



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, 2011

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

JoAnne Leznoff, Staff Director
House Appropriations Committee
221 Capitol
Tallahassee, Florida 32399-1300

Terry Rhodes, Staff Director
Senate Budget Committee
201 Capitol
Tallahassee, Florida 32399-1300

Dear Directors:

Pursuant to Chapter 216, Florida Statutes, the Long Range Program Plan 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 2012-13 through Fiscal Year 2016-17. 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 black ink, appearing to read "Alton L. Colvin, Jr.", written over a white background.

Alton L. "Rip" Colvin, Jr.



JUSTICE ADMINISTRATIVE COMMISSION

LONG-RANGE PROGRAM PLAN FY 2012-13 THROUGH 2016-17

September 30, 2011



STATEWIDE GUARDIAN AD LITEM OFFICE

Long Range Program Plan

Fiscal Years 2012-2013 through 2016-2017

September 30, 2011

Alan Abramowitz
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 2012-2013 THROUGH FY 2016-2017**

September 30, 2011

Submitted by

John Dew
Executive Director
2560-102 Barrington Circle
Tallahassee, FL 32308-3890
(850) 386-2223



OFFICES OF THE STATE ATTORNEY

LONG RANGE PROGRAM PLAN FY 2012-2013 THROUGH FY 2016-2017

September 30, 2011

**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 Russell
State Attorney, Twentieth Judicial Circuit**



OFFICES OF THE PUBLIC DEFENDER

LONG RANGE PROGRAM PLAN FY 2012-2013 THROUGH FY 2016-2017

September 30, 2011

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

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

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

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

**Honorable Howard H. "Skip" Babb, Jr.
Public Defender, Fifth Judicial Circuit**

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

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

**Honorable Stacy A. Scott
Public Defender, Eighth Judicial Circuit**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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



OFFICES OF THE PUBLIC DEFENDER – APPELLATE

**LONG RANGE PROGRAM PLAN
FY 2012-2013 THROUGH FY 2016-2017**

September 30, 2011

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

**Honorable James S. 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 2012-13 through 2016-17

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

September 2011



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

**LONG RANGE PROGRAM PLAN
FY 2012-2013 THROUGH FY 2016-2017**

September 30, 2011

**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 mission of the Justice Administrative Commission (JAC) is to be responsible stewards of taxpayer dollars, while providing the highest quality service to the 49 judicial entities we serve, by ensuring compliance with Florida Statutes and Generally Accepted Accounting Principles.

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

Priority # 1 Goal:

Provide quality administrative services.

STATEWIDE GUARDIAN AD LITEM

Mission: *The Florida Guardian ad Litem Program is a partnership of community volunteer advocates and professional staff providing a powerful voice on behalf of Florida's abused, abandoned or neglected children, advocating for the child's best interest, as our only interest.*

Long Range Operational Goals:

- *Assure that every child has a voice in court.*
- *Using quantitative and qualitative data to demonstrate that GAL advocacy correlates with improved case outcomes for children in the dependency system.*
- *Implement a consistent core program of evidence based on training for GAL volunteers which strengthens their ability to address the needs of the children they represent.*
- *Advance the mission alignment and operational relationships among and between the Office of the Executive Director, the Circuits, the local Non-Profit Boards and the Foundation.*

Priority # 1 Goal:

To provide effective advocacy and improved outcomes for all of Florida's abused, abandoned and neglected children.

AGENCY MISSION AND GOALS

STATEWIDE GUARDIAN AD LITEM

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.

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*

AGENCY MISSION AND GOALS

PUBLIC DEFENDER

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.

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*

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.

OFFICE OF CRIMINAL CONFLICT AND CIVIL REGIONAL COUNSEL (OCCRC)

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

AGENCY MISSION AND GOALS

OFFICE OF CRIMINAL CONFLICT AND CIVIL REGIONAL COUNSEL (OCCRC)

Priority # 1 Goal:

To ensure cases are processed in a timely and cost effective manner.

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:

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

AGENCY OBJECTIVES

STATE ATTORNEY

Goal 2 Objective:

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

PUBLIC DEFENDER

Goals 1 – 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 (CCRC)

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:

*Appeals: File initial appellate briefs within 30 days of receipt of record.
Criminal: Close misdemeanor cases within 120 days of appointment.
Dependency: In cases where there is either an adjudication or a withhold of adjudication, file a case plan to be approved by the court within 90 day of appointment.*

AGENCY SERVICE OUTCOMES AND PERFORMANCE PROJECTION TABLES

JUSTICE ADMINISTRATIVE COMMISSION

Outcome: Number of transactions processed.

Baseline/ Year 2010-11	FY 2012-13	FY 2013-14	FY 2014-15	FY 2015-16	FY 2016-17
490,640	450,000	459,000	468,180	477,544	487,095

Outcome: Number of invoices processed.

Baseline/ Year 2010-11	FY 2012-13	FY 2013-14	FY 2014-15	FY 2015-16	FY 2016-17
54,733	55,828	56,945	58,804	59,246	60,431

STATEWIDE GUARDIAN AD LITEM

PRIMARY SERVICE OUTCOMES:

Outcome: Average number of children represented.

Baseline					
FY 2010/11	FY 2012/13	FY 2013/14	FY 2014/15	FY 2015/16	FY 2016/17
21,497	24,864	26,441	28,018	29,594	31,171

Proposed Outcome Measure: Average percent of children represented.

Baseline					
FY 2010/11	FY 2012/13	FY 2013/14	FY 2014/15	FY 2015/16	FY 2016/17
70%	80%	85%	90%	95%	100%

Explanation: Showing the average percent of children represented gives the reader an understanding of the number of children we represent as a percent of the whole number needing representation. It is important to show the number and percent of children represented in order to give a more accurate picture of this measure.

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

Baseline					
FY 2010/11	FY 2012/13	FY 2013/14	FY 2014/15	FY 2015/16	FY 2016/17
79%	80%	81%	82%	83%	84%

AGENCY SERVICE OUTCOMES AND PERFORMANCE PROJECTION TABLES

Explanation: Propose deletion of outcome measure “Percent of cases discharged after DCF supervision is terminated” and replace with revised outcome “Percent of cases closed with Permanency Goal achieved”.

Proposed Outcome Measure: Percent of cases closed with Permanency Goal achieved.

<u>Baseline</u>					
FY 2010/11	FY 2012/13	FY 2013/14	FY 2014/15	FY 2015/16	FY 2016/17
68%	70%	71%	72%	73%	74%

Explanation: The original outcome measure of “Percent of cases discharged after DCF supervision is terminated” is a difficult measure to assess. The Guardian ad Litem (GAL) Program does not capture this data within our data systems, and we are unsure how this measure was calculated when the measure was originally chosen. We are unable to accurately provide a result. We propose to change the language of the outcome to more clearly assess what we believe the original authors of the outcome intended to demonstrate: Percent of cases closed with Permanency Goal achieved.” A key outcome measure for children is achievement of true permanency, either through adoption, reunification with family, or a permanent guardianship arrangement. These are true permanency outcomes and, in each case, DCF supervision is terminated when those goals are achieved. Ideally, a GAL should not discharge off of an assigned case short of achieving that permanency although that desired result is not always achieved. We should, however, strive to maximize that result for the best interests of the child. We currently capture closing information for adoption, reunification and permanent guardianship. Improvement in that result over time is highly desired and in the best interests of children. It is a true outcome measure.

Outcome: Number of new volunteers certified as a GAL.

<u>Baseline</u>					
FY 2010/11	FY 2012/13	FY 2013/14	FY 2014/15	FY 2015/16	FY 2016/17
2,013	3,924	4,120	4,326	4,542	4,796

Outcome: Average number of active volunteers.

<u>Baseline</u>					
FY 2010/11	FY 2012/13	FY 2013/14	FY 2014/15	FY 2015/16	FY 2016/17
7,633	9,283	9,747	10,234	10,746	11,283

AGENCY SERVICE OUTCOMES AND PERFORMANCE PROJECTION TABLES

CLERKS OF COURT OPERATIONS CORPORATION

Outcome Measure: 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 2012-13	FY 2013-14	FY 2014-15	FY 2015-16	FY 2016-17
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 2010-11 BASELINE	FY 2012-13	FY 2013-14	FY 2014-15	FY 2015-16	FY 2016-17
Offenders who qualify for enhanced sentence for whom the State requests enhanced sentence	407	407	407	407	407	407
Offenders for whom the Court orders enhanced sentencing	407	407	407	407	407	407
Percentage of offenders sentenced by the Court to an enhanced sentence	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

Outcome: Assistant State Attorney turnover rate.

FY 2010-11 BASELINE	FY 2012-13	FY 2013-14	FY 2014-15	FY 2015-16	FY 2016-17
17.07%	17.07%	17.07%	17.07%	17.07%	17.07%

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 2012-13	FY 2013-14	FY 2014-15	FY 2015-16	FY 2016-17
Offenders who qualify for enhanced sentence for whom the State requests enhanced sentence	152	175	175	180	180	180
Offenders for whom the Court orders enhanced sentencing	53	175	175	180	180	180
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 2012-13	FY 2013-14	FY 2014-15	FY 2015-16	FY 2016-17
33.4%	30%	30%	25%	20%	20%

STATE ATTORNEY, THIRD JUDICIAL CIRCUIT

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

	FY 2000-01 BASELINE	FY 2012-13	FY 2013-14	FY 2014-15	FY 2015-16	FY 2016-17
Offenders who qualify for enhanced sentence for whom the State requests enhanced sentence	7	10	11	12	13	14
Offenders for whom the Court orders enhanced sentencing	6	9	10	11	12	13
Percentage of offenders sentenced by the Court to an enhanced sentence	85.7%	90%	91%	92%	92%	93%

Outcome: Assistant State Attorney turnover rate.

FY 2000-01 BASELINE	FY 2012-13	FY 2013-14	FY 2014-15	FY 2015-16	FY 2016-17
13.6%	12%	14%	15%	17%	17%

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 2012-13	FY 2013-14	FY 2014-15	FY 2015-16	FY 2016-17
Offenders who qualify for enhanced sentence for whom the State requests enhanced sentence	303	950	950	950	950	950
Offenders for whom the Court orders enhanced sentencing	300	902	902	902	902	902
Percentage of offenders sentenced by the Court to an enhanced sentence	99%	95	95	95	95	95

Outcome: Assistant State Attorney turnover rate.

FY 2000-01 BASELINE	FY 2012-13	FY 2013-14	FY 2014-15	FY 2015-16	FY 2016-17
22%	15%	15%	15%	15%	15%

STATE ATTORNEY, FIFTH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT

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

	FY 2001-02 BASELINE	FY 2012-13	FY 2013-14	FY 2014-15	FY 2015-16	FY 2016-17
Offenders who qualify for enhanced sentence for whom the State requests enhanced sentence	320	291	299	308	317	326
Offenders for whom the Court orders enhanced sentencing	168	280	288	296	305	314
Percentage of offenders sentenced by the Court to an enhanced sentence	52.50%	97%	97%	97%	97%	97%

Outcome: Assistant State Attorney turnover rate.

FY 2000-01 BASELINE	FY 2012-13	FY 2013-14	FY 2014-15	FY 2015-16	FY 2016-17
20.59%	12.36%	11.74%	11.15%	10.59%	10.06%

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 2012-13	FY 2013-14	FY 2014-15	FY 2015-16	FY 2016-17
Offenders who qualify for enhanced sentence for whom the State requests enhanced sentence	508	400	400	350	350	325
Offenders for whom the Court orders enhanced sentencing	356	280	300	280	280	276
Percentage of offenders sentenced by the Court to an enhanced sentence	38%	39%	40%	41%	41%	42%

Outcome: Assistant State Attorney turnover rate.

FY 2000-01 BASELINE	FY 2012-13	FY 2013-14	FY 2014-15	FY 2015-16	FY 2016-17
15%	15%	15%	15%	15%	14%

STATE ATTORNEY, SEVENTH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT

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

	FY 2000-01 BASELINE	FY 2012-13	FY 2013-14	FY 2014-15	FY 2015-16	FY 2016-17
Offenders who qualify for enhanced sentence for whom the State requests enhanced sentence	223	440	450	455	460	460
Offenders for whom the Court orders enhanced sentencing	90	404	427	432	437	437
Percentage of offenders sentenced by the Court to an enhanced sentence	40.5%	92%	95%	95%	95%	95%

Outcome: Assistant State Attorney turnover rate.

FY 2000-01 BASELINE	FY 2012-13	FY 2013-14	FY 2014-15	FY 2015-16	FY 2016-17
19.8%	25%	22%	20%	19%	18%

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 2012-13	FY 2013-14	FY 2014-15	FY 2015-16	FY 2016-17
Offenders who qualify for enhanced sentence for whom the State requests enhanced sentence	175	137	139	141	143	145

Outcome: Assistant State Attorney turnover rate.

FY 2006-07 BASELINE	FY 2012-13	FY 2013-14	FY 2014-15	FY 2015-16	FY 2016-17
14.36%	20.20%	20.30%	20.40%	20.50%	20.60%

STATE ATTORNEY, NINTH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT

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

	FY 2000-01 BASELINE	FY 2012-13	FY 2013-14	FY 2014-15	FY 2015-16	FY 2016-17
Offenders who qualify for enhanced sentence for whom the State requests enhanced sentence	634	206	207	208	209	210
Offenders for whom the Court orders enhanced sentencing	148	206	207	208	209	210
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 2012-13	FY 2013-14	FY 2014-15	FY 2015-16	FY 2016-17
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 2012-13	FY 2013-14	FY 2014-15	FY 2015-16	FY 2016-17
Offenders who qualify for enhanced sentence for whom the State requests enhanced sentence	465	340	347	354	368	370
Offenders for whom the Court orders enhanced sentencing	220	323	330	336	350	350
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 2012-13	FY 2013-14	FY 2014-15	FY 2015-16	FY 2016-17
16.7%	25%	25%	25%	25%	25%

STATE ATTORNEY, ELEVENTH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT

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

	FY 2000-01 BASELINE	FY 2012-13	FY 2013-14	FY 2014-15	FY 2015-16	FY 2016-17
Offenders who qualify for enhanced sentence for whom the State requests enhanced sentence	3,683	2,576	2,704	2,840	2,982	3,131

Outcome: Assistant State Attorney turnover rate.

FY 2000-01 BASELINE	FY 2012-13	FY 2013-14	FY 2014-15	FY 2015-16	FY 2016-17
21.85%	20%	20%	20%	20%	20%

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 2012-13	FY 2013-14	FY 2014-15	FY 2015-16	FY 2016-17
Offenders who qualify for enhanced sentence for whom the State requests enhanced sentence	210	123	124	125	126	127
Offenders for whom the Court orders enhanced sentencing	123	42	44	46	48	50
Percentage of offenders sentenced by the Court to an enhanced sentence	58.57%	34%	35%	36%	38%	39%

Outcome: Assistant State Attorney turnover rate.

FY 2000-01 BASELINE	FY 2012-13	FY 2013-14	FY 2014-15	FY 2015-16	FY 2016-17
20.5%	19.7%	18%	17%	16%	15%

STATE ATTORNEY, THIRTEENTH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT

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

	FY 2000-01 BASELINE	FY 2012-13	FY 2013-14	FY 2014-15	FY 2015-16	FY 2016-17
Offenders who qualify for enhanced sentence for whom the State requests enhanced sentence	210	541	546	551	557	563
Offenders for whom the Court orders enhanced sentencing	203	523	528	533	539	545
Percentage of offenders sentenced by the Court to an enhanced sentence	96.70%	96.70%	96.70%	96.73%	96.77%	96.80%

Outcome: Assistant State Attorney turnover rate.

FY 2000-01 BASELINE	FY 2012-13	FY 2013-14	FY 2014-15	FY 2015-16	FY 2016-17
27.91%	17%	18%	19%	20%	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 2012-13	FY 2013-14	FY 2014-15	FY 2015-16	FY 2016-17
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 2012-13	FY 2013-14	FY 2014-15	FY 2015-16	FY 2016-17
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 2012-13	FY 2013-14	FY 2014-15	FY 2015-16	FY 2016-17
Offenders who qualify for enhanced sentence for whom the State requests enhanced sentence	313	230	235	240	245	250
Offenders for whom the Court orders enhanced sentencing	164	230	235	240	245	250
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 2012-13	FY 2013-14	FY 2014-15	FY 2015-16	FY 2016-17
24.15%	14%	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 2012-13	FY 2013-14	FY 2014-15	FY 2015-16	FY 2016-17
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 2012-13	FY 2013-14	FY 2014-15	FY 2015-16	FY 2016-17
77%	25%	25%	25%	25%	25%

STATE ATTORNEY, SEVENTEENTH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT

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

	FY 2001-02 BASELINE	FY 2012-13	FY 2013-14	FY 2014-15	FY 2015-16	FY 2016-17
Offenders who qualify for enhanced sentence for whom the State requests enhanced sentence	849	883	883	883	883	883
Offenders for whom the Court orders enhanced sentencing	501	407	407	407	407	407
Percentage of offenders sentenced by the Court to an enhanced sentence	59%	50%	50%	50%	50%	50%

Outcome: Assistant State Attorney turnover rate.

FY 2000-01 BASELINE	FY 2012-13	FY 2013-14	FY 2014-15	FY 2015-16	FY 2016-17
18%	20%	20%	20%	20%	20%

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 2012-13	FY 2013-14	FY 2014-15	FY 2015-16	FY 2016-17
Offenders who qualify for enhanced sentence for whom the State requests enhanced sentence	121	134	136	140	142	145
Offenders for whom the Court orders enhanced sentencing	97	134	136	140	142	145
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 2012-13	FY 2013-14	FY 2014-15	FY 2015-16	FY 2016-17
27.2%	12.5%	12.25%	12.00%	11.75%	11.50%

STATE ATTORNEY, NINETEENTH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT

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

	FY 2000-01 BASELINE	FY 2012-13	FY 2013-14	FY 2014-15	FY 2015-16	FY 2016-17
Offenders who qualify for enhanced sentence for whom the State requests enhanced sentence	69	51	53	55	57	59
Offenders for whom the Court orders enhanced sentencing	28	51	53	55	57	59
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 2012-13	FY 2013-14	FY 2014-15	FY 2015-16	FY 2016-17
17.67%	12.05%	12.05%	12.05%	12.05%	12.05%

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 2012-13	FY 2013-14	FY 2014-15	FY 2015-16	FY 2016-17
Offenders who qualify for enhanced sentence for whom the State requests enhanced sentence	257	448	448	448	448	448
Offenders for whom the Court orders enhanced sentencing	105	327	327	327	327	327
Percentage of offenders sentenced by the Court to an enhanced sentence	41.00%	72.99%	72.99%	72.99%	72.99%	72.99%

Outcome: Assistant State Attorney turnover rate.

FY 2000-01 BASELINE	FY 2012-13	FY 2013-14	FY 2014-15	FY 2015-16	FY 2016-17
27.00%	12.35%	12.35%	12.35%	12.35%	12.35%

PUBLIC DEFENDER PUBLIC DEFENDER, FIRST THROUGH TWENTIETH CIRCUITS

Outcome: Percent of attorney turnover rates.

FY 2000-01 BASELINE	FY 2012-13	FY 2013-14	FY 2014-15	FY 2015-16	FY 2016-17
23.47%	14.26%	13.55%	12.87%	12.23%	11.62%

Outcome: Number of cases per attorney.

FY 2009-10 BASELINE	FY 2012-13	FY 2013-14	FY 2014-15	FY 2015-16	FY 2016-17
547	494	469	445	423	402

**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 2012-13	FY 2013-14	FY 2014-15	FY 2015-16	FY 2016-17
8.1%	6.0%	5.0%	4.0%	3.0%	2.0%

Outcome: Percent of appeals resolved annually.

FY 2000-01 BASELINE	FY 2012-13	FY 2013-14	FY 2014-15	FY 2015-16	FY 2016-17
95.8%	99.7%	99%	99.99%	99.99%	99.99%

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 2012-13	FY 2013-14	FY 2014-15	FY 2015-16	FY 2016-17
3	6	6	6	5	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 2012-13	FY 2013-14	FY 2014-15	FY 2015-16	FY 2016-17
3	6	5	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: Annual percentage of appellate briefs filed within 30 days of receipt of record.

FY 2010-11 BASELINE	FY 2012-13	FY 2013-14	FY 2014-15	FY 2015-16	FY 2016-17
50%	60%	65%	70%	75%	80%

Outcome: Annual percentage of misdemeanor cases closed within 120 days of appointment.

FY 2010-11 BASELINE	FY 2012-13	FY 2013-14	FY 2014-15	FY 2015-16	FY 2016-17
46%	56%	61%	66%	71%	76%

Outcome: In cases where there is either an adjudication or a withhold of adjudication, the percentage of case plans approved by the court within 90 days of appointment.

FY 2010-11 BASELINE	FY 2012-13	FY 2013-14	FY 2014-15	FY 2015-16	FY 2016-17
82%	92%	97%	100%	100%	100%

CRIMINAL CONFLICT AND CIVIL REGIONAL COUNSEL, SECOND DISTRICT

Outcome: Annual percentage of appellate briefs filed within 30 days of receipt of record.

FY 2010-11 BASELINE	FY 2012-13	FY 2013-14	FY 2014-15	FY 2015-16	FY 2016-17
30%	40%	50%	52%	54%	54%

Outcome: Annual percentage of misdemeanor cases closed within 120 days of appointment.

FY 2010-11 BASELINE	FY 2012-13	FY 2013-14	FY 2014-15	FY 2015-16	FY 2016-17
92%	93%	93%	93%	93%	93%

AGENCY SERVICE OUTCOMES AND PERFORMANCE PROJECTION TABLES

OFFICES OF CRIMINAL CONFLICT AND CIVIL REGIONAL COUNSELS *

Outcome: In cases where there is either an adjudication or a withhold of adjudication, the percentage of case plans approved by the court within 90 days of appointment.

FY 2010-11 BASELINE	FY 2012-13	FY 2013-14	FY 2014-15	FY 2015-16	FY 2016-17
88%	90%	90%	90%	90%	90%

CRIMINAL CONFLICT AND CIVIL REGIONAL COUNSEL, THIRD DISTRICT

Outcome: Annual percentage of appellate briefs filed within 30 days of receipt of record.

FY 2010-11 BASELINE	FY 2012-13	FY 2013-14	FY 2014-15	FY 2015-16	FY 2016-17
20%	25%	30%	35%	40%	45%

Outcome: Annual percentage of misdemeanor cases closed within 120 days of appointment.

FY 2010-11 BASELINE	FY 2012-13	FY 2013-14	FY 2014-15	FY 2015-16	FY 2016-17
60%	65%	70%	75%	80%	85%

Outcome: In cases where there is either an adjudication or a withhold of adjudication, the percentage of case plans approved by the court within 90 days of appointment.

FY 2010-11 BASELINE	FY 2012-13	FY 2013-14	FY 2014-15	FY 2015-16	FY 2016-17
10%	15%	20%	25%	30%	35%

CRIMINAL CONFLICT AND CIVIL REGIONAL COUNSEL, FOURTH DISTRICT

Outcome: Annual percentage of appellate briefs filed within 30 days of receipt of record.

FY 2010-11 BASELINE	FY 2012-13	FY 2013-14	FY 2014-15	FY 2015-16	FY 2016-17
5%	10%	15%	20%	25%	30%

AGENCY SERVICE OUTCOMES AND PERFORMANCE PROJECTION TABLES

OFFICES OF CRIMINAL CONFLICT AND CIVIL REGIONAL COUNSELS *

Outcome: Annual percentage of misdemeanor cases closed within 120 days of appointment.

FY 2010-11 BASELINE	FY 2012-13	FY 2013-14	FY 2014-15	FY 2015-16	FY 2016-17
55%	60%	65%	70%	75%	80%

Outcome: In cases where there is either an adjudication or a withhold of adjudication, the percentage of case plans approved by the court within 90 days of appointment.

FY 2010-11 BASELINE	FY 2012-13	FY 2013-14	FY 2014-15	FY 2015-16	FY 2016-17
60%	62%	64%	66%	67%	68%

CRIMINAL CONFLICT AND CIVIL REGIONAL COUNSEL, FIFTH DISTRICT

Outcome: Annual percentage of appellate briefs filed within 30 days of receipt of record.

FY 2010-11 BASELINE	FY 2012-13	FY 2013-14	FY 2014-15	FY 2015-16	FY 2016-17
69%	74%	79%	84%	89%	92%

Outcome: Annual percentage of misdemeanor cases closed within 120 days of appointment.

FY 2010-11 BASELINE	FY 2012-13	FY 2013-14	FY 2014-15	FY 2015-16	FY 2016-17
72%	77%	82%	87%	92%	97%

Outcome: In cases where there is either an adjudication or a withhold of adjudication, the percentage of case plans approved by the court within 90 days of appointment.

FY 2010-11 BASELINE	FY 2012-13	FY 2013-14	FY 2014-15	FY 2015-16	FY 2016-17
85%	87%	89%	91%	93%	95%

***The Offices of Criminal Conflict and Civil Regional Counsels did not have approved measures, so Fiscal Year 2010-2011 numbers were used as our baseline. A 5% growth is anticipated for Fiscal Year 2011-2012.**

LINKAGE TO GOVERNOR'S PRIORITIES

PRIORITY #1 – ACCOUNTABILITY BUDGETING

JUSTICE ADMINISTRATIVE COMMISSION (JAC)

Objective 1: Accurately and efficiently process transactions for JAC, and, on behalf of, the 49 agencies we administratively serve.

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 (GAL)

Governor Rick Scott has established priorities for his administration to better serve Floridians. As shown below, direct linkages exist between the priorities of Governor Scott and the goals set out in this plan.

GAL Program Goal # 1: To provide effective advocacy and improved outcomes for all of Florida's abused, abandoned or neglected children.

GAL Program Goal # 2: Advocate for timely permanency for children.

CLERKS OF COURT OPERATIONS CORPORATION (CCOC)

The CCOC is charged by state statute to be accountable for providing credible Legislative Budget Requests to the state, administering the allocation of final appropriations to 67 Clerks' offices and providing Clerks and the state with credible financial and performance measurement status reports during the fiscal year. The CCOC operates with sophisticated and comprehensive budgeting and metrics based monitoring systems to justify budget requests, monitor and manage fiscal year trust fund balances and track Clerks' office financial and performance results. CCOC systems expertly monitor approved court related performance standards and provide highly credible accountability reports on financial, operational and performance results.

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.

PUBLIC DEFENDERS

Goal # 1: Provide quality representation to all appointees.

LINKAGE TO GOVERNOR’S PRIORITIES

PRIORITY #1 – ACCOUNTABILITY BUDGETING

PUBLIC DEFENDERS APPELLATE

Goal # 1: Process appeals in a timely manner.

CAPITAL COLLATERAL REGIONAL COUNSELS (CCRC)

CCRC Middle and South utilize a sophisticated and integrated budget, operations and performance accountability system. This system allows CCRCs to prepare credible, detailed Legislative Budget Requests, track financial and operational performance results during the fiscal year and provide state required reports. This system provides the means by which CCRC operations can be transparent.

The CCRC system produces internal budget and performance management oriented “metrics” during the fiscal year. These metrics help CCRC offices to monitor cost efficiency, employee productivity and performance results objectives. In addition, CCRCs can use the metrics to provide timely responses to Governor’s Office and Legislative staff and member questions related to any aspect of CCRC operations, financial status and performance results.

OFFICE OF CRIMINAL CONFLICT AND CIVIL REGIONAL COUNSELS

Goal: To ensure cases are processed in a timely and cost effective manner.

PRIORITY #2 – REDUCE GOVERNMENT SPENDING

JUSTICE ADMINISTRATIVE COMMISSION (JAC)

Objective 1: Accurately and efficiently process transactions for JAC, and, on behalf of, the 49 agencies we administratively serve.

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 (GAL)

GAL Program Goal # 3: Increase number of volunteer advocates for children.

LINKAGE TO GOVERNOR'S PRIORITIES

PRIORITY #2 – REDUCE GOVERNMENT SPENDING

CLERKS OF COURT OPERATIONS CORPORATION (CCOC)

The CCOC uses its administrative and budget systems to continually track costs per case processed (i.e. unit costs) in each of Florida's ten (10) judicial system courts. The CCOC uses Peer Groups to compare unit costs across like sized Clerks' offices. This data is used to help each Clerk's office to review average unit costs in their Peer Group and find ways to maintain or lower their unit costs over time. The CCOC also encourages the use of technology to help Clerk employees to increase their productivity and avoid the necessity of adding staff to respond to increasing court case workloads. The focus is to lessen the impact of cost drivers on Clerk budgets.

PRIORITY #3 – REGULATORY REFORM

PRIORITY #4 – FOCUS ON JOB GROWTH AND RETENTION

STATE ATTORNEYS

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.

PRIORITY #5 - WORLD CLASS UNIVERSITIES

PRIORITY #6 – REDUCE PROPERTY TAXES

PRIORITY #7 – ELIMINATE FLORIDA'S CORPORATE INCOME TAX OVER SEVEN YEARS

TRENDS AND CONDITIONS STATEMENTS

JUSTICE ADMINISTRATIVE COMMISSION

Pursuant to s. 43.16, F.S., the Justice Administrative Commission (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, 2011. 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 programs in Florida and in other states, developing statewide performance measures and

TRENDS AND CONDITIONS STATEMENTS

STATEWIDE GUARDIAN AD LITEM

standards, forming a training committee and developing a training program, reviewing various funding sources, and developing methods to improve delivery of program services.

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

- The deficiencies in the overall economy and reduced State Funding resources for all agencies continue to impact our ability to achieve full representation as required by state statutes. 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. For fiscal years 2009/10 and 2010/11, funding levels did stabilize thus stemming the losses of children represented. Our long range plan is to achieve full representation within the next 5 years, but the continuing pressures on the economy will continue to make that challenging. The Program has adjusted Goal #1 to reflect the reduction in its resources to represent all children under Court supervision but also to plan for full representation within 5 years.
- In many Circuit based offices, we are unable to grow additional volunteers because we don't have the staff to support them. Additional funding is necessary to fund that volunteer growth.
- The Program is also experiencing a reduction in the resources provided by county governments, grants and our non-profits. The counties while obligated by statute to provide facilities and communications for the Program, have in some cases provided additional support to the Program, including staff. Because of a reduction in county funding, some 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**

TRENDS AND CONDITIONS STATEMENTS

CLERKS OF COURT OPERATIONS CORPORATION (CCOC)

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.

This SFY 2012-13 LRPP (Exhibit VI) and LBR requires the calculation of "unit costs" using output standards and actual expenditures for SFY 2010-11. The CCOC estimated the units worked for each of its three "activities" for SFY 2011-12 in order to allow the state system to calculate unit costs for SFY 2011-12. 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

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. Core services were changed by the 2010 Legislature.

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

TRENDS AND CONDITIONS STATEMENTS

CLERKS OF COURT OPERATIONS CORPORATION (CCOC)

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.

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 changed from the four core services in the 2010-11 LRPP/LBR, to 10 core services required in the 2011-12 LRPP/LBR. The 2012-13 LRPP/LBR will continue with the 10 core services.

Year 1: SFY 2012-13

The CCOC will focus primarily on the following strategies:

1. Continue to utilize the 2011-12 refined Peer Groups for the 2012-13 LRPP and LBR submission.
2. 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.
3. 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.
4. 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. The UCA system

TRENDS AND CONDITIONS STATEMENTS

CLERKS OF COURT OPERATIONS CORPORATION (CCOC)

includes the identification and analysis of key cost drivers affecting Clerk budgets individually and in different Peer Groups.

5. 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.
6. 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.
7. Evaluate the effectiveness of the current Legislative budgeting requirements for Clerks in an effort to provide critical and useful data/information to the Legislature with minimum workload impacts on Clerks. Provide the Legislature with a report on the status/effectiveness of the Clerks’ budgeting process.
8. Review the impact of actions that reduce revenue collections such as State attorney case diversions and use of community service.
9. Review the use of technology as a tool to help Clerk offices seek efficiencies and cost savings.

Year 2: SFY 2013-14

The CCOC will focus primarily on the following strategies:

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.

TRENDS AND CONDITIONS STATEMENTS

CLERKS OF COURT OPERATIONS CORPORATION (CCOC)

4. Continue to develop CCOC staff capacities to support the Council and Clerks in preparing and approving budgets.
5. Review core service related performance measures and reporting frequencies to increase their value for the Legislature while minimizing the workload impacts on Clerks' Office.
6. Review the results of 2010-11 changes to the Clerk Peer Groups related to the capacities to logically analyze and respond to significant core service unit cost differences.

Year 3: 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 4: SFY 2015-16

The CCOC will focus primarily on the following strategies:

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

TRENDS AND CONDITIONS STATEMENTS

CLERKS OF COURT OPERATIONS CORPORATION (CCOC)

Year 5: SFY 2016-17

1. Continue to add sophistications to the SQL server database system.
2. Improve CCOC web-based capacities to make the LBR process more efficient for Clerks and CCOC.
3. Improve the CCOC/Clerk Peer Group capacities to identify options for lowering costs and maximizing revenues within Peer Group counties.

CCOC Activity / Responsibility 2.0
During each fiscal year, monitor, analyze and respond to Clerks' Trust Fund and approved budget implementation issues.

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 2016-17, 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 changes in the numbers of foreclosure cases 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 2012 through SFY 2016-17. As much time as possible is required to alter Clerk budgets if administrative fee transfers, required reserves or possible revenue shortfalls due to economic conditions appear to leave the Trust Fund with insufficient dollars to fully fund approved Clerk budgets.

TRENDS AND CONDITIONS STATEMENTS

CLERKS OF COURT OPERATIONS CORPORATION (CCOC)

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 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 2: 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

TRENDS AND CONDITIONS STATEMENTS

CLERKS OF COURT OPERATIONS CORPORATION (CCOC)

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 3: 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 4: 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.
2. Further develop automated, integrated web site capacities for supporting CCOC and Clerk budget preparation, management and reporting.

Year 5: SFY 2016-17

1. Identify budget management needs for smaller, medium and larger Clerks offices and build tools and processes that can help offices to manage situations that result in serious budget challenges affecting court related operations during a fiscal year.
2. Improve "unit cost analysis" capacities within Peer Groups to isolate strategies that can be shared between and among Clerks' offices.

CCOC Activity / Responsibility 3.0
Provide education, training and technical assistance
to Clerks' Offices to meet their constitutional duties.

With the 2009 Legislative requirement for Clerks to be part of the Legislative Appropriations

TRENDS AND CONDITIONS STATEMENTS

CLERKS OF COURT OPERATIONS CORPORATION (CCOC)

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 2012-13 Legislative Budget Request includes the use of sophisticated unit costing related budget tools, revised budget instructions, a budget hearing process focused on individual Clerk's Office Budget Requests as well as Clerk Peer Group budget request comparisons. This unique Clerks' budgeting process requires significant education, training and technical assistance being available 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.

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.

The CCOC will build strategies for supporting Clerks' offices in conjunction with Clerks' offices, with the Florida Association of Clerks of Courts and with state stakeholders.

Activity 3.0 Five Year Strategy

Year 1: SFY 2012-13

TRENDS AND CONDITIONS STATEMENTS

CLERKS OF COURT OPERATIONS CORPORATION (CCOC)

1. The CCOC will continue to provide education and training to Clerks and their offices for them to fulfill their Constitutionally required duties more efficiently and effectively.
2. The CCOC will create more sophisticated Peer Group data and strategy sharing to allow more rapid accumulation of budgeting and performance enhancement skills in Clerks' offices.
3. The CCOC will further develop the capacities of its web site to be used to provide educational and training opportunities for Clerks' offices.
4. Coordinate with organizations such as the Association of Clerks on acquiring subjects and subject matter for Clerks' office budget related education and training experiences, individually or collectively.

Year 2: 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 3: 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.

TRENDS AND CONDITIONS STATEMENTS

CLERKS OF COURT OPERATIONS CORPORATION (CCOC)

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

Year 4: 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.
3. The CCOC will continue to identify critical constitutional issues and budget related issues and provide education and training on resolution options.

Year 5: SFY 2016-17

1. Improve internet/web based training and education capacities to support Clerks' Offices.
2. Improve revenue collection maximization training, tools and techniques.

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.

TRENDS AND CONDITIONS STATEMENTS

STATE ATTORNEYS

STATE ATTORNEY DUTIES AND RESPONSIBILITIES 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 as prescribed by general law. Chapters 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 Assistant State Attorneys and staff shall appear in the circuit and county courts within his/her judicial circuit and prosecute or defend on behalf of the state, all suits, applications, or motions, civil and criminal, in which the state is a party.

Consistent with and necessary to the performance of these duties is the requirement that the State Attorney provide personnel and procedures for the orderly, efficient and effective investigation, intake and processing of all felony, misdemeanor, criminal traffic 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 a population 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 in some counties.

STATE ATTORNEY PRIORITIES AND THEIR APPLICATIONS

The State Attorneys' priorities are to pursue justice by effectively, efficiently and in a timely manner, review and process all criminal matters presented to or investigated by the State Attorney. These priorities include representing the State of Florida efficiently and effectively in civil actions specified and mandated by the Florida Statutes or civil suits, motions or actions in which the state is a party.

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 appropriation and budgetary restrictions. Over the last several years, State

TRENDS AND CONDITIONS STATEMENTS

STATE ATTORNEYS

Attorneys' prosecution obligations have not only increased in the criminal justice system but have also expanded into the civil courts. This has resulted in an increased workload of serious and sophisticated criminal and civil case referrals.

In addition, it is imperative that State Attorneys have the ability to compensate Assistant State Attorneys and staff at a sufficient level within the competing markets of not only the private sector, but other government agencies, to reduce turnover and provide a more stable, efficient and experienced staff. This can only be achieved when public safety is deemed a priority by the Governor and Legislature.

Simply put, there is a direct correlation between public safety and the legislative budget appropriations to the State Attorneys. The citizens and visitors of Florida should feel safe in their homes and accommodations as well as in the economics of their businesses.

CHANGES THAT REQUIRE LEGISLATIVE ACTION

Although there are no changes to activity or performance measures that require legislative action for fiscal year 2012-2013, there are changes needed for the more efficient and effective use of State Attorney appropriations. State Attorneys are requesting increased budget flexibility within their appropriations, which would be utilized for the retention of staff, especially those who handle the serious criminal and civil cases that deal with sophisticated evidentiary issues and victims of crime.

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

TRENDS AND CONDITIONS STATEMENTS

PUBLIC DEFENDERS

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.

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

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

TRENDS AND CONDITIONS STATEMENTS

CAPITAL COLLATERAL REGIONAL COUNSELS (CCRC)

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-conviction legal services by competently working all cases assigned by the Florida Supreme Court in as cost and operationally efficient and timely manner as possible.

CCRC MIDDLE AND SOUTH'S LONG RANGE PROGRAM PLAN STORY

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

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

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

TRENDS AND CONDITIONS STATEMENTS

CAPITAL COLLATERAL REGIONAL COUNSELS (CCRC)

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 Florida 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.

TRENDS AND CONDITIONS STATEMENTS

CAPITAL COLLATERAL REGIONAL COUNSELS (CCRC)

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

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

Representing capital collateral (death penalty) cases requires exceptional legal skills and case presentation experience, especially in the federal court system, that is beyond those that most lawyers attain.

The budget cuts over four years have reduced CCRCs' budget approximately 21.5 % below FY 2007-08. If additional budget reductions of 10% occur in FY 2011-12, it is likely that 5 lawyers and 4 investigators will be laid off (about 20% 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 CCRCs' budgets by 10% 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 25%. 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. The Florida Auditor General's Office 2007 report concluded that the CCRCs are more cost effective than Legal Registry lawyers who also are assigned post-conviction cases to represent affected parties in state and federal courts. If the CCRCs' budgets are cut, cases may be reassigned to the Registry. This is likely to cost more than would have been the case if cuts in CCRCs' budgets had not occurred allowing the CCRCs to continue the case work.

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 at reasonable levels is important to retain staff over a longer period of time. The loss of FTEs due to annual budget cuts increases the workloads on the remaining FTEs which causes additional work place strains.

CCRCs have made excellent progress in attracting, training and keeping post-conviction law experienced attorneys. Currently, 93% of CCRC attorneys have greater than 3 years experience in post conviction law. Almost 75% of CCRC attorneys have greater than 5 years experience. Lowering staff turnover rates has been a priority.

TRENDS AND CONDITIONS STATEMENTS

CAPITAL COLLATERAL REGIONAL COUNSELS (CCRC)

Multiple year budget cuts have resulted in reductions to CCRC FTEs, and no General Revenues have been provided to replace them even though workloads continued to climb.

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

2.0 Trends and Conditions

CCRC caseloads, as assigned by the Florida Supreme Court, typically increase annually. In FY 2010-11, the caseload was 172. In FY 11-12, the CCRC workload is expected to be 176

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 2011-12 and into FY 2012-13.

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

External Issue 2.1: Have the capacity to meet increasing workloads

in 2009-10 in 2010-11 in 2011-12

Death warrants:	1	1	4
-----------------	---	---	---

Death warrants require accelerated representation in both state and federal courts. CCRCs usually must re-allocate limited resources to respond within a 60 day period to state and federal court process requirements.

For each warrant, two teams of lawyers and investigators are required due to the limited time allowed. The four lawyers involved work an average 70-80 hours a week for up to two months on each warrant. These are significant workloads for CCRCs.

TRENDS AND CONDITIONS STATEMENTS

CAPITAL COLLATERAL REGIONAL COUNSELS (CCRC)

Over the next five years, the number of warrants is projected to increase significantly when compared to the previous five years.

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

State and federal 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. Over the last three state fiscal years, over 97% of all motions filed by CCRCs were timely filed without requests for extensions. However, the latest Auditor General's Report to the Legislature comparing CCRCs with private Registry indicated that the private registry attorneys only filed 63% of their motions in a timely fashion.

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. This trend is likely to continue at an even faster pace in the next five years.

In addition to working more cases, this trend is the basis for more 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 ten (10) 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.

TRENDS AND CONDITIONS STATEMENTS

CAPITAL COLLATERAL REGIONAL COUNSELS (CCRC)

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

The number of cases being decided slowed to a trickle while the trial and appellate courts awaited 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.

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 2011-12, it is estimated to be 13.2. The Spangenburg Report of 1999 and the American Bar Association recommended a caseload of less than 6 per attorney. Continued loss of FTEs and rate in future budgets will increase these ratios.

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.

TRENDS AND CONDITIONS STATEMENTS

CAPITAL COLLATERAL REGIONAL COUNSELS (CCRC)

**CCRC FOCUS AREA 3:
Keeping CCRC costs as low as possible
while still providing competent representation
and still meeting the Florida 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" to the Legislature 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, current circumstances remain similar.

1. Average cost per case for legal representation: \$ 15,117 (CCRC) vs. \$ 18,579 Registry.
2. Average per hour cost for attorney time: \$ 38 (CCRC) vs. \$ 100 Registry
3. Average per hour cost for investigators: \$ 26 (CCRC) vs. \$ 40 Registry
4. Average cost per 3.851 court filing of issues: \$ 17,033 (CCRC) vs. \$ 18,359 Registry
5. Average cost per court evidentiary hearing on issues: \$ 17,325 (CCRC) vs. \$ 24,589 Registry
6. Average cost per appellate representation in courts: \$ 12,237 (CCRC) vs. \$ 17,263 Registry
7. Number of cases worked: 169 (CCRC) vs. 153 Registry
8. There is a potential that the CCRCs will have 173 cases in FY 2011-12, 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 is costly. There was one death warrant issued in FY 2007-08 and 5 in FY 2008-09. Many more are possible in the future. Each death warrant response costs CCRC between \$ 30,000 - \$ 50,000.

TRENDS AND CONDITIONS STATEMENTS

CAPITAL COLLATERAL REGIONAL COUNSELS (CCRC)

<p style="text-align: center;">CCRC FOCUS AREA 4: The Time It Takes To Complete Capital Cases in the Judicial System</p>
--

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

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.

TRENDS AND CONDITIONS STATEMENTS

CAPITAL COLLATERAL REGIONAL COUNSELS (CCRC)

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.

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, had 31 lawyers, 16 investigators, 8 case processing staff and 7 administrative staff.

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 2007 through 2011. Four straight years of budget cuts and the resulting loss of highly skilled attorneys presents a major challenge to CCRC capacities to perform at levels expected by the courts.

TRENDS AND CONDITIONS STATEMENTS

<p style="text-align: center;">CCRC FOCUS AREA 5: CCRC Operational Improvements</p>
--

CAPITAL COLLATERAL REGIONAL COUNSELS (CCRC)

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

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

The CCRCs' ability to help investigators and attorneys search case records more efficiently improved significantly 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 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 tasks in the most efficient way possible,

TRENDS AND CONDITIONS STATEMENTS

CAPITAL COLLATERAL REGIONAL COUNSELS (CCRC)

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
- 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 2011-12 and into FY 2012-13, 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.

TRENDS AND CONDITIONS STATEMENTS

CAPITAL COLLATERAL REGIONAL COUNSELS (CCRC)

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

The CCRCs are currently working with the Florida Department of Corrections to implement a video conferencing system. When this system is operational, it will produce significant cost savings for CCRCs by seriously reducing travel expenses to the two prisons that house CCRC clients. Additionally, it will increase the productivity levels of CCRC attorneys and investigators.

OFFICE 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 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

TRENDS AND CONDITIONS STATEMENTS

CAPITAL COLLATERAL REGIONAL COUNSELS (CCRC)

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.

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

The following goal has been established in an effort to carry out the Offices of Criminal Conflict and Civil Regional Counsels’ mission:

To ensure cases are processed in a timely and cost effective manner.

JUSTICE ADMINISTRATION



***LONG RANGE PROGRAM PLAN
FISCAL YEARS 2012-13 THROUGH 2016-17***

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
---	----------------

Approved Performance Measures for FY2011-12	Approved Prior Year Standard FY2010-11	Prior Year Actual FY2010-11	Approved Standards for FY2011-12	Requested FY2012-13 Standard
Percent of invoices processed within statutory time frames	95.00%	92.27%	95.00%	95.00%
Number of public records requests	150	116	150	150
Number of cases where registry lawyers request fees above the statutory caps	2,500	790	2,500	700
Number of cases where the court orders fees above the statutory cap	2,000	696	2,000	650
Total amount of excess fees awarded by the court per circuit	\$6,000,000	\$4,665,022	\$6,000,000	\$4,000,000
Number of budget, payroll, disbursement, revenue and financial report transactions processed	375,000	490,640	375,000	375,000
Number of court-appointed attorney and due process vendor invoices processed	65,000	54,733	65,000	50,000

EXHIBIT II – PERFORMANCE MEASURES AND STANDARDS

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

Program: Statewide Guardian ad Litem Program	Code: 21.31.00.00
Service/Budget Entity: PGM: Stw/Guardian ad Litem	Code: 21.31.00.00

Approved Performance Measures for FY 2011-12 (Words)	Approved Prior Year Standard FY 2010-11 (Numbers)	Actual Prior Year Standard FY 2010-11 (Numbers)	Approved Standards for FY 2011-12 (Numbers)	Requested Standards for FY 2012-13 (Numbers)
Average number of children represented	26,500	21,497	26,500	24,864
New Measure – Average percent of children represented				80%
Deleting Measure - Percent of cases discharged after DCF supervision is terminated	45%	79%	45%	
New Measure – Percent of cases closed with permanency goal achieved				70%
Number of new volunteers certified as a GAL	1,464	2,013	1,464	3,924
Average number of active volunteers *	5,057	7,633	5,057	9,283
* - 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

Approved Performance Measures for FY 2011-12 (Words)	Approved Prior Year Standards FY 2010-11 (Numbers)	Actual Prior Year Standards FY 2010-11 (Numbers)	Approved Standards for FY 2011-12 (Numbers)	Requested Standards for FY 2012-13 (Numbers)
# of work products produced in support of Clerks' Budget Requests analyses and CCOC Legislative Budget Requests.	N/A	291	299	299
# of CCOC technical and analytical products produced in support of implementing Clerks' approved budgets.	N/A	1,120	1,530	1,530
# of CCOC education and training programs and opportunities provided to Clerks' offices during the fiscal year.	NA	36	70	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

Approved Performance Measures for FY 2011-12 (Words)	Approved Prior Year Standard FY 2010-11 (Numbers)	Actual Prior Year Standard FY 2010-11 (Numbers)
Percent of offenders who qualify for enhanced sentencing for whom state attorneys requested enhanced sentencing	92.00%	91.91%
Total number of dispositions	1,339,035	1,259,271
Number of dispositions by trial verdicts	14,004	23,489
Number of dispositions by pleas	727,246	677,580
Number of dispositions by non trial	157,990	211,254
Number of dispositions by otherwise	439,795	346,948
Percent of dispositions by trial verdicts	1.05%	1.87%
Percent of dispositions by pleas	54.30%	53.80%
Percent of dispositions by non trial	11.80%	16.78%
Percent of dispositions by otherwise	32.84%	27.55%
Number of substantiated Bar grievances filed annually	0	0
Number of misdemeanor criminal case referrals	1,183,597	1,027,154
Number of felony criminal case referrals	490,965	430,484
Number of juvenile criminal case referrals	197,338	136,383
Number of misdemeanor filings	792,393	721,307
Number of felony filings	219,752	200,660
Number of juvenile filings	83,616	59,881
Number of post conviction relief responses or Habeas Corpus responses	22,391	13,898
Number of sexual predator civil commitment proceedings	TBD	3,230
Number of Baker Act hearings	27,686	17,133

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

Approved Performance Measures for FY 2011-12 (Words)	Approved Prior Year Standard FY 2010-11 (Numbers)	Actual Prior Year Standard FY 2010-11 (Numbers)	Approved Standards for FY 2011-12 (Numbers)	Requested Standards for FY 2012-13 (Numbers)
Percent of offenders who qualify for enhanced sentencing for whom state attorneys requested enhanced sentencing		407		407
Total number of dispositions		55,217		55,217
Number of dispositions by trial verdicts		558		558
Number of dispositions by pleas		30,882		30,882
Number of dispositions by non trial		3,605		3,605
Number of dispositions by otherwise		20,172		20,172
Percent of dispositions by trial verdicts		1%		1%
Percent of dispositions by pleas		56%		56%
Percent of dispositions by non trial		6%		6%
Percent of dispositions by otherwise		37%		37%
Number of substantiated Bar grievances filed annually		0		0
Number of misdemeanor criminal case referrals		35,757		35,757
Number of felony criminal case referrals		16,166		16,166
Number of juvenile criminal case referrals		5,773		5,773
Number of misdemeanor filings		18,265		18,265
Number of felony filings		10,507		10,507
Number of juvenile filings		2,597		2,597
Number of post conviction relief responses or Habeas Corpus responses		447		447
Number of sexual predator civil commitment proceedings		174		174
Number of Baker Act hearings		1,464		1,464

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	

Approved Performance Measures for FY 2011-12 (Words)	Approved Prior Year Standard FY 2010-11 (Numbers)	Actual Prior Year Standard FY 2010-11 (Numbers)	Approved Standards for FY 2011-12 (Numbers)	Requested Standards for FY 2012-13 (Numbers)
Percent of offenders who qualify for enhanced sentencing for whom state attorneys requested enhanced sentencing		100%		100%
Total number of dispositions		27,339		27,339
Number of dispositions by trial verdicts		382		382
Number of dispositions by pleas		12,809		12,809
Number of dispositions by non trial		1,540		1,540
Number of dispositions by otherwise		12,608		12,608
Percent of dispositions by trial verdicts		1.40%		1.40%
Percent of dispositions by pleas		46.85%		46.85%
Percent of dispositions by non trial		5.63%		5.63%
Percent of dispositions by otherwise		46.12%		46.12%
Number of substantiated Bar grievances filed annually		0		0
Number of misdemeanor criminal case referrals		18,361		18,361
Number of felony criminal case referrals		7,619		7,619
Number of juvenile criminal case referrals		1,638		1,638
Number of misdemeanor filings		14,890		14,890
Number of felony filings		4,675		4,675
Number of juvenile filings		1,159		1,159
Number of post conviction relief responses or Habeas Corpus responses		100		100
Number of sexual predator civil commitment proceedings		110		110
Number of Baker Act hearings		31		31

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

Approved Performance Measures for FY 2011-12 (Words)	Approved Prior Year Standard FY 2010-11 (Numbers)	Actual Prior Year Standard FY 2010-11 (Numbers)	Approved Standards for FY 2011-12 (Numbers)	Requested Standards for FY 2012-13 (Numbers)
Percent of offenders who qualify for enhanced sentencing for whom state attorneys requested enhanced sentencing		100%		100%
Total number of dispositions		16,834		16,834
Number of dispositions by trial verdicts		134		134
Number of dispositions by pleas		7,287		7,287
Number of dispositions by non trial		1,617		1,617
Number of dispositions by otherwise		7,796		7,796
Percent of dispositions by trial verdicts		.80%		.80%
Percent of dispositions by pleas		43.29%		43.29%
Percent of dispositions by non trial		9.60%		9.60%
Percent of dispositions by otherwise		46.31%		46.31%
Number of substantiated Bar grievances filed annually		0		0
Number of misdemeanor criminal case referrals		9,731		9,731
Number of felony criminal case referrals		6,079		6,079
Number of juvenile criminal case referrals		993		993
Number of misdemeanor filings		6,572		6,572
Number of felony filings		2,918		2,918
Number of juvenile filings		569		569
Number of post conviction relief responses or Habeas Corpus responses		27		27
Number of sexual predator civil commitment proceedings		56		56
Number of Baker Act hearings		334		334

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

Approved Performance Measures for FY 2011-12 (Words)	Approved Prior Year Standard FY 2010-11 (Numbers)	Actual Prior Year Standard FY 2010-11 (Numbers)	Approved Standards for FY 2011-12 (Numbers)	Requested Standards for FY 2012-13 (Numbers)
Percent of offenders who qualify for enhanced sentencing for whom state attorneys requested enhanced sentencing		80.98%		80.98%
Total number of dispositions		105,767		105,767
Number of dispositions by trial verdicts		715		715
Number of dispositions by pleas		59,872		59,872
Number of dispositions by non trial		13,585		13,585
Number of dispositions by otherwise		31,595		31,595
Percent of dispositions by trial verdicts		.01%		.01%
Percent of dispositions by pleas		.57%		.57%
Percent of dispositions by non trial		.13%		.13%
Percent of dispositions by otherwise		.30%		.30%
Number of substantiated Bar grievances filed annually				
Number of misdemeanor criminal case referrals		58,541		58,541
Number of felony criminal case referrals		19,018		19,018
Number of juvenile criminal case referrals		6,024		6,024
Number of misdemeanor filings		57,495		57,495
Number of felony filings		13,473		13,473
Number of juvenile filings		3,735		3,735
Number of post conviction relief responses or Habeas Corpus responses		2,494		2,494
Number of sexual predator civil commitment proceedings		281		281
Number of Baker Act hearings		33		33

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	

Approved Performance Measures for FY 2011-12 (Words)	Approved Prior Year Standard FY 2010-11 (Numbers)	Actual Prior Year Standard FY 2010-11 (Numbers)	Approved Standards for FY 2011-12 (Numbers)	Requested Standards for FY 2012-13 (Numbers)
Percent of offenders who qualify for enhanced sentencing for whom state attorneys requested enhanced sentencing		96.22%		96.22%
Total number of dispositions		50,086		50,086
Number of dispositions by trial verdicts		325		325
Number of dispositions by pleas		31,396		31,396
Number of dispositions by non trial		2,296		2,296
Number of dispositions by otherwise		16,074		16,074
Percent of dispositions by trial verdicts		0.65%		0.65%
Percent of dispositions by pleas		62.68%		62.68%
Percent of dispositions by non trial		4.57%		4.57%
Percent of dispositions by otherwise		32.10%		32.10%
Number of substantiated Bar grievances filed annually		0		0
Number of misdemeanor criminal case referrals		33,544		33,544
Number of felony criminal case referrals		20,815		20,815
Number of juvenile criminal case referrals		5,095		5,095
Number of misdemeanor filings		17,855		17,855
Number of felony filings		10,962		10,962
Number of juvenile filings		2,727		2,727
Number of post conviction relief responses or Habeas Corpus responses		183		183
Number of sexual predator civil commitment proceedings		139		139
Number of Baker Act hearings		156		156

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	

Approved Performance Measures for FY 2011-12 (Words)	Approved Prior Year Standard FY 2010-11 (Numbers)	Actual Prior Year Standard FY 2010-11 (Numbers)	Approved Standards for FY 2011-12 (Numbers)	Requested Standards for FY 2012-13 (Numbers)
Percent of offenders who qualify for enhanced sentencing for whom state attorneys requested enhanced sentencing		100%		100%
Total number of dispositions		109,434		110,000
Number of dispositions by trial verdicts		834		900
Number of dispositions by pleas		79,589		79,000
Number of dispositions by non trial		4,619		4,600
Number of dispositions by otherwise		24,492		24,000
Percent of dispositions by trial verdicts		0.76%		0.8%
Percent of dispositions by pleas		72.7%		72%
Percent of dispositions by non trial		4.2%		4%
Percent of dispositions by otherwise		22.4%		23.2%
Number of substantiated Bar grievances filed annually		N/A		N/A
Number of misdemeanor criminal case referrals		78,015		78,000
Number of felony criminal case referrals		37,308		38,000
Number of juvenile criminal case referrals		9,807		10,000
Number of misdemeanor filings		48,400		49,000
Number of felony filings		17,583		18,000
Number of juvenile filings		3,751		4,000
Number of post conviction relief responses or Habeas Corpus responses		84		80
Number of sexual predator civil commitment proceedings		401		400
Number of Baker Act hearings		1,431		1,500

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	

Approved Performance Measures for FY 2011-12 (Words)	Approved Prior Year Standard FY 2010-11 (Numbers)	Actual Prior Year Standard FY 2010-11 (Numbers)	Approved Standards for FY 2011-12 (Numbers)	Requested Standards for FY 2012-13 (Numbers)
Percent of offenders who qualify for enhanced sentencing for whom state attorneys requested enhanced sentencing		96%		96%
Total number of dispositions		63,704		63,704
Number of dispositions by trial verdicts		266		266
Number of dispositions by pleas		27,252		27,252
Number of dispositions by non trial		12,215		12,215
Number of dispositions by otherwise		23,691		23,691
Percent of dispositions by trial verdicts		1%		1%
Percent of dispositions by pleas		43%		43%
Percent of dispositions by non trial		19%		19%
Percent of dispositions by otherwise		37%		37%
Number of substantiated Bar grievances filed annually		0		0
Number of misdemeanor criminal case referrals		60,088		60,088
Number of felony criminal case referrals		20,686		20,686
Number of juvenile criminal case referrals		6,671		6,671
Number of misdemeanor filings		19,382		19,382
Number of felony filings		9,682		9,682
Number of juvenile filings		2,405		2,405
Number of post conviction relief responses or Habeas Corpus responses		283		283
Number of sexual predator civil commitment proceedings		122		122
Number of Baker Act hearings		393		393

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	

Approved Performance Measures for FY 2011-12 (Words)	Approved Prior Year Standard FY 2010-11 (Numbers)	Actual Prior Year Standard FY 2010-11 (Numbers)	Approved Standards for FY 2011-12 (Numbers)	Requested Standards for FY 2012-13 (Numbers)
Percent of offenders who qualify for enhanced sentencing for whom state attorneys requested enhanced sentencing		100%		100%
Total number of dispositions		32,046		30,420
Number of dispositions by trial verdicts		139		163
Number of dispositions by pleas		13,669		13,256
Number of dispositions by non trial		5,430		5,419
Number of dispositions by otherwise		12,808		11,583
Percent of dispositions by trial verdicts		0.43%		0.53%
Percent of dispositions by pleas		42.66%		43.58%
Percent of dispositions by non trial		16.94%		17.81%
Percent of dispositions by otherwise		39.97%		38.08%
Number of substantiated Bar grievances filed annually		0		0
Number of misdemeanor criminal case referrals		23,701		22,404
Number of felony criminal case referrals		9,404		8,785
Number of juvenile criminal case referrals		2,375		2,071
Number of misdemeanor filings		14,783		14,894
Number of felony filings		5,079		5,096
Number of juvenile filings		1,127		946
Number of post conviction relief responses or Habeas Corpus responses		304		274
Number of sexual predator civil commitment proceedings		145		146
Number of Baker Act hearings		682		628

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

Approved Performance Measures for FY 2011-12 (Words)	Approved Prior Year Standard FY 2010-11 (Numbers)	Actual Prior Year Standard FY 2010-11 (Numbers)	Approved Standards for FY 2011-12 (Numbers)	Requested Standards for FY 2012-13 (Numbers)
Percent of offenders who qualify for enhanced sentencing for whom state attorneys requested enhanced sentencing		100%		100%
Total number of dispositions		82,189		82,189
Number of dispositions by trial verdicts		1,148		1,148
Number of dispositions by pleas		40,767		40,767
Number of dispositions by non trial		10,218		10,218
Number of dispositions by otherwise		30,056		30,056
Percent of dispositions by trial verdicts		1.4%		1.4%
Percent of dispositions by pleas		49.60%		49.60%
Percent of dispositions by non trial		12.43%		12.43%
Percent of dispositions by otherwise		36.57%		36.57%
Number of substantiated Bar grievances filed annually		0		0
Number of misdemeanor criminal case referrals		49,487		49,487
Number of felony criminal case referrals		27,950		27,950
Number of juvenile criminal case referrals		8,354		8,354
Number of misdemeanor filings		35,319		35,319
Number of felony filings		14,790		14,790
Number of juvenile filings		4,835		4,835
Number of post conviction relief responses or Habeas Corpus responses		537		537
Number of sexual predator civil commitment proceedings		216		216
Number of Baker Act hearings		1,313		1,313

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

Approved Performance Measures for FY 2011-12 (Words)	Approved Prior Year Standard FY 2010-11 (Numbers)	Actual Prior Year Standard FY 2010-11 (Numbers)	Approved Standards for FY 2011-12 (Numbers)	Requested Standards for FY 2012-13 (Numbers)
Percent of offenders who qualify for enhanced sentencing for whom state attorneys requested enhanced sentencing		100%		100%
Total number of dispositions		47,740		47,740
Number of dispositions by trial verdicts		404		404
Number of dispositions by pleas		30,640		30,640
Number of dispositions by non trial		4,007		4,007
Number of dispositions by otherwise		12,689		12,689
Percent of dispositions by trial verdicts		1%		1%
Percent of dispositions by pleas		64%		64%
Percent of dispositions by non trial		8%		8%
Percent of dispositions by otherwise		27%		27%
Number of substantiated Bar grievances filed annually		0		0
Number of misdemeanor criminal case referrals		37,604		37,604
Number of felony criminal case referrals		12,394		12,394
Number of juvenile criminal case referrals		5,257		5,257
Number of misdemeanor filings		28,636		28,636
Number of felony filings		10,294		10,294
Number of juvenile filings		8,235		8,235
Number of post conviction relief responses or Habeas Corpus responses		1		1
Number of sexual predator civil commitment proceedings		301		301
Number of Baker Act hearings		2,297		2,297

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	

Approved Performance Measures for FY 2011-12 (Words)	Approved Prior Year Standard FY 2010-11 (Numbers)	Actual Prior Year Standard FY 2010-11 (Numbers)	Approved Standards for FY 2011-12 (Numbers)	Requested Standards for FY 2012-13 (Numbers)
Percent of offenders who qualify for enhanced sentencing for whom state attorneys requested enhanced sentencing		100%		100%
Total number of dispositions		198,024		207,925
Number of dispositions by trial verdicts		13,116		13,772
Number of dispositions by pleas		58,815		61,756
Number of dispositions by non trial		85,479		89,753
Number of dispositions by otherwise		40,614		42,645
Percent of dispositions by trial verdicts		7%		7%
Percent of dispositions by pleas		30%		30%
Percent of dispositions by non trial		43%		43%
Percent of dispositions by otherwise		21%		21%
Number of substantiated Bar grievances filed annually		0		0
Number of misdemeanor criminal case referrals		147,462		154,835
Number of felony criminal case referrals		58,521		61,447
Number of juvenile criminal case referrals		16,109		16,914
Number of misdemeanor filings		147,462		154,835
Number of felony filings		21,262		22,325
Number of juvenile filings		4,988		5,237
Number of post conviction relief responses or Habeas Corpus responses		2,636		2,768
Number of sexual predator civil commitment proceedings		586		0
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

Approved Performance Measures for FY 2011-12 (Words)	Approved Prior Year Standard FY 2010-11 (Numbers)	Actual Prior Year Standard FY 2010-11 (Numbers)	Approved Standards for FY 2011-12 (Numbers)	Requested Standards for FY 2012-13 (Numbers)
Percent of offenders who qualify for enhanced sentencing for whom state attorneys requested enhanced sentencing		100%		100%
Total number of dispositions		37,946		38,325
Number of dispositions by trial verdicts		391		395
Number of dispositions by pleas		21,639		21,855
Number of dispositions by non trial		1,293		1,306
Number of dispositions by otherwise		14,623		14,769
Percent of dispositions by trial verdicts		1%		1%
Percent of dispositions by pleas		57%		57%
Percent of dispositions by non trial		3.4%		3.4%
Percent of dispositions by otherwise		38.6%		38.6%
Number of substantiated Bar grievances filed annually		0		0
Number of misdemeanor criminal case referrals		29,017		29,307
Number of felony criminal case referrals		15,020		15,170
Number of juvenile criminal case referrals		3,820		3,858
Number of misdemeanor filings		17,699		17,876
Number of felony filings		6,385		6,448
Number of juvenile filings		1,741		1,758
Number of post conviction relief responses or Habeas Corpus responses		72		73
Number of sexual predator civil commitment proceedings		53		54
Number of Baker Act hearings		217		219

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	

Approved Performance Measures for FY 2011-12 (Words)	Approved Prior Year Standard FY 2010-11 (Numbers)	Actual Prior Year Standard FY 2010-11 (Numbers)	Approved Standards for FY 2011-12 (Numbers)	Requested Standards for FY 2012-13 (Numbers)
Percent of offenders who qualify for enhanced sentencing for whom state attorneys requested enhanced sentencing		61.94%		92.00%
Total number of dispositions		91,971		92,891
Number of dispositions by trial verdicts		1,435		1,449
Number of dispositions by pleas		54,758		55,306
Number of dispositions by non trial		15,271		15,424
Number of dispositions by otherwise		20,507		20,712
Percent of dispositions by trial verdicts		1.56%		1.56%
Percent of dispositions by pleas		59.54%		59.54%
Percent of dispositions by non trial		16.60%		16.60%
Percent of dispositions by otherwise		22.30%		22.30%
Number of substantiated Bar grievances filed annually		0		0
Number of misdemeanor criminal case referrals		65,316		65,969
Number of felony criminal case referrals		34,688		35,034
Number of juvenile criminal case referrals		9,304		9,397
Number of misdemeanor filings		57,934		58,513
Number of felony filings		14,091		14,232
Number of juvenile filings		4,130		4,171
Number of post conviction relief responses or Habeas Corpus responses		1,255		1,268
Number of sexual predator civil commitment proceedings		199		201
Number of Baker Act hearings		2,764		2,792

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

Approved Performance Measures for FY 2011-12 (Words)	Approved Prior Year Standard FY 2010-11 (Numbers)	Actual Prior Year Standard FY 2010-11 (Numbers)	Approved Standards for FY 2011-12 (Numbers)	Requested Standards for FY 2012-13 (Numbers)
Percent of offenders who qualify for enhanced sentencing for whom state attorneys requested enhanced sentencing		98%		92%
Total number of dispositions		35,567		33,000
Number of dispositions by trial verdicts		330		300
Number of dispositions by pleas		18,483		18,250
Number of dispositions by non trial		4,670		2,000
Number of dispositions by otherwise		12,084		10,000
Percent of dispositions by trial verdicts		1%		1.0%
Percent of dispositions by pleas		52%		56%
Percent of dispositions by non trial		13%		10%
Percent of dispositions by otherwise		34%		33%
Number of substantiated Bar grievances filed annually		0		0
Number of misdemeanor criminal case referrals		20,765		20,000
Number of felony criminal case referrals		9,171		9,000
Number of juvenile criminal case referrals		3,596		3,500
Number of misdemeanor filings		17,183		14,000
Number of felony filings		6,528		5,000
Number of juvenile filings		1,727		1,600
Number of post conviction relief responses or Habeas Corpus responses		373		350
Number of sexual predator civil commitment proceedings		65		35
Number of Baker Act hearings		291		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	

Approved Performance Measures for FY 2011-12 (Words)	Approved Prior Year Standard FY 2010-11 (Numbers)	Actual Prior Year Standard FY 2010-11 (Numbers)	Approved Standards for FY 2011-12 (Numbers)	Requested Standards for FY 2012-13 (Numbers)
Percent of offenders who qualify for enhanced sentencing for whom state attorneys requested enhanced sentencing		100%		100%
Total number of dispositions		67,788		69,144
Number of dispositions by trial verdicts		922		940
Number of dispositions by pleas		38,811		39,587
Number of dispositions by non trial		13,260		13,525
Number of dispositions by otherwise		14,795		15,092
Percent of dispositions by trial verdicts		1.36%		1.36%
Percent of dispositions by pleas		57.25%		57.25%
Percent of dispositions by non trial		19.56%		19.56%
Percent of dispositions by otherwise		21.83%		21.83%
Number of substantiated Bar grievances filed annually		0		0
Number of misdemeanor criminal case referrals		94,298		96,184
Number of felony criminal case referrals		21,669		22,102
Number of juvenile criminal case referrals		7,926		8,085
Number of misdemeanor filings		76,912		78,450
Number of felony filings		10,914		11,132
Number of juvenile filings		2,882		2,940
Number of post conviction relief responses or Habeas Corpus responses		712		727
Number of sexual predator civil commitment proceedings		18		19
Number of Baker Act hearings		1,193		1,217

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

Approved Performance Measures for FY 2011-12 (Words)	Approved Prior Year Standard FY 2010-11 (Numbers)	Actual Prior Year Standard FY 2010-11 (Numbers)	Approved Standards for FY 2011-12 (Numbers)	Requested Standards for FY 2012-13 (Numbers)
Percent of offenders who qualify for enhanced sentencing for whom state attorneys requested enhanced sentencing		100%		95%
Total number of dispositions		5,692		5,692
Number of dispositions by trial verdicts		70		70
Number of dispositions by pleas		3,067		3,067
Number of dispositions by non trial		1,544		1,544
Number of dispositions by otherwise		1,011		1,011
Percent of dispositions by trial verdicts		1%		1%
Percent of dispositions by pleas		54%		54%
Percent of dispositions by non trial		27%		27%
Percent of dispositions by otherwise		18%		18%
Number of substantiated Bar grievances filed annually		0		0
Number of misdemeanor criminal case referrals		4,832		4,832
Number of felony criminal case referrals		2,020		2,020
Number of juvenile criminal case referrals		252		252
Number of misdemeanor filings		3,868		3,868
Number of felony filings		1,380		1,380
Number of juvenile filings		169		169
Number of post conviction relief responses or Habeas Corpus responses		16		16
Number of sexual predator civil commitment proceedings		1		1
Number of Baker Act hearings		24		24

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	

Approved Performance Measures for FY 2011-12 (Words)	Approved Prior Year Standard FY 2010-11 (Numbers)	Actual Prior Year Standard FY 2010-11 (Numbers)	Approved Standards for FY 2011-12 (Numbers)	Requested Standards for FY 2012-13 (Numbers)
Percent of offenders who qualify for enhanced sentencing for whom state attorneys requested enhanced sentencing		100%		100%
Total number of dispositions		84,921		84,921
Number of dispositions by trial verdicts		948		948
Number of dispositions by pleas		61,751		61,751
Number of dispositions by non trial		7,736		7,736
Number of dispositions by otherwise		14,486		14,486
Percent of dispositions by trial verdicts		1.12%		1.12%
Percent of dispositions by pleas		72.72%		72.72%
Percent of dispositions by non trial		9.11%		9.11%
Percent of dispositions by otherwise		17.06%		17.06%
Number of substantiated Bar grievances filed annually		0		0
Number of misdemeanor criminal case referrals		84,390		84,390
Number of felony criminal case referrals		48,270		48,270
Number of juvenile criminal case referrals		12,891		12,891
Number of misdemeanor filings		60,784		60,784
Number of felony filings		15,617		15,617
Number of juvenile filings		6,030		6,030
Number of post conviction relief responses or Habeas Corpus responses		1,110		1,110
Number of sexual predator civil commitment proceedings		175		175
Number of Baker Act hearings		1,598		1,598

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

Approved Performance Measures for FY 2011-12 (Words)	Approved Prior Year Standard FY 2010-11 (Numbers)	Actual Prior Year Standard FY 2010-11 (Numbers)	Approved Standards for FY 2011-12 (Numbers)	Requested Standards for FY 2012-13 (Numbers)
Percent of offenders who qualify for enhanced sentencing for whom state attorneys requested enhanced sentencing		100%		100%
Total number of dispositions		49,737		49,985
Number of dispositions by trial verdicts		516		540
Number of dispositions by pleas		28,782		28,935
Number of dispositions by non trial		4,323		4,350
Number of dispositions by otherwise		16,116		16,160
Percent of dispositions by trial verdicts		1.04%		1.08%
Percent of dispositions by pleas		57.87%		57.89%
Percent of dispositions by non trial		8.69%		8.70%
Percent of dispositions by otherwise		32.40%		32.33%
Number of substantiated Bar grievances filed annually		0		0
Number of misdemeanor criminal case referrals		37,792		37,980
Number of felony criminal case referrals		18,492		19,037
Number of juvenile criminal case referrals		5,590		5,618
Number of misdemeanor filings		26,085		26,215
Number of felony filings		8,908		8,953
Number of juvenile filings		2,355		2,367
Number of post conviction relief responses or Habeas Corpus responses		733		737
Number of sexual predator civil commitment proceedings		62		63
Number of Baker Act hearings		430		432

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	

Approved Performance Measures for FY 2011-12 (Words)	Approved Prior Year Standard FY 2010-11 (Numbers)	Actual Prior Year Standard FY 2010-11 (Numbers)	Approved Standards for FY 2011-12 (Numbers)	Requested Standards for FY 2012-13 (Numbers)
Percent of offenders who qualify for enhanced sentencing for whom state attorneys requested enhanced sentencing		100%		100%
Total number of dispositions		28,101		29,812
Number of dispositions by trial verdicts		282		299
Number of dispositions by pleas		19,568		20,760
Number of dispositions by non trial		3,997		4,240
Number of dispositions by otherwise		4,254		4,513
Percent of dispositions by trial verdicts		1%		1%
Percent of dispositions by pleas		70%		70%
Percent of dispositions by non trial		14%		14%
Percent of dispositions by otherwise		15%		15%
Number of substantiated Bar grievances filed annually		0		0
Number of misdemeanor criminal case referrals		21,008		22,287
Number of felony criminal case referrals		10,838		11,498
Number of juvenile criminal case referrals		3,843		4,077
Number of misdemeanor filings		13,329		14,141
Number of felony filings		5,576		5,916
Number of juvenile filings		2,072		2,198
Number of post conviction relief responses or Habeas Corpus responses		361		383
Number of sexual predator civil commitment proceedings		99		105
Number of Baker Act hearings		1,302		1,381

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	

Approved Performance Measures for FY 2011-12 (Words)	Approved Prior Year Standard FY 2010-11 (Numbers)	Actual Prior Year Standard FY 2010-11 (Numbers)	Approved Standards for FY 2011-12 (Numbers)	Requested Standards for FY 2012-13 (Numbers)
Percent of offenders who qualify for enhanced sentencing for whom state attorneys requested enhanced sentencing		72.99%		72.99%
Total number of dispositions		69,368		70,062
Number of dispositions by trial verdicts		594		600
Number of dispositions by pleas		37,743		38,120
Number of dispositions by non trial		14,554		14,700
Number of dispositions by otherwise		16,477		16,642
Percent of dispositions by trial verdicts		.856%		.856%
Percent of dispositions by pleas		54.41%		54.41%
Percent of dispositions by non trial		20.98%		20.98%
Percent of dispositions by otherwise		23.75%		23.75%
Number of substantiated Bar grievances filed annually		0		0
Number of misdemeanor criminal case referrals		58,935		59,524
Number of felony criminal case referrals		19,433		19,627
Number of juvenile criminal case referrals		6,621		6,687
Number of misdemeanor filings		38,454		38,839
Number of felony filings		10,036		10,136
Number of juvenile filings		2,647		2,673
Number of post conviction relief responses or Habeas Corpus responses		1,910		1,929
Number of sexual predator civil commitment proceedings		164		166
Number of Baker Act hearings		1,180		1,192

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	

Approved Performance Measures for FY 2011-12 (Words)	Approved Prior Year Standards FY 2010-11 (Numbers)	Actual Prior Year Standards FY 2010- 11 (Numbers)	Approved Standards for FY 2011-12 (Numbers)	Requested Standards for FY 2012-13 (Numbers)
Annual attorney turnover rate	18%	14.77%	18%	14.03%
Number of appointed & re-opened cases	875,837	761,689	875,837	799,733
Number of cases closed	784,964	712,933	784,964	748,580
Number of clients represented	705,061	644,738	705,061	676,975
Number of cases per attorney	547	502	547	477

EXHIBIT II PERFORMANCE MEASURES AND STANDARDS - BY CIRCUIT
 FY 2010-11 - August 16, 2011

	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
ANNUAL ATTORNEY TURNOVER RATE	21.02%	11.73%	5.71%	15.17%	22.69%	10.59%	14.55%	11.11%	21.60%	6.56%	14.40%	9.26%	19.25%	3.51%	13.87%	0.00%	18.32%	16.53%	11.94%	20.25%	14.77%
NUMBER OF APPOINTED & RE-OPENED CASES	35,192	19,399	9,228	41,506	32,214	80,415	36,855	20,983	63,877	34,780	83,949	26,926	58,132	20,344	43,800	6,127	52,907	31,460	21,005	42,590	761,689
# CLIENTS	27,493	15,742	8,362	37,501	26,599	80,415	30,823	17,316	47,569	28,789	78,561	19,937	47,759	16,143	37,078	5,178	45,443	23,350	18,482	32,198	644,738
NUMBER OF PLEAS	21,394	9,437	4,834	20,671	18,489	36,626	19,339	7,414	24,802	13,061	28,441	9,356	20,322	11,190	23,232	2,599	20,441	18,609	11,974	14,729	336,960
NUMBER OF TRIALS/ CONTESTED HEARINGS	1,742	642	110	253	358	1,266	173	93	2,350	644	10,485	284	1,550	89	502	24	430	468	121	449	22,033
NUMBER OF CASES NOLLE PROSSED OR DISMISSED	2,945	2,705	517	2,831	1,599	2,376	2,827	1,893	6,844	3,234	18,011	872	5,770	536	8,438	550	7,103	3,273	1,762	3,788	77,874
TOTAL NUMBER OF CASES CLOSED	32,755	16,343	9,045	40,474	32,458	84,614	36,873	16,853	50,506	33,561	82,401	19,267	59,162	16,948	46,394	4,634	43,936	31,574	22,105	33,030	712,933

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	

Approved Performance Measures for FY 2011-12 (Words)	Approved Prior Year Standards FY 2010-11 (Numbers)	Actual Prior Year Standards FY 2010-11 (Numbers)	Approved Standards for FY 2011-12 (Numbers)	Requested Standards for FY 2012-13 (Numbers)
Annual attorney turnover rate	8%	7.5%	8%	7.12%
Percent of appeals resolved	99.99%	98.5%	99.99%	99.99%
Number of appointed cases	5,643	5,445	5,643	5,717
Number of clients represented	5,810	5,441	5,810	5,713
Number of briefs filed	5,968	5,611	5,968	5,892
Number of writs filed	106	83	106	87
Number of cases closed	5,612	5,364	5,612	5,632

EXHIBIT II – PERFORMANCE MEASURES AND STANDARDS

**Public Defender Appellate Offices
PB2 BASELINE DATA COLLECTION FY 2010-2011 -
8/16/2011**

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

	2nd	7th	10th	11th	15th	Total
ANNUAL ATTORNEY TURNOVER RATES *	4.26%	4.61%	0.00%	20.00%	13.19%	7.50%
APPEALS ASSIGNED	1,282	1,062	1,504	609	988	5,445
NUMBER OF CLIENTS REPRESENTED	1,347	1,057	1,455	609	973	5,441
PERCENT OF APPEALS RESOLVED	93.14%	112.62%	108.78%	90.80%	79.45%	98.51%
NUMBER OF CASES CLOSED	1,194	1,196	1,636	553	785	5,364
NUMBER OF BRIEFS FILED	1,289	1,177	1,563	577	1,005	5,611
NUMBER OF WRITS FILED	8	11	13	35	16	83

Notes / Explanations: "***" Indicates employee data to be supplied by JAC

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

Approved Performance Measures for FY 2011-12 (Words)	Approved Prior Year Standards FY 2010-11 (Numbers)	Prior Year Actual FY 2010-11 (Numbers)
Percent of cases in which post-conviction motion, post-conviction appeal, federal habeas corpus motion or federal appeal is timely filed, without extension	90%	92%
Number of substantiated Bar grievances filed annually	0	0
Number of appellate actions	78	85
Number of 3.851 filings	26	39
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	6
Number of active cases	171	172
Number of evidentiary hearings	16	17
Number of federal court actions	42	94

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

Approved Performance Measures for FY 2011-12 (Words)	Approved Prior Year Standards FY 2010-11 (Numbers)	Prior Year Actual FY 2010-11 (Numbers)	Approved Standards for FY 2011-12 (Numbers)	Requested Standards for FY 2012-13 (Numbers)
Percent of cases in which post-conviction motion, post-conviction appeal, federal habeas corpus motion or federal appeal is timely filed, without extension		94.6 %		90%
Number of substantiated Bar grievances filed annually		0		0
Number of appellate actions		40		35
Number of 3.851 filings		13		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		3		2
Number of active cases		101		103
Number of evidentiary hearings		9		6
Number of federal court actions		57		36

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

Approved Performance Measures for FY 2011-12 (Words)	Approved Prior Year Standards FY 2010-11 (Numbers)	Prior Year Actual FY 2010-11 (Numbers)	Approved Standards for FY 2011-12 (Numbers)	Requested Standards for FY 2012-13 (Numbers)
Percent of cases in which post-conviction motion, post-conviction appeal, federal habeas corpus motion or federal appeal is timely filed, without extension		91%		90%
Number of substantiated Bar grievances filed annually		0		0
Number of appellate actions		45		40
Number of 3.851 filings		26		7
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		71		72
Number of evidentiary hearings		8		7
Number of federal court actions		37		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	

<u>Proposed</u> Performance Measures for FY 2011-12 (Words)	Approved Prior Year Standard FY 2010-11 (Numbers)	Actual Prior Year Standard FY 2010-11 (Numbers)	Approved Standards for FY 2011-12 (Numbers)	Requested Standards for FY 2012-13 (Numbers)
“New Measure” – Annual percentage of appellate briefs filed within 30 days of receipt of record.	N/A	50%	N/A	60%
“New Measure” – Annual percentage of misdemeanor cases closed within 120 days of appointment.	N/A	46%	N/A	56%
“New Measure” – In cases where there is either an adjudication or a withhold of adjudication, the percentage of case plans approved by the court within 90 days of appointment.	N/A	82%	N/A	92%

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	

<u>Proposed</u> Performance Measures for FY 2011-12 (Words)	Approved Prior Year Standard FY 2010-11 (Numbers)	Actual Prior Year Standard FY 2010-11 (Numbers)	Approved Standards for FY 2011-12 (Numbers)	Requested Standards for FY 2012-13 (Numbers)
“New Measure” – Annual percentage of appellate briefs filed within 30 days of receipt of record.	N/A	30%	N/A	40%
“New Measure” – Annual percentage of misdemeanor cases closed within 120 days of appointment.	N/A	92%	N/A	93%
“New Measure” – In cases where there is either an adjudication or a withhold of adjudication, the percentage of case plans approved by the court within 90 days of appointment.	N/A	88%	N/A	90%

EXHIBIT II – PERFORMANCE MEASURES AND STANDARDS

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

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

<u>Proposed</u> Performance Measures for FY 2011-12 (Words)	Approved Prior Year Standard FY 2010-11 (Numbers)	Actual Prior Year Standard FY 2010-11 (Numbers)	Approved Standards for FY 2011-12 (Numbers)	Requested Standards for FY 2012-13 (Numbers)
“New Measure” – Annual percentage of appellate briefs filed within 30 days of receipt of record.	N/A	20%	N/A	25%
“New Measure” – Annual percentage of misdemeanor cases closed within 120 days of appointment.	N/A	60%	N/A	65%
“New Measure” – In cases where there is either an adjudication or a withhold of adjudication, the percentage of case plans approved by the court within 90 days of appointment.	N/A	10%	N/A	15%

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	

Proposed Performance Measures for FY 2011-12 (Words)	Approved Prior Year Standard FY 2010-11 (Numbers)	Actual Prior Year Standard FY 2010-11 (Numbers)	Approved Standards for FY 2011-12 (Numbers)	Requested Standards for FY 2012-13 (Numbers)
“New Measure” – Annual percentage of appellate briefs filed within 30 days of receipt of record.	N/A	5%	N/A	10%
“New Measure” – Annual percentage of misdemeanor cases closed within 120 days of appointment.	N/A	55%	N/A	60%
“New Measure” – In cases where there is either an adjudication or a withhold of adjudication, the percentage of case plans approved by the court within 90 days of appointment.	N/A	60%	N/A	62%

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	

<u>Proposed</u> Performance Measures for FY 2011-12 (Words)	Approved Prior Year Standard FY 2010-11 (Numbers)	Actual Prior Year Standard FY 2010-11 (Numbers)	Approved Standards for FY 2011-12 (Numbers)	Requested Standards for FY 2012-13 (Numbers)
“New Measure” – Annual percentage of appellate briefs filed within 30 days of receipt of record.	N/A	69%	N/A	74%
“New Measure” – Annual percentage of misdemeanor cases closed within 120 days of appointment.	N/A	72%	N/A	77%
“New Measure” – In cases where there is either an adjudication or a withhold of adjudication, the percentage of case plans approved by the court within 90 days of appointment.	N/A	85%	N/A	87%

JUSTICE ADMINISTRATION



***LONG RANGE PROGRAM PLAN
FISCAL YEARS 2012-13 THROUGH 2016-17***

***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: 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	790	-1,710	-68%

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: 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	\$4,665,022	\$1,334,978	-22%

Factors Accounting for the Difference:

Internal Factors (check all that apply):

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

Explanation:

External Factors (check all that apply):

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

Explanation:

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	490,640	+115,460	+31%

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 budget, payroll, and accounting transactions fluctuate 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:

Maintain current approved standard.

EXHIBIT III – ASSESSMENT OF PERFORMANCE MEASURES

Department: Justice Administration
Program: State Attorneys
Service/Budget Entity: First – Twentieth Judicial Circuits
Measure: Percent of offenders who qualify for enhanced sentencing for whom state attorneys requested enhanced sentencing

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
92.00%	91.91%	(0.09%)	(0.10%)

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 percentages represent those cases the State Attorney deemed appropriate for enhanced sentencing recommendations pursuant to s. 775.084, Florida Statutes. Any deviation from the criteria established in statute is explained in writing by the State Attorney and maintained in the case file.

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: Total number of dispositions

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
1,339,035	1,259,271	(79,764)	(5.96%)

Factors Accounting for the Difference:

Internal Factors (check all that apply):

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

Explanation:

External Factors (check all that apply):

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

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

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

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

Recommendations:

EXHIBIT III – ASSESSMENT OF PERFORMANCE MEASURES

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

Action:

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

Approved Standard	Actual Performance Results	Difference (Over/Under)	Percentage Difference
439,795	346,948	(92,847)	(21.11%)

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 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%	53.80%	(0.50%)	(0.92%)

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"/> Staff Capacity
<input type="checkbox"/> Level of Training
<input type="checkbox"/> Other (Identify) |
|---|--|

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: 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"/> Personnel | <input type="checkbox"/> Technology
<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%	27.55%	(5.29%)	(16.11%)

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 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	1,027,154	(156,443)	(13.22%)

Factors Accounting for the Difference:

Internal Factors (check all that apply):

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

Explanation:

External Factors (check all that apply):

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

Explanation: These numbers 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	59,881	(23,735)	(28.39%)

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"/> Staff Capacity
<input type="checkbox"/> Level of Training
<input type="checkbox"/> Other (Identify) |
|---|--|

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: 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"/> Personnel | <input type="checkbox"/> Technology
<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: 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%	7.50%	(.5)	(6.25%)

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 current labor market and economic factors seem to cause attorneys to remain in their current employment. The very stable turnover rate of the appellate attorneys is good for the offices and for the clients.

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

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

Recommendations:

EXHIBIT III – ASSESSMENT OF PERFORMANCE MEASURES

Department: _____ Justice Administration _____
Program: _____ Public Defender, Appellate _____
Service/Budget Entity: _____ Public Defender, Appellate _____
Measure: **Number of clients represented**

Action:

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

Approved Standard	Actual Performance Results	Difference (Over/Under)	Percentage Difference
5,810	5,441	(369)	(6.35%)

Factors Accounting for the Difference:

Internal Factors (check all that apply):

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

Explanation:

The number of arrests reported to FDLE are down. This has resulted in fewer filings by the State Attorneys and fewer cases assigned to Public Defenders and fewer appeals.

External Factors (check all that apply):

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

Explanation:

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

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

Recommendations:

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:

- | | |
|---|--|
| <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
5,612	5,364	(248)	(4.42%)

Factors Accounting for the Difference:

Internal Factors (check all that apply):

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

Explanation: The number of arrests reported to FDLE are down. This has resulted in fewer filings by the State Attorneys and fewer cases assigned to Public Defenders and less appeals.

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

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

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

Recommendations:

Adequate staffing is needed.

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 2010-11.

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:

JUSTICE ADMINISTRATION



***LONG RANGE PROGRAM PLAN
FISCAL YEARS 2012-13 THROUGH 2016-17***

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) and Hearings Database.

Validity:

Court appointed attorney and due process vendor invoices are processed in CAATS and motions for fees above the statutory caps are maintained in the Hearings Database.

Reliability:

The number of transactions processed in CAATS and motions requesting fees above statutory caps maintained in the Hearings Database 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) and Hearings Database.

Validity:

Court appointed attorney and due process vendor invoices are processed in CAATS and motions for fees above the statutory caps are maintained in the Hearings Database.

Reliability:

The number of transactions processed in CAATS and motions requesting fees above statutory caps maintained in the Hearings Database 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 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 briefs filed within 30 days of receipt of record.

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 all appellate cases appointed to offices in a case tracking database. Regional Counsel Offices will flag the cases where the appellate briefs are filed within the 30 days of receipt of record, and annually will record the percentage of appellate briefs filed within 30 days of receipt of record.

Validity: This performance measure produces a valid measurement of the Regional Counsels' appellate briefs filed within 30 days of receipt of record which produces an outcome of quality representation in a cost effective manner.

Reliability: The data produced is reliable in that the percentage of appellate briefs filed within 30 days of receipt of record is reported accurately in Regional Counsels' case tracking program.

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 misdemeanor cases closed within 120 days of appointment.

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 all misdemeanor cases appointed to the Regional Counsel Offices in a case tracking database. The number of misdemeanor cases closed within 120 days of appointment will be counted and the percentage will be recorded annually.

Validity: This performance measure produces a valid measurement of the Regional Counsels' annual percentage of misdemeanor cases closed within 120 days of appointment which produces an outcome of quality representation in a cost effective manner.

Reliability: The data produced is reliable in that the percentage of misdemeanor cases closed within 120 days of appointment is reported accurately in Regional Counsels' case tracking program.

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:	In cases where there is either an adjudication or a withhold of adjudication, the percentage of case plans approved by the court within 90 days.

Action (check one):

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

Data Sources and Methodology:

The Criminal Conflict and Civil Regional Counsels record the number of dependency cases that include an accepted case plan in a case tracking program. In cases where there is either an adjudication or a withhold of adjudication, a case plan approved by the court will be flagged and the percentage of accepted case plans filed within the timeframe will be recorded annually.

Validity: This performance measure produces a valid measurement of the Regional Counsels' percentage of approved case plans within 90 days of appointment, which produces an outcome of quality representation in a cost effective manner.

Reliability: The data produced is reliable in that the percentage of accepted case plans filed within 90 days of acceptance of case is reported accurately Regional Counsels' case tracking program.

JUSTICE ADMINISTRATION



***LONG RANGE PROGRAM PLAN
FISCAL YEARS 2012-13 THROUGH 2016-17***

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

EXHIBIT V – ASSOCIATED ACTIVITIES CONTRIBUTING TO PERFORMANCE MEASURES

Measure Number	Approved Performance Measures for FY 2011-12		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

EXHIBIT V – ASSOCIATED ACTIVITIES CONTRIBUTING TO PERFORMANCE MEASURES

Measure Number	Approved Performance Measures for FY 2011-12 (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	Approved Performance Measures for FY 2011-12 (Words)		Associated Activity Titles (From Exhibit VI)
1	# of work products produced in support of Clerks’ Budget Requests analyses and CCOC Legislative Budget Requests.		Clerks’ Legislative Budget Request and Final Appropriation Allocations
2	# of CCOC technical and analytical products produced in support of implementing Clerks’ approved budgets.		Trust Fund and Clerks’ Budget Status Monitoring, Analysis, Reporting And Issues Management.
3	# of CCOC education and training programs and opportunities provided to Clerks’ offices during the fiscal year.		Provide Education and Training to Clerks’ Offices

EXHIBIT V – ASSOCIATED ACTIVITIES CONTRIBUTING TO PERFORMANCE MEASURES

Measure Number	Approved Performance Measures for FY 2011-12 (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 2011-12 (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 2011-12 (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 2011-12 (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 2011-12 (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 2011-12 (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 2011-12 (Words)		Associated Activities Title (From Exhibit VI)
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 2011-12 (Words)		Approved Associated Activity Titles (From Exhibit VI)
1	“New Measure” – Annual percentage of appellate briefs filed within 30 days of receipt of record.		Regional Counsel Workload
2	“New Measure” – Annual percentage of misdemeanor cases closed within 120 days of appointment.		Regional Counsel Workload
3	“New Measure” – In cases where there is an adjudication or a withhold of adjudication, the percentage of case plans approved by the court within 90 days of appointment.		Regional Counsel Workload

JUSTICE ADMINISTRATION		FISCAL YEAR 2010-11			
SECTION I: BUDGET		OPERATING		FIXED CAPITAL OUTLAY	
TOTAL ALL FUNDS GENERAL APPROPRIATIONS ACT		1,210,513,941		0	
ADJUSTMENTS TO GENERAL APPROPRIATIONS ACT (Supplementals, Vetoes, Budget Amendments, etc.)		49,495,542		0	
FINAL BUDGET FOR AGENCY		1,260,009,483		0	
SECTION II: ACTIVITIES * MEASURES		Number of Units	(1) Unit Cost	(2) Expenditures (Allocated)	(3) FCO
<i>Executive Direction, Administrative Support and Information Technology (2)</i>					0
Represent Children * Average number of children represented.		21,497	1,425.58	30,645,727	
Civil Investigative Services * Number of appointed civil cases investigated		22,851	240.02	5,484,637	
Criminal Investigative Services * Number of appointed criminal cases investigated		738,838	116.30	85,925,986	
Criminal Trial Indigent Defense * Number of appointed criminal cases		738,838	116.30	85,925,989	
Civil Trial Indigent Defense * Number of appointed civil cases		22,851	240.02	5,484,637	
Indigent Appellate Defense * Number of appointed appellate cases		5,445	2,495.69	13,589,045	
Death Penalty Legal Counsel * Number of active cases		172	19,797.10	3,405,102	
Death Row Case Preparation * Number of active cases		172	20,605.15	3,544,085	
Felony Prosecution * Felony Cases Referred		417,675	482.34	201,459,621	
Misdemeanor Prosecution * Misdemeanor/Criminal Traffic Cases Referred		968,427	107.43	104,042,057	
Juvenile Prosecution * Juvenile Cases Referred		121,637	265.54	32,299,765	
Child Support Enforcement Services * Child Support Enforcement Actions		27,268	819.62	22,349,263	
Civil Action Services * Number of Civil Actions		108,874	102.10	11,115,610	
Regional Counsel Workload * Number of appointed cases.		61,662	576.40	35,541,910	
Clerks Legislative Budget Request And Final Appropriation Allocations * Number of work products produced in support of Clerks' budget request analyses and Clerks of Court Operations Corporation Legislative Budget Requests.		292	1,596.54	466,189	
Trust Fund And Clerks' Budget Status Monitoring, Analysis, Reporting And Issues Management * Number of Clerks of Court Operations Corporation technical and analytical products produced in support of implementing Clerks' approved budgets.		1,120	367.47	411,569	
Provide Education And Training To Clerks' Offices * Number of education and training programs and opportunities provided to Clerks' offices during the fiscal year.		36	13,697.81	493,121	
TOTAL				642,184,313	
SECTION III: RECONCILIATION TO BUDGET					
PASS THROUGHS					
TRANSFER - STATE AGENCIES				574,546,418	
AID TO LOCAL GOVERNMENTS					
PAYMENT OF PENSIONS, BENEFITS AND CLAIMS					
OTHER					
REVERSIONS				43,278,784	
TOTAL BUDGET FOR AGENCY (Total Activities + Pass Throughs + Reversions) - Should equal Section I above. (4)				1,260,009,515	

SCHEDULE XI/EXHIBIT VI: AGENCY-LEVEL UNIT COST SUMMARY

(1) Some activity unit costs may be overstated due to the allocation of double budgeted items.
(2) Expenditures associated with Executive Direction, Administrative Support and Information Technology have been allocated based on FTE. Other allocation methodologies could result in significantly different unit costs per activity.
(3) Information for FCO depicts amounts for current year appropriations only. Additional information and systems are needed to develop meaningful FCO unit costs.
(4) Final Budget for Agency and Total Budget for Agency may not equal due to rounding.

IUCSSP03 LAS/PBS SYSTEM
BUDGET PERIOD: 2002-2013
STATE OF FLORIDA

SP 09/14/2011 15:48
SCHED XI: AGENCY-LEVEL UNIT COST SUMMARY
AUDIT REPORT JUSTICE ADMINISTRATION

ACTIVITY ISSUE CODES SELECTED:

TRANSFER-STATE AGENCIES ACTIVITY ISSUE CODES SELECTED:

1-8: ACT5000 ACT5100 ACT5200 ACT5300 ACT5400

AID TO LOCAL GOVERNMENTS ACTIVITY ISSUE CODES SELECTED:

1-8:

THE FOLLOWING STATEWIDE ACTIVITIES (ACT0010 THROUGH ACT0490) HAVE AN OUTPUT STANDARD (RECORD TYPE 5)
AND SHOULD NOT:

*** NO ACTIVITIES FOUND ***

THE FCO ACTIVITY (ACT0210) CONTAINS EXPENDITURES IN AN OPERATING CATEGORY AND SHOULD NOT:
(NOTE: THIS ACTIVITY IS ROLLED INTO EXECUTIVE DIRECTION, ADMINISTRATIVE SUPPORT AND INFORMATION
TECHNOLOGY)

*** NO OPERATING CATEGORIES FOUND ***

THE FOLLOWING ACTIVITIES DO NOT HAVE AN OUTPUT STANDARD (RECORD TYPE 5) AND ARE REPORTED AS 'OTHER' IN
SECTION III: (NOTE: 'OTHER' ACTIVITIES ARE NOT 'TRANSFER-STATE AGENCY' ACTIVITIES OR 'AID TO LOCAL
GOVERNMENTS' ACTIVITIES. ALL ACTIVITIES WITH AN OUTPUT STANDARD (RECORD TYPE 5) SHOULD BE REPORTED
IN SECTION II.)

*** NO ACTIVITIES FOUND ***

TOTALS FROM SECTION I AND SECTIONS II + III:

DEPARTMENT: 21	EXPENDITURES	FCO
FINAL BUDGET FOR AGENCY (SECTION I):	1,260,009,483	
TOTAL BUDGET FOR AGENCY (SECTION III):	1,260,009,515	
	-----	-----
DIFFERENCE:	32-	
(MAY NOT EQUAL DUE TO ROUNDING)	=====	=====

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