percent of Contracted Services (Due Process) budget component utilized to pay for technology	N/A	10.77%	0%	0%
“New Measure” – Percent of Contracted Services (Due Process) budget component utilized for appeals	N/A	6.93%	0%	0%
“New Measure” – Percent of Salaries and Benefits allocated for unallocated and underfunded appellate full-time equivalent (FTE) positions	N/A	2.88%	0%	0%

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, 4 th Region	Code: 21.80.04.00	

NOTE: Approved primary service outcomes must be listed first.

Proposed Performance Measures for FY 2010-11 (Words)	Approved Prior Year Standards FY 2009-10 (Numbers)	Actual Prior Year Standards FY 2009-10 (Numbers)	Proposed Standards for FY 2010-11 (Numbers)	Requested Standards for FY 2011-12 (Numbers)
“New Measure” – Annual percentage of attorney turnover	N/A	30.95%	TBD	TBD
“New Measure” – Percent of Contracted Services (Due Process) budget component utilized to pay for leasing, maintenance and operations of facilities	N/A	30.51%	TBD	TBD
“New Measure” – Percent of Contracted Services (Due Process) budget component utilized to pay for technology	N/A	4.75%	TBD	TBD
“New Measure” – Percent of Contracted Services (Due Process) budget component utilized for appeals	N/A	8.43%	TBD	TBD
“New Measure” – Percent of Salaries and Benefits allocated for unallocated and underfunded appellate full-time equivalent (FTE) positions	N/A	12.05%	TBD	TBD

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 th Region	Code: 21.80.05.00	

NOTE: Approved primary service outcomes must be listed first.

Proposed Performance Measures for FY 2010-11 (Words)	Approved Prior Year Standards FY 2009-10 (Numbers)	Actual Prior Year Standards FY 2009-10 (Numbers)	Proposed Standards for FY 2010-11 (Numbers)	Requested Standards for FY 2011-12 (Numbers)
“New Measure” – Annual percentage of attorney turnover	N/A		25.46%	24.18%
“New Measure” – Percent of Contracted Services (Due Process) budget component utilized to pay for leasing, maintenance and operations of facilities	N/A		29%	0
“New Measure” – Percent of Contracted Services (Due Process) budget component utilized to pay for technology	N/A		15.22%	0%
“New Measure” – Percent of Contracted Services (Due Process) budget component utilized for appeals	N/A		9.06%	5%
“New Measure” – Percent of Salaries and Benefits allocated for unallocated and underfunded appellate full-time equivalent (FTE) positions	N/A		0	0

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

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:

- 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
95.00%	94.04%	-0.96%	-1.01%

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:

The availability of funds necessary to timely process court appointed counsel billings adversely impacted our compliance rate.

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

- Training Technology
- Personnel Other (Identify)

Recommendations:

Maintain current approved standard.

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	133	-17	-11.3%

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:

Performance is dependant upon the number of records requests received.

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:

Maintain current approved standard.

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:

- 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
2,500	999	-1,501	-60%

Factors Accounting for the Difference:

Internal Factors (check all that apply):

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

Explanation:

External Factors (check all that apply):

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

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

Recommendations:

Modify the approved standard to reflect the most recent 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 cases where the court orders fees above the statutory caps

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
2,000	972	-1,028	-51.4%

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:

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:

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

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

- Training Technology
 Personnel Other (Identify)

Recommendations:

Modify the approved standard to reflect the most recent 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:

- 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
\$6,000,000	\$9,728,077	\$3,728,077	62.13%

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 amount 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:

Modify the approved standard to reflect the most recent 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 budget, payroll, disbursement, revenue and financial reports transactions 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
375,000	359,804	-15,196	-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:

Performance is dependent upon the number of invoices, payroll action requests, budget transfers, and budget amendments received from the agencies we administratively serve.

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:

Modify the approved standard to reflect the most recent 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	50,593	-14,407	-22.16%

Factors Accounting for the Difference:

Internal Factors (check all that apply):

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

Explanation:

External Factors (check all that apply):

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

Explanation:

The numbers of cases appointed to the Offices of Criminal Conflict and Civil Regional Counsel have significantly reduced the need to appoint private court appointed attorneys.

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

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

Recommendations:

Modify the approved standard to reflect the most recent 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:	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Performance Assessment of <u>Outcome</u> Measure	<input type="checkbox"/> Revision of Measure
<input type="checkbox"/> Performance Assessment of <u>Output</u> Measure	<input type="checkbox"/> Deletion of Measure
<input type="checkbox"/> Adjustment of GAA Performance Standards	
<u>Average Number of Children Represented standard not met. All other standards exceeded.</u>	

Approved Standard	Actual Performance Results	Difference (Over/Under)	Percentage Difference
26,500	23,804	(2,696)	(11.3%)

Factors Accounting for the Difference:

Internal Factors (check all that apply):

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

Explanation:

External Factors (check all that apply):

<input 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 is currently actively representing over 94% of the children assigned to the Program. We have increased our volunteer percentages by record amounts. We moved from children assigned to a volunteer at just above 50% to where it is now over 70%. The reduction in funding for the past three years (over 14%) has drastically curtailed the Program’s ability to represent all of the children in care.

EXHIBIT III – ASSESSMENT OF PERFORMANCE MEASURES

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

There were no legislatively approved measures for FY 2009-10.

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:

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	383,868	-55,927	-12.71%

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%	52.87%	-1.43	-2.63%

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%	27.69%	-5.15	-15.68%

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	1,147,172	-36,425	-3.07%

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 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
490,965	441,325	-49,640	-10.11%

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	151,236	-46,102	-23.36%

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	208,171	-11,581	-5.27%

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: 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	65,042	-18,574	-22.21%

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	14,091	-8,300	-37.06%

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	16,530	-11,156	-40.29%

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, Circuits 1-20 _____
Measure: Number of 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
784,964	728,860	56,104	7.15%

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 several 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, Circuits 1-20
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
705,061	681,563	23,498	3.3%

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: 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):

- 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, Circuits 1-20 _____

Measure: Number of cases per attorney

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
547	588	41	7.5%

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 several 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 Defender, Appellate _____
Service/Budget Entity: _____ Public Defender, Appellate _____
Measure: Annual attorney turnover rate

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
8%	3.64%	4.36	54.5%

Factors Accounting for the Difference:

Internal Factors (check all that apply):

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

Explanation: The current economic conditions have resulted in attorneys remaining in their jobs.

External Factors (check all that apply):

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

Explanation:

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

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

Recommendations:

The very stable turnover rate of the appellate attorneys is good for the offices and for the clients.

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%	90.35%	9.64	9.64%

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 several 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):

- 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:

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

- Training Technology
 Personnel 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:

- 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
5,643	5,842	199	3.52%

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 checked="" 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 briefs 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
5,968	5,818	150	2.5%

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:

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):

- 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:

Public Defenders have no control over the number of cases that are appointed.

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

- Training Technology
 Personnel 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
5,612	5,278	334	5.95%

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 several 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 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: Additional resources are required to keep up with the demand of increased cases.

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

- Training Technology
 Personnel Other (Identify)

Recommendations:

Adequate staffing is needed.

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:

- 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
5,810	5,773	37	.63%

Factors Accounting for the Difference:

Internal Factors (check all that apply):

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

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

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

Recommendations:

Acquire additional resources to provide adequate staffing.

EXHIBIT III – ASSESSMENT OF PERFORMANCE MEASURES

Department: Capital Collateral Regional Counsels

Program: Legal Representation

Service/Budget Entity: Legal Representation

Measure: Number of 3.851 Filings

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
26	25	-1	-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: The Supreme Court assigned fewer than projected 2009-10 cases.

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: Capital Collateral Regional Counsels

Program: Legal Representation

Service/Budget Entity: Legal Representation

Measure: Number 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	1	-4	-80%

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 signed one (1) Death Warrant in FY 2009-10.

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, 1st – 5th Regions
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:

**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 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: 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 court appointed attorney and due process
vendor invoices processed

Action (check one):

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

Data Sources and Methodology:

The 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 invoices 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.

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: # of work products produced in support of Clerks' Budget Requests
analyses and CCOC Legislative Budget Requests.**

Action (check one):

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

Data Sources and Methodology:

The source for this measure is Senate Bill 2108 which changed the Clerks' budgeting system from previous legislation.

Validity:

A primary function of the CCOC is to receive and assess 67 Clerk Budget Requests to the CCOC, provide assessments of those requests to the CCOC Council and support the Council in their decisions to approve 67 Clerk budgets in their annually submitted Legislative Budget Request.

Reliability:

The CCOC has a file on each of the 67 Clerks' Budget Requests and final allocated budgets.

**EXHIBIT IV – PERFORMANCE MEASURE VALIDITY AND
RELIABILITY**

Department: _____ **Justice Administration** _____

Program: _____ **Clerks of Court** _____

Service/Budget Entity: __ **Clerks of Court Operations Corporation (CCOC)**

**Measure: # of CCOC technical and analytical products produced in support of
implementing Clerks’ approved budgets.**

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:

The Legislature created the CCOC to perform as a Budget Office on behalf of the State. A primary role for this type of office is to assist in the implementation of the General Appropriations Act and meet Legislative expectations related to the funding and performance of Clerks’ offices. During a budget implementation year, the CCOC will provide status reports and assessments on a variety of budget conditions, identify and assist in resolving Clerk budget issues, manage the Clerks’ Operations Trust Fund and respond to specific Clerk and Legislative requests.

Reliability:

The CCOC documents these outputs as created and has workload survey results.

**EXHIBIT IV – PERFORMANCE MEASURE VALIDITY AND
RELIABILITY**

Department: _____ **Justice Administration** _____

Program: _____ **Clerks of Court** _____

Service/Budget Entity: __ **Clerks of Court Operations Corporation (CCOC)**

Measure: # of CCOC education and training programs and opportunities provided to Clerks' offices during the fiscal 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:

State law requires the availability of education and training for Clerks related to their operational responsibilities and related to their management of state appropriations.

Reliability:

The CCOC files contain plans for and actual instances of education and training planning, facilitation and evaluation provided through various mediums.

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

Department:	Justice Administration
Program:	State Attorneys, First - Twentieth Judicial Circuits
Service/Budget Entity:	State Attorneys, First - Twentieth Judicial Circuits
Measure:	Total number of dispositions

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

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

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

Department:	Justice Administration
Program:	State Attorneys, First - Twentieth Judicial Circuits
Service/Budget Entity:	State Attorneys, First - Twentieth Judicial Circuits
Measure:	Number of dispositions by pleas

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Department: Justice Administration
Program: State Attorneys, First – Twentieth Judicial Circuits
Service/Budget Entity: State Attorneys, First - Twentieth Judicial Circuits
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:

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

Department:	Justice Administration
Program:	State Attorneys, First – Twentieth Judicial Circuits
Service/Budget Entity:	State Attorneys, First – Twentieth Judicial Circuits
Measure:	Number of felony 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 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

Department:	Justice Administration
Program:	State Attorneys, First - Twentieth Judicial Circuits
Service/Budget Entity:	State Attorneys, First – Twentieth Judicial Circuits
Measure:	Number of juvenile 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 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

Department:	Justice Administration
Program:	State Attorneys, First – Twentieth Judicial Circuits
Service/Budget Entity:	State Attorneys, First – Twentieth Judicial Circuits
Measure:	Number of misdemeanor 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 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

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

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

Department:	Justice Administration
Program:	State Attorneys, First - Twentieth Judicial Circuits
Service/Budget Entity:	State Attorneys, First – Twentieth Judicial Circuits
Measure:	Number of sexual predator civil commitment proceedings

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

Department:	Justice Administration
Program:	State Attorneys, First – Twentieth Judicial Circuits
Service/Budget Entity:	State Attorneys, First – Twentieth Judicial Circuits
Measure:	Number of Baker Act 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:

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, Circuits 1-20** _____
Measure: **Annual attorney turnover rate**

Action (check one):

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

Data Sources and Methodology:

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: Ten 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, Circuits 1-20** _____
Measure: **Number of appointed & re-opened 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 (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: Ten 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, Circuits 1-20** _____
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 (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: Ten 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, Circuits 1-20** _____
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 (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: Ten 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, Circuits 1-20** _____
Measure: **Number of cases per attorney**

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 (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: Ten 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: **Annual attorney turnover rate**

Action (check one):

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

Data Sources and Methodology:

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 input in each office.

Reliability: Ten 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 input in each office.

Reliability: Ten 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 input in each office.

Reliability: Ten 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 input in each office.

Reliability: Ten 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 input in each office.

Reliability: Ten 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 input in each office.

Reliability: Ten 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 input in each office.

Reliability: Ten 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 as 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**

Department: Justice Administration
Program: Criminal Conflict and Civil Regional Counsels
Service/Budget Entity: Regional Conflict Counsels, 1st – 5th Regions
Measure: Annual percentage of attorney turnover

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 percentage of attorney turnover rate in a case management database.

Validity: This performance measure produces a valid measurement of the Regional Counsels' attorney turnover rate, as it relates to an equitable salary structure which produces an outcome of quality representation.

Reliability: The data produced is reliable in that the percentage of attorney turnover is 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, 1st – 5th Regions
Measure: Percent of Contracted Services (Due Process) budget component utilized to pay for leasing, maintenance and operations of facilities.

Action (check one):

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

Data Sources and Methodology:

The Criminal Conflict and Civil Regional Counsels record the percentage of Contracted Services (CS) budget used to pay leases, maintenance and operations of facilities in the State accounting program, Florida Accounting Information Resource Subsystem (FLAIR).

Validity: This performance measure produces a valid measurement of the Regional Counsels' workload that is affected by the underfunded expenditures of the CS budget component used for leases, maintenance and operations of facilities with an outcome of limited revenue to provide quality representation to all clients.

Reliability: The data produced is reliable in that the percentage of CS budget used for leases, maintenance and operations of facilities is recorded accurately in the State accounting program, FLAIR.

**EXHIBIT IV – PERFORMANCE MEASURE VALIDITY AND
RELIABILITY**

Department: Justice Administration
Program: Criminal Conflict and Civil Regional Counsels
Service/Budget Entity: Regional Conflict Counsels, 1st – 5th Regions
Measure: Percent of Contracted Services (Due Process) budget component utilized to pay for technology

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 percentage of Contracted Services (CS) budget used for technology in the State accounting program, Florida Accounting Information Resource Subsystem (FLAIR).

Validity: This performance measure produces a valid measurement of the Regional Counsels' workload that is affected by the unfunded expenditures of the CS budget component used for technology with an outcome of limited revenue to provide quality representation to all clients.

Reliability: The data produced is reliable in that the percentage of CS budget used for technology is reported accurately in the State accounting program, FLAIR.

**EXHIBIT IV – PERFORMANCE MEASURE VALIDITY AND
RELIABILITY**

Department:	Justice Administration
Program:	Criminal Conflict and Civil Regional Counsels
Service/Budget Entity:	Regional Conflict Counsels, 1st – 5th Regions
Measure:	Percent of Contracted Services (Due Process) budget component utilized for 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 Criminal Conflict and Civil Regional Counsels record the number of appellate cases appointed and the percentage of Contracted Services (CS) budget utilized for appeals in a case management database.

Validity: This performance measure produces a valid measurement of the Regional Counsels' workload as it is affected by the use of the Contracted Services budget with an outcome of limited revenue to provide quality representation to all clients.

Reliability: The data produced is reliable in that the number of appellate cases and the percentage of CS budget used 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, 1st – 5th Regions
Measure:	Percent of Salaries and Benefits allocated for unallocated and underfunded appellate full-time equivalent (FTE) positions

Action (check one):

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

Data Sources and Methodology:

The Criminal Conflict and Civil Regional Counsels record the number of appellate cases appointed in a case management database. The percentage of Contracted Services (CS) budget utilized for appeals and the percentage of Salaries and Benefits allocated for unallocated and underfunded appellate full-time equivalent positions are also recorded in the State accounting program, Florida Accounting Information Resource Subsystem (FLAIR).

Validity: This performance measure produces a valid measurement of the Regional Counsels' workload as it is affected by the use of the Contracted Services budget and the Salaries and Benefits budget with an outcome of limited revenue to provide quality representation to all clients.

Reliability: The data produced is reliable in that the number of appellate cases and the percentages of CS and Salary budget used are reported accurately in the database and the State accounting program, FLAIR.

**ASSOCIATED ACTIVITIES CONTRIBUTING TO PERFORMANCE
MEASURES – LRPP EXHIBIT V**

EXHIBIT V – ASSOCIATED ACTIVITIES CONTRIBUTING TO PERFORMANCE MEASURES

Measure Number	Approved Performance Measures for FY 2010-11 (Words)		Associated Activities Title
1	Percent of invoices processed within statutory time frames		Executive Direction Pass Through - Due Process and Court Appointed Costs Pass Through - to DMS and DFS
2	Number of public records requests		Executive Direction Pass Through - Due Process and Court Appointed Costs
3	Number of cases where registry lawyers request fees above statutory caps		Pass Through - Due Process and Court Appointed Costs
4	Number of cases where the court orders fees above the statutory caps		Pass Through - Due Process and Court Appointed Costs
5	Total amount of excess fees awarded by the courts per circuit		Pass Through - Due Process and Court Appointed Costs
6	Number of budget, payroll, disbursement, revenue, and financial reporting transactions		Executive Direction Pass Through - Due Process and Court Appointed Costs Pass Through – to DMS and DFS
7	Number of court appointed attorney and due process vendor invoices		Pass Through – Due Process and Court Appointed Costs

Office of Policy and Budget – July, 2009

EXHIBIT V – ASSOCIATED ACTIVITIES CONTRIBUTING TO PERFORMANCE MEASURES

Measure Number	Approved Performance Measures for FY 2010-11 (Words)		Associated Activities Title
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

Measure Number	“Proposed” Performance Measures for FY 2010-11 (Words)		“Proposed” Associated Activity Titles
1	“New Measure” - # of work products produced in support of Clerks’ Budget Requests analyses and CCOC Legislative Budget Requests.		“New Activity” – Clerks’ Legislative Budget Request and Final Appropriation Allocations
2	“New Measure” - # of CCOC technical and analytical products produced in support of implementing Clerks’ approved budgets.		“New Activity” - Trust Fund and Clerks’ budget status monitoring, analysis, reporting and issues management.
3	“New Measure” - # of CCOC education and training programs and opportunities provided to Clerks’ offices during the fiscal year.		“New Activity” - Provide Education and Training to Clerks’ Offices

EXHIBIT V – ASSOCIATED ACTIVITIES CONTRIBUTING TO PERFORMANCE MEASURES

Measure Number	Approved Performance Measures for FY 2010-11 (Words)		Associated Activity Titles (From Exhibit VI)
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

Measure Number	Approved Performance Measures for FY 2010-11 (Words)		Associated Activity Titles (From Exhibit VI)
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

Measure Number	Approved Performance Measures for FY 2010-11 (Words)		Associated Activity Titles (From Exhibit VI)
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

Measure Number	Approved Performance Measures for FY 2010-11 (Words)		Associated Activity Titles (From Exhibit VI)
20	Number of Baker Act hearings		Civil Action Services

EXHIBIT V – ASSOCIATED ACTIVITIES CONTRIBUTING TO PERFORMANCE MEASURES

Measure Number	Approved Performance Measures for FY 2010-11 (Words)		Associated Activity Titles (From Exhibit VI)
1	Annual attorney turnover rate		Civil Trial Indigent Defense Civil Investigative Services Criminal Trial Indigent Defense Criminal Investigative Services
2	Number of appointed & re-opened cases		Civil Trial Indigent Defense Civil Investigative Services Criminal Trial Indigent Defense Criminal Investigative Services
3	Number of cases closed		Civil Trial Indigent Defense Civil Investigative Services Criminal Trial Indigent Defense Criminal Investigative Services
4	Number of clients represented		Civil Trial Indigent Defense Civil Investigative Services Criminal Trial Indigent Defense Criminal Investigative Services
5	Number of cases per attorney		Civil Trial Indigent Defense Civil Investigative Services Criminal Trial Indigent Defense Criminal Investigative Services

EXHIBIT V – ASSOCIATED ACTIVITIES CONTRIBUTING TO PERFORMANCE MEASURES

Measure Number	Approved Performance Measures for FY 2010-11 (Words)		Associated Activity Titles (From Exhibit VI)
1	Annual attorney turnover rates		Indigent Appellate Defense
2	Percent of appeals resolved		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

Measure Number	Approved Performance Measures for FY 2010-11 (Words)		Associated Activities Title
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

Measure Number	“Proposed” Performance Measures for FY 2010-11 (Words)		Approved Associated Activity Titles (From Exhibit VI)
1	“New Measure” – Annual percentage of attorney turnover		Regional Counsel Workload
2	“New Measure” – Percent of Contracted Services (Due Process) budget component utilized to pay for leasing, maintenance and operations of facilities		Regional Counsel Workload
3	“New Measure” – Percent of Contracted Services (Due Process) budget component utilized to pay for technology		Regional Counsel Workload
4	“New Measure” – Percent of Contracted Services (Due Process) budget component utilized for appeals		Regional Counsel Workload
5	“New Measure” – Percent of Salaries and Benefits allocated for unallocated and underfunded appellate full-time equivalent (FTE) positions.		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