



THE STATE OF FLORIDA  
**JUSTICE ADMINISTRATIVE COMMISSION**

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



**COMMISSIONERS**

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

(850) 488-2415  
Toll Free (866) 355-7902  
FAX (850) 488-8944

[www.justiceadmin.org](http://www.justiceadmin.org)

**Brad King, Chair**  
*State Attorney*  
**Diamond R. Litty**  
*Public Defender*  
**Jerry Hill**  
*State Attorney*  
**Nancy Daniels**  
*Public Defender*

**LONG RANGE PROGRAM PLAN**

Justice Administration  
Tallahassee, Florida

September 30, 2013

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

Mike Hansen, Staff Director  
Senate Budget Committee  
201 Capitol  
Tallahassee, FL 32399-1300

Dear Directors:

Pursuant to Chapter 216, Florida Statutes, the Long Range Program Plan (LRPP) for the Department of Justice Administration is submitted in the format prescribed in the budget instructions. The information provided electronically and contained herein is a true and accurate presentation of our mission, goals, objectives and measures for the Fiscal Year 2014-15 through Fiscal Year 2018-19. The internet website address that provides the link to the LRPP located on the Florida Fiscal Portal is [www.justiceadmin.com](http://www.justiceadmin.com). This submission is being provided by me as Executive Director of the Justice Administrative Commission on behalf of all agencies within the Department.

Sincerely,

Alton L. "Rip" Colvin, Jr.



**Justice Administrative Commission  
Long-Range Program Plan  
FY 2014-2015 through 2018-2019**

**Alton L. “Rip” Colvin, Jr.  
Executive Director  
227 N. Bronough St., Suite 2100  
Tallahassee, FL 32301**



## **STATEWIDE GUARDIAN AD LITEM OFFICE**

### **Long Range Program Plan**

Fiscal Years 2014-2015 through 2018-2019

September 30, 2013

Alan Abramowitz  
Executive Director

600 South Calhoun Street, Suite 273  
Tallahassee, Florida 32399

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



## **OFFICES OF THE STATE ATTORNEY**

### **LONG RANGE PROGRAM PLAN FY 2014-15 THROUGH FY 2018-2019**

**September 30, 2013**

**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 Ed Brodsky  
State Attorney, Twelfth Judicial Circuit**

**Honorable Jeffrey A. Siegmeister  
State Attorney, Third Judicial Circuit**

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

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

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

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

**Honorable David A. Aronberg  
State Attorney, Fifteenth Judicial Circuit**

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

**Honorable Catherine F. Vogel  
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 Philip G. Archer  
State Attorney, Eighteenth Judicial Circuit**

**Honorable Jeffrey L. Ashton  
State Attorney, Ninth Judicial Circuit**

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

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

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



## **OFFICES OF THE PUBLIC DEFENDER**

### **LONG RANGE PROGRAM PLAN FY 2014-2015 THROUGH FY 2018-2019**

**September 30, 2013**

**Honorable Bruce Miller  
Public Defender, First Judicial Circuit**

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

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

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

**Honorable Blair Payne  
Public Defender, Third Judicial Circuit**

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

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

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

**Honorable Mike Graves  
Public Defender, Fifth Judicial Circuit**

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

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

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

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

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

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

**Honorable Blaise Trettis  
Public Defender, Eighteenth Judicial Circuit**

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

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

**Honorable Rex Dimmig  
Public Defender, Tenth Judicial Circuit**

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



**OFFICES OF THE PUBLIC DEFENDER – APPELLATE**

**LONG RANGE PROGRAM PLAN  
FY 2014-2015 THROUGH FY 2018-2019**

**September 30, 2013**

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

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

**Honorable Rex Dimmig  
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 2014-15 through 2018-19**

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

**September 30, 2013**



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

**LONG RANGE PROGRAM PLAN  
FY 2014-2015 THROUGH FY 2018-2019**

**September 30, 2013**

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

**Ita Neymotin  
Regional Counsel, Second Region**

**Eugene Zenobi  
Regional Counsel, Third Region**

**Anthony Parker Ryan  
Regional Counsel, Fourth Region**

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



---

## AGENCY MISSION AND GOALS

---

### JUSTICE ADMINISTRATIVE COMMISSION

**Mission:** *Provide Superior Services*

*To be responsible stewards of taxpayer dollars, while providing the highest quality service to the 49 judicial related entities, private court appointed counsel, and associated vendors we serve, by ensuring compliance with laws, rules, regulations, and best business practices.*

*The Justice Administrative Commission (JAC) administratively serves the offices of State Attorneys, Public Defenders, Capital Collateral Regional Counsels, Criminal Conflict and Civil Regional Counsels, and the Statewide Guardian ad Litem Program; 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**

- *To assure that every child has a voice in court.*
- *Using quantitative and qualitative data, to demonstrate that Guardian ad Litem (GAL) advocacy correlates with improved outcomes for children in the dependency system.*
- *To implement a consistent core program of evidence-based training for GAL volunteers which strengthens their ability to address the needs of the children they represent.*
- *To 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.*

### 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 the rights of the indigent accused under the United States Constitution, Florida Constitution, and fulfill obligations and responsibilities under Chapters 27, 394, and 985, Florida Statutes; the Criminal, Juvenile, and Appellate Rules of Procedure; and the Florida Rules of Professional Conduct.

**Priority #1 Goal:**

*Provide fair and equitable salaries and benefits for employees to improve retention, reduce attorney turnover, and ensure continuity of legal representation.*

**Priority #2 Goal:**

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

---

## AGENCY MISSION AND GOALS

---

### **PUBLIC DEFENDER APPELLATE**

**Mission:** Protect the rights of the indigent accused under the United States Constitution, Florida Constitution, and fulfill obligations and responsibilities under Chapters 27, 394, and 985, Florida Statutes; the Criminal, Juvenile, and Appellate Rules of Procedure; and the Florida Rules of Professional Conduct.

**Priority #1 Goal:**

*Provide fair and equitable salaries and benefits for employees to improve retention, reduce turnover, and ensure continuity of legal representation.*

**Priority #2 Goal:**

*Establish reasonable caseloads for appellate attorneys and 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 3.851 and 3.852: CCRCs are responsible for collecting and analyzing public records of all assigned post-death penalty conviction cases, investigating each case and providing legal representation within state and federal courts performing post-conviction reviews.*

**Priority #1 Goal:**

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

### **OFFICES OF CRIMINAL CONFLICT AND CIVIL REGIONAL COUNSELS (OCCRC)**

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

**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 volunteer base.*

### STATE ATTORNEY

**Goal 1 Objective:**

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

**Goal 2 Objective:**

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

### PUBLIC DEFENDER

**Goals 1 & 2 Objective:**

*Provide quality representation to all appointed clients and thereby protect the constitutional and statutory rights of all citizens.*

---

## AGENCY OBJECTIVES

---

### **PUBLIC DEFENDER APPELLATE**

#### **Goals 1 & 2 Objective:**

*Provide quality representation to all appointed clients and thereby protect the constitutional and statutory rights of all citizens.*

### **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 days of appointment.*

---

**AGENCY SERVICE OUTCOMES AND  
PERFORMANCE PROJECTION TABLES**

---

**JUSTICE ADMINISTRATIVE COMMISSION**

Outcome: Number of transactions processed on behalf of agencies administratively served.

<b>Baseline/ Year 2012-13</b>	<b>FY 2014-15</b>	<b>FY 2015-16</b>	<b>FY 2016-17</b>	<b>FY 2017-18</b>	<b>FY 2018-19</b>
384,033	387,873	391,752	395,670	399,626	403,623

Outcome: Number of court appointed counsel and due process vendor invoices processed.

<b>Baseline/ Year 2012-13</b>	<b>FY 2014-15</b>	<b>FY 2015-16</b>	<b>FY 2016-17</b>	<b>FY 2017-18</b>	<b>FY 2018-19</b>
52,868	53,400	53,930	54,470	55,015	55,565

**STATEWIDE GUARDIAN AD LITEM**

**PRIMARY SERVICE OUTCOMES**

Outcome: Average number of children represented.

<u>Baseline</u>					
FY 2012/2013	FY2014/15	FY2015/16	FY2016/17	FY2017/18	FY2018/19
21,397	23,250	25,500	28,850	30,000	30,000

Explanation: This is the average of 12 months of data, from July 1, 2012 – June 30, 2013, reflecting children served in-home and out-of-home, in the dependency system. The proposed incremental increases reflected in the chart above provide for expansion on a phased-in basis over a three-year period, until such time as 100% of all children in the dependency system are represented by the end of FY 2016-17. **These levels of performance are contingent upon funding of the legislative budget requests to be submitted by the Guardian ad Litem Program for the years FY 2014-15 forward. These targets also assume that the average number of children in the dependency system remains constant at a level estimated at 30,000.**

Outcome: Average percent of children represented.

<u>Baseline</u>					
FY 2012/2013	FY2014/15	FY2015/16	FY2016/17	FY2017/18	FY2018/19
69.78%	77.5%	85%	95%	100%	100%

---

**AGENCY SERVICE OUTCOMES AND  
PERFORMANCE PROJECTION TABLES**

---

**STATEWIDE GUARDIAN AD LITEM**

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, i.e., those in the dependency system. It is important to show both the number represented (as in the first outcome shown above) and the percent of children represented (as in the second chart above) in order to give an accurate picture of performance on this measure. It is worth noting that although the GAL Program averaged 69.78% representation last fiscal year, performance improved from 68.08% at the beginning of FY 2012-13 to 73% in July 2013. The proposed incremental increases reflected in the chart above provide for expansion on a phased-in basis over a three-year period, until such time as 100% of all children in the dependency system are represented by the end of FY 2016-17. **These levels of performance are contingent upon funding of the legislative budget requests to be submitted by the Guardian ad Litem Program for the years FY 2014-15 forward. These targets also assume that the average number of children in the dependency system remains constant at a level estimated at 30,000.**

Outcome: Percent of cases closed with Permanency Goal achieved.

<u>Baseline</u>					
FY 2012/13	FY2014/15	FY2015/16	FY2016/17	FY2017/18	FY2018/19
69%	77%	78%	79%	80%	80%

Explanation: This measure is an average of 12 months' data on cases closed with permanency goals 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, supervision by the Department of Children and Families (DCF) is terminated when those goals are achieved. Ideally, a GAL should not discharge off of an assigned case short of a child achieving permanency, although that desired result is not always achieved. Improvement in that result over time is highly desired and in the best interest of children.

Outcome: Number of new volunteers certified as a GAL.

<u>Baseline</u>					
FY 2012/13	FY2014/15	FY2015/16	FY2016/17	FY2017/18	FY2018/19
2,895	1,091	1,323	1,323	*Recruitment for attrition only	*Recruitment for attrition only

Explanation: Performance in FY 2012-13 represents an increase of 20% over the number new volunteers certified the prior fiscal year, FY 2011-12.

---

**AGENCY SERVICE OUTCOMES AND  
PERFORMANCE PROJECTION TABLES**

---

**STATEWIDE GUARDIAN AD LITEM**

**Outcome:** Number of volunteers on June 30, annually. [This outcome measure is being proposed as a replacement for the currently approved measure which reads: “Average number of active volunteers.”]

<u>Baseline</u>					
FY 2012/13	FY2014/15	FY2015/16	FY2016/17	FY2017/18	FY2018/19
8,566	9,500	10,591	11,915	13,239	13,239

**STATE ATTORNEY**

**STATE ATTORNEY, FIRST JUDICIAL CIRCUIT**

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

	<b>FY 2000-01 BASELINE</b>	<b>FY 2014-15</b>	<b>FY 2015-16</b>	<b>FY 2016-17</b>	<b>FY 2017-18</b>	<b>FY 2018-19</b>
Offenders who qualify for enhanced sentence for whom the State requests enhanced sentence	146	316	316	316	316	316
Offenders for whom the Court orders enhanced sentencing	91	316	316	316	316	316
Percentage of offenders sentenced by the Court to an enhanced sentence	62%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

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

<b>FY 2000-01 BASELINE</b>	<b>FY 2014-15</b>	<b>FY 2015-16</b>	<b>FY 2016-17</b>	<b>FY 2017-18</b>	<b>FY 2018-19</b>
15.6%	21.25%	21.25%	21.25%	21.25%	21.25%



---

**AGENCY SERVICE OUTCOMES AND  
PERFORMANCE PROJECTION TABLES**

---

**STATE ATTORNEY, SECOND JUDICIAL CIRCUIT**

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

	<b>FY 2000-01 BASELINE</b>	<b>FY 2014-15</b>	<b>FY 2015-16</b>	<b>FY 2016-17</b>	<b>FY 2017-18</b>	<b>FY 2018-19</b>
Offenders who qualify for enhanced sentence for whom the State requests enhanced sentence	152	180	180	180	180	180
Offenders for whom the Court orders enhanced Sentencing	53	180	180	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.

<b>FY 2000-01 BASELINE</b>	<b>FY 2014-15</b>	<b>FY 2015-16</b>	<b>FY 2016-17</b>	<b>FY 2017-18</b>	<b>FY 2018-19</b>
33.4%	25%	25%	30%	30%	25%

**STATE ATTORNEY, THIRD JUDICIAL CIRCUIT**

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

	<b>FY 2000-01 BASELINE</b>	<b>FY 2014-15</b>	<b>FY 2015-16</b>	<b>FY 2016-17</b>	<b>FY 2017-18</b>	<b>FY 2018-19</b>
Offenders who qualify for enhanced sentence for whom the State requests enhanced sentence	7	20	22	23	26	27
Offenders for whom the Court orders enhanced sentencing	6	18	20	21	23	24
Percentage of offenders sentenced by the Court to an enhanced sentence	85.7%	90%	90%	90%	90%	90%

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

<b>FY 2000-01 BASELINE</b>	<b>FY 2014-15</b>	<b>FY 2015-16</b>	<b>FY 2016-17</b>	<b>FY 2017-18</b>	<b>FY 2018-19</b>
13.6%	21%	20%	21%	20%	20%

---

**AGENCY SERVICE OUTCOMES AND  
PERFORMANCE PROJECTION TABLES**

---

**STATE ATTORNEY, FOURTH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT**

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

	<b>FY 2000-01 BASELINE</b>	<b>FY 2014-15</b>	<b>FY 2015-16</b>	<b>FY 2016-17</b>	<b>FY 2017-18</b>	<b>FY 2018-19</b>
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.

<b>FY 2000-01 BASELINE</b>	<b>FY 2014-15</b>	<b>FY 2015-16</b>	<b>FY 2016-17</b>	<b>FY 2017-18</b>	<b>FY 2018-19</b>
21%	22%	22%	22%	22%	22%

**STATE ATTORNEY, FIFTH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT**

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

	<b>FY 2001-02 BASELINE</b>	<b>FY 2014-15</b>	<b>FY 2015-16</b>	<b>FY 2016-17</b>	<b>FY 2017-18</b>	<b>FY 2018-19</b>
Offenders who qualify for enhanced sentence for whom the State requests enhanced sentence	320	393	405	417	468	482
Offenders for whom the Court orders enhanced sentencing	168	384	395	406	418	430
Percentage of offenders sentenced by the Court to an enhanced sentence	52.50%	98%	98%	98%	90%	90%

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

<b>FY 2000-01 BASELINE</b>	<b>FY 2014-15</b>	<b>FY 2015-16</b>	<b>FY 2016-17</b>	<b>FY 2017-18</b>	<b>FY 2018-19</b>
20.59%	15.92%	15.44%	14.97%	14.52%	14.08%

---

**AGENCY SERVICE OUTCOMES AND  
PERFORMANCE PROJECTION TABLES**

---

**STATE ATTORNEY, SIXTH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT**

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

	<b>FY 2000-01 BASELINE</b>	<b>FY 2014-15</b>	<b>FY 2015-16</b>	<b>FY 2016-17</b>	<b>FY 2017-18</b>	<b>FY 2018-19</b>
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.

<b>FY 2000-01 BASELINE</b>	<b>FY 2014-15</b>	<b>FY 2015-16</b>	<b>FY 2016-17</b>	<b>FY 2017-18</b>	<b>FY 2018-19</b>
15%	15%	15%	15%	15%	14%

**STATE ATTORNEY, SEVENTH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT**

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

	<b>FY 2000-01 BASELINE</b>	<b>FY 2014-15</b>	<b>FY 2015-16</b>	<b>FY 2016-17</b>	<b>FY 2017-18</b>	<b>FY 2018-19</b>
Offenders who qualify for enhanced sentence for whom the State requests enhanced sentence	223	455	460	460	465	470
Offenders for whom the Court orders enhanced sentencing	90	432	437	437	442	447
Percentage of offenders sentenced by the Court to an enhanced sentence	40.5%	95%	95%	95%	95%	95%

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

<b>FY 2000-01 BASELINE</b>	<b>FY 2014-15</b>	<b>FY 2015-16</b>	<b>FY 2016-17</b>	<b>FY 2017-18</b>	<b>FY 2018-19</b>
19.8%	18%	16%	14%	12%	12%

---

**AGENCY SERVICE OUTCOMES AND  
PERFORMANCE PROJECTION TABLES**

---

**STATE ATTORNEY, EIGHTH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT**

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

	<b>FY 2009-10 BASELINE</b>	<b>FY 2014-15</b>	<b>FY 2015-16</b>	<b>FY 2016-17</b>	<b>FY 2017-18</b>	<b>FY 2018-19</b>
Offenders who qualify for enhanced sentence for whom the State requests enhanced sentence	131	100	100	100	100	100

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

<b>FY 2006-07 BASELINE</b>	<b>FY 2014-15</b>	<b>FY 2015-16</b>	<b>FY 2016-17</b>	<b>FY 2017-18</b>	<b>FY 2018-19</b>
14.36%	15%	15%	15%	15%	15%

**STATE ATTORNEY, NINTH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT**

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

	<b>FY 2000-01 BASELINE</b>	<b>FY 2014-15</b>	<b>FY 2015-16</b>	<b>FY 2016-17</b>	<b>FY 2017-18</b>	<b>FY 2018-19</b>
Offenders who qualify for enhanced sentence for whom the State requests enhanced sentence	634	346	347	348	349	350
Offenders for whom the Court orders enhanced sentencing	148	346	347	348	349	350
Percentage of offenders sentenced by the Court to an enhanced sentence	23%	90%	90%	90%	90%	90%

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

<b>FY 2000-01 BASELINE</b>	<b>FY 2014-15</b>	<b>FY 2015-16</b>	<b>FY 2016-17</b>	<b>FY 2017-18</b>	<b>FY 2018-19</b>
28.14%	20%	20%	20%	20%	20%

---

**AGENCY SERVICE OUTCOMES AND  
PERFORMANCE PROJECTION TABLES**

---

**STATE ATTORNEY, TENTH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT**

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

	<b>FY 2000-01 BASELINE</b>	<b>FY 2014-15</b>	<b>FY 2015-16</b>	<b>FY 2016-17</b>	<b>FY 2017-18</b>	<b>FY 2018-19</b>
Offenders who qualify for enhanced sentence for whom the State requests enhanced sentence	465	600	600	600	600	600
Offenders for whom the Court orders enhanced sentencing	220	600	600	600	600	600
Percentage of offenders sentenced by the Court to an enhanced sentence	47.3%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

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

<b>FY 2000-01 BASELINE</b>	<b>FY 2014-15</b>	<b>FY 2015-16</b>	<b>FY 2016-17</b>	<b>FY 2017-18</b>	<b>FY 2018-19</b>
16.7%	20%	20%	20%	20%	20%

**STATE ATTORNEY, ELEVENTH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT**

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

	<b>FY 2000-01 BASELINE</b>	<b>FY 2014-15</b>	<b>FY 2015-16</b>	<b>FY 2016-17</b>	<b>FY 2017-18</b>	<b>FY 2018-19</b>
Offenders who qualify for enhanced sentence for whom the State requests enhanced sentence	3,683	2,694	2,829	2,970	3,119	3,275

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

<b>FY 2000-01 BASELINE</b>	<b>FY 2014-15</b>	<b>FY 2015-16</b>	<b>FY 2016-17</b>	<b>FY 2017-18</b>	<b>FY 2018-19</b>
21.85%	20.62%	21%	21%	21%	21%

---

**AGENCY SERVICE OUTCOMES AND  
PERFORMANCE PROJECTION TABLES**

---

**STATE ATTORNEY, TWELFTH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT**

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

	<b>FY 2000-01 BASELINE</b>	<b>FY 2014-15</b>	<b>FY 2015-16</b>	<b>FY 2016-17</b>	<b>FY 2017-18</b>	<b>FY 2018-19</b>
Offenders who qualify for enhanced sentence for whom the State requests enhanced sentence	210	53	54	55	56	57
Offenders for whom the Court orders enhanced sentencing	123	10	11	12	13	14
Percentage of offenders sentenced by the Court to an enhanced sentence	58.57%	19%	20%	22%	23%	25%

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

<b>FY 2000-01 BASELINE</b>	<b>FY 2014-15</b>	<b>FY 2015-16</b>	<b>FY 2016-17</b>	<b>FY 2017-18</b>	<b>FY 2018-19</b>
20.5%	15.83%	14%	13%	12%	11%

**STATE ATTORNEY, THIRTEENTH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT**

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

	<b>FY 2000-01 BASELINE</b>	<b>FY 2014-15</b>	<b>FY 2015-16</b>	<b>FY 2016-17</b>	<b>FY 2017-18</b>	<b>FY 2018-19</b>
Offenders who qualify for enhanced sentence for whom the State requests enhanced sentence	210	311	314	317	320	324
Offenders for whom the Court orders enhanced Sentencing	203	301	304	307	310	314
Percentage of offenders sentenced by the Court to an enhanced sentence	96.70%	96.80%	96.80%	96.80%	96.90%	96.90%

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

<b>FY 2000-01 BASELINE</b>	<b>FY 2014-15</b>	<b>FY 2015-16</b>	<b>FY 2016-17</b>	<b>FY 2017-18</b>	<b>FY 2018-19</b>
27.91%	19%	20%	20%	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.

	<b>FY 2000-01 BASELINE</b>	<b>FY 2014-15</b>	<b>FY 2015-16</b>	<b>FY 2016-17</b>	<b>FY 2017-18</b>	<b>FY 2018-19</b>
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	72	72	72	72	72
Percentage of offenders sentenced by the Court to an enhanced sentence	87%	90%	90%	90%	90%	90%

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

<b>FY 2000-01 BASELINE</b>	<b>FY 2014-15</b>	<b>FY 2015-16</b>	<b>FY 2016-17</b>	<b>FY 2017-18</b>	<b>FY 2018-19</b>
12.50%	25%	25%	30%	30%	25%

**STATE ATTORNEY, FIFTEENTH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT**

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

	<b>FY 2000-01 BASELINE</b>	<b>FY 2014-15</b>	<b>FY 2015-16</b>	<b>FY 2016-17</b>	<b>FY 2017-18</b>	<b>FY 2018-19</b>
Offenders who qualify for enhanced sentence for whom the State requests enhanced sentence	313	235	240	245	250	250
Offenders for whom the Court orders enhanced Sentencing	164	235	240	245	250	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.

<b>FY 2000-01 BASELINE</b>	<b>FY 2014-15</b>	<b>FY 2015-16</b>	<b>FY 2016-17</b>	<b>FY 2017-18</b>	<b>FY 2018-19</b>
24.15%	15%	14%	13%	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.

	<b>FY 2000-01 BASELINE</b>	<b>FY 2014-15</b>	<b>FY 2015-16</b>	<b>FY 2016-17</b>	<b>FY 2017-18</b>	<b>FY 2018-19</b>
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.

<b>FY 2000-01 BASELINE</b>	<b>FY 2014-15</b>	<b>FY 2015-16</b>	<b>FY 2016-17</b>	<b>FY 2017-18</b>	<b>FY 2018-19</b>
77%	25%	25%	25%	25%	25%

**STATE ATTORNEY, SEVENTEENTH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT**

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

	<b>FY 2001-02 BASELINE</b>	<b>FY 2014-15</b>	<b>FY 2015-16</b>	<b>FY 2016-17</b>	<b>FY 2017-18</b>	<b>FY 2018-19</b>
Offenders who qualify for enhanced sentence for whom the State requests enhanced sentence	849	1,026	1,026	1,026	1,026	1,026
Offenders for whom the Court orders enhanced sentencing	501	495	495	495	495	495
Percentage of offenders sentenced by the Court to an enhanced sentence	59%	48%	48%	48%	48%	48%

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

<b>FY 2000-01 BASELINE</b>	<b>FY 2014-15</b>	<b>FY 2015-16</b>	<b>FY 2016-17</b>	<b>FY 2017-18</b>	<b>FY 2018-19</b>
18%	16%	16%	16%	16%	16%



---

**AGENCY SERVICE OUTCOMES AND  
PERFORMANCE PROJECTION TABLES**

---

**STATE ATTORNEY, EIGHTEENTH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT**

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

	<b>FY 2000-01 BASELINE</b>	<b>FY 2014-15</b>	<b>FY 2015-16</b>	<b>FY 2016-17</b>	<b>FY 2017-18</b>	<b>FY 2018-19</b>
Offenders who qualify for enhanced sentence for whom the State requests enhanced sentence	121	158	160	162	164	166
Offenders for whom the Court orders enhanced sentencing	97	158	160	162	164	166
Percentage of offenders sentenced by the Court to an enhanced sentence	80.2%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

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

<b>FY 2000-01 BASELINE</b>	<b>FY 2014-15</b>	<b>FY 2015-16</b>	<b>FY 2016-17</b>	<b>FY 2017-18</b>	<b>FY 2018-19</b>
27.20%	13.50%	13.25%	13.00%	12.75%	12.50%

**STATE ATTORNEY, NINETEENTH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT**

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

	<b>FY 2000-01 BASELINE</b>	<b>FY 2014-15</b>	<b>FY 2015-16</b>	<b>FY 2016-17</b>	<b>FY 2017-18</b>	<b>FY 2018-19</b>
Offenders who qualify for enhanced sentence for whom the State requests enhanced sentence	69	38	39	40	41	42
Offenders for whom the Court orders enhanced Sentencing	28	38	39	40	41	42
Percentage of offenders sentenced by the Court to an enhanced sentence	41%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

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

<b>FY 2000-01 BASELINE</b>	<b>FY 2014-15</b>	<b>FY 2015-16</b>	<b>FY 2016-17</b>	<b>FY 2017-18</b>	<b>FY 2018-19</b>
17.67%	11.11%	11.11%	11.11%	11.11%	11.11%

---

**AGENCY SERVICE OUTCOMES AND  
PERFORMANCE PROJECTION TABLES**

---

**STATE ATTORNEY, TWENTIETH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT**

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

	<b>FY 2000-01 BASELINE</b>	<b>FY 2014-15</b>	<b>FY 2015-16</b>	<b>FY 2016-17</b>	<b>FY 2017-18</b>	<b>FY 2018- 19</b>
Offenders who qualify for enhanced sentence for whom the State requests enhanced sentence	257	673	673	673	673	673
Offenders for whom the Court orders enhanced sentencing	105	499	499	499	499	499
Percentage of offenders sentenced by the Court to an enhanced sentence	41.00%	74.15%	74.15%	74.15%	74.15%	74.15 %

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

<b>FY 2000-01 BASELINE</b>	<b>FY 2014-15</b>	<b>FY 2015-16</b>	<b>FY 2016-17</b>	<b>FY 2017-18</b>	<b>FY 2018-19</b>
27.00%	9.96%	9.96%	9.96%	9.96	9.96%

**PUBLIC DEFENDER**

**PUBLIC DEFENDER, FIRST THROUGH TWENTIETH CIRCUITS**

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

<b>FY 2000-01 BASELINE</b>	<b>FY 2014-15</b>	<b>FY 2015-16</b>	<b>FY 2016-17</b>	<b>FY 2017-18</b>	<b>FY 2018-19</b>
23.47%	12.87%	12.23%	11.62%	11.04%	10.49%

**Outcome:** Number of cases per attorney.

<b>FY 2009-10 BASELINE</b>	<b>FY 2014-15</b>	<b>FY 2015-16</b>	<b>FY 2016-17</b>	<b>FY 2017-18</b>	<b>FY 2018-19</b>
547	445	423	402	382	363

---

**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.

<b>FY 2000-01 BASELINE</b>	<b>FY 2014-15</b>	<b>FY 2015-16</b>	<b>FY 2016-17</b>	<b>FY 2017-18</b>	<b>FY 2018-19</b>
8.1%	4%	3%	2%	1.5%	1%

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

<b>FY 2000-01 BASELINE</b>	<b>FY 2014-15</b>	<b>FY 2015-16</b>	<b>FY 2016-17</b>	<b>FY 2017-18</b>	<b>FY 2018-19</b>
95.8%	99.9%	99.9%	99.9%	99.9%	99.9%

**CAPITAL COLLATERAL REGIONAL COUNSEL, MIDDLE REGION**

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

<b>FY 2000-01 BASELINE</b>	<b>FY 2014-15</b>	<b>FY 2015-16</b>	<b>FY 2016-17</b>	<b>FY 2017-18</b>	<b>FY 2018-19</b>
3	6	5	5	5	5

**CAPITAL COLLATERAL REGIONAL COUNSEL, SOUTHERN REGION**

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

<b>FY 2000-01 BASELINE</b>	<b>FY 2014-15</b>	<b>FY 2015-16</b>	<b>FY 2016-17</b>	<b>FY 2017-18</b>	<b>FY 2018-19</b>
3	5	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 REGION**

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

<b>FY 2012-13 BASELINE</b>	<b>FY 2014-15</b>	<b>FY 2015-16</b>	<b>FY 2016-17</b>	<b>FY 2017-18</b>	<b>FY 2018-19</b>
17%	22%	27%	32%	37%	42%

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

<b>FY 2012-13 BASELINE</b>	<b>FY 2014-15</b>	<b>FY 2015-16</b>	<b>FY 2016-17</b>	<b>FY 2017-18</b>	<b>FY 2018-19</b>
95%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

**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.

<b>FY 2012-13 BASELINE</b>	<b>FY 2014-15</b>	<b>FY 2015-16</b>	<b>FY 2016-17</b>	<b>FY 2017-18</b>	<b>FY 2018-19</b>
87%	92%	97%	100%	100%	100%

**CRIMINAL CONFLICT AND CIVIL REGIONAL COUNSEL, SECOND REGION**

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

<b>FY 2012-13 BASELINE</b>	<b>FY 2014-15</b>	<b>FY 2015-16</b>	<b>FY 2016-17</b>	<b>FY 2017-18</b>	<b>FY 2018-19</b>
53%	56%	58%	60%	62%	64%

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

<b>FY 2012-13 BASELINE</b>	<b>FY 2014-15</b>	<b>FY 2015-16</b>	<b>FY 2016-17</b>	<b>FY 2017-18</b>	<b>FY 2018-19</b>
79%	81%	83%	85%	87%	89%

---

**AGENCY SERVICE OUTCOMES AND  
PERFORMANCE PROJECTION TABLES**

---

**CRIMINAL CONFLICT AND CIVIL REGIONAL COUNSEL, SECOND REGION**

**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.

<b>FY 2012-13 BASELINE</b>	<b>FY 2014-15</b>	<b>FY 2015-16</b>	<b>FY 2016-17</b>	<b>FY 2017-18</b>	<b>FY 2018-19</b>
44%	48%	52%	56%	60%	64%

**CRIMINAL CONFLICT AND CIVIL REGIONAL COUNSEL, THIRD REGION**

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

<b>FY 2012-13 BASELINE</b>	<b>FY 2014-15</b>	<b>FY 2015-16</b>	<b>FY 2016-17</b>	<b>FY 2017-18</b>	<b>FY 2018-19</b>
20%	20%	20%	25%	30%	30%

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

<b>FY 2012-13 BASELINE</b>	<b>FY 2014-15</b>	<b>FY 2015-16</b>	<b>FY 2016-17</b>	<b>FY 2017-18</b>	<b>FY 2018-19</b>
84%	84%	84%	85%	85%	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.

<b>FY 2012-13 BASELINE</b>	<b>FY 2014-15</b>	<b>FY 2015-16</b>	<b>FY 2016-17</b>	<b>FY 2017-18</b>	<b>FY 2018-19</b>
50%	50%	50%	50%	55%	55%

**CRIMINAL CONFLICT AND CIVIL REGIONAL COUNSEL, FOURTH REGION**

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

<b>FY 2012-13 BASELINE</b>	<b>FY 2014-15</b>	<b>FY 2015-16</b>	<b>FY 2016-17</b>	<b>FY 2017-18</b>	<b>FY 2018-19</b>
33%	33%	33%	33.33%	33.66%	34%

---

**AGENCY SERVICE OUTCOMES AND  
PERFORMANCE PROJECTION TABLES**

---

**CRIMINAL CONFLICT AND CIVIL REGIONAL COUNSEL, FOURTH REGION**

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

<b>FY 2012-13 BASELINE</b>	<b>FY 2014-15</b>	<b>FY 2015-16</b>	<b>FY 2016-17</b>	<b>FY 2017-18</b>	<b>FY 2018-19</b>
85%	86.70%	87.57%	88.43%	89.33%	90.22%

**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.

<b>FY 2012-13 BASELINE</b>	<b>FY 2014-15</b>	<b>FY 2015-16</b>	<b>FY 2016-17</b>	<b>FY 2017-18</b>	<b>FY 2018-19</b>
0%	3%	3.03%	3.06%	3.09%	3.12%

**CRIMINAL CONFLICT AND CIVIL REGIONAL COUNSEL, FIFTH REGION**

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

<b>FY 2012-13 BASELINE</b>	<b>FY 2014-15</b>	<b>FY 2015-16</b>	<b>FY 2016-17</b>	<b>FY 2017-18</b>	<b>FY 2018-19</b>
81%	81%	81%	81%	81%	81%

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

<b>FY 2012-13 BASELINE</b>	<b>FY 2014-15</b>	<b>FY 2015-16</b>	<b>FY 2016-17</b>	<b>FY 2017-18</b>	<b>FY 2018-19</b>
75%	75%	75%	75%	75%	75%

**Outcome:** In cases where there is either an adjudication or a withhold of adjudication, a case plan to be approved by the court within 90 day of appointment.

<b>FY 2012-13 BASELINE</b>	<b>FY 2014-15</b>	<b>FY 2015-16</b>	<b>FY 2016-17</b>	<b>FY 2017-18</b>	<b>FY 2018-19</b>
85%	85%	85%	85%	85%	85%

---

## LINKAGE TO GOVERNOR'S PRIORITIES

---

### **PRIORITY #1 – IMPROVING EDUCATION**

- World Class Education

### **PRIORITY #2 – ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT AND JOB CREATION**

- 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.*

#### **PUBLIC DEFENDERS**

**Goal #1:** *Provide fair and equitable salaries and benefits for employees to improve retention, reduce attorney turnover, and ensure continuity of legal representation.*

#### **PUBLIC DEFENDERS APPELLATE**

**Goal #1:** *Provide fair and equitable salaries and benefits for employees to improve retention, reduce attorney turnover, and ensure continuity of legal representation.*

- Reduce Taxes
- Regulatory Reform
- Phase out Florida's Corporate Income Tax

### **PRIORITY #3 – MAINTAINING AFFORDABLE COST OF LIVING IN FLORIDA**

- 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.*

---

## LINKAGE TO GOVERNOR'S PRIORITIES

---

### **JUSTICE ADMINISTRATIVE COMMISSION (JAC)**

**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 #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.*

### **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**

**Priorities 1 & 2 Goals:** *Provide quality representation to all appointed clients and thereby protect the constitutional and statutory rights of all citizens. Establish standard caseloads for felony attorneys at 200 cases per year, misdemeanor attorneys at 400 cases per year, and juvenile attorneys at 250 cases per year.*

### **PUBLIC DEFENDERS APPELLATE**

**Priorities 1 & 2 Goals:** *Provide quality representation to all appointed clients and thereby protect the constitutional and statutory rights of all citizens. Establish reasonable caseloads for appellate attorneys and 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*



---

## LINKAGE TO GOVERNOR'S PRIORITIES

---

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

*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 (OCCRC)**

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

- 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.*

- Reduce Taxes
- Phase out Florida's Corporate Income Tax

---

## TRENDS AND CONDITIONS

---

### **JUSTICE ADMINISTRATIVE COMMISSION (JAC)**

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.

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. Section 39.8296, Florida Statutes, created the State Office as an independent entity within the Justice Administrative Commission.

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

Since 2004, 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. Past annual reports may be viewed at the Guardian ad Litem Program's website, <http://www.guardianadlitem.org/>

---

## TRENDS AND CONDITIONS

---

### STATEWIDE GUARDIAN AD LITEM

under the topic “News,” or may be viewed at the following URL:

<http://www.guardianadlitem.org/Documents/Voice%20Heard%203-11-13%20-%20FINAL.pdf>

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.

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

- Between FY 2007-08 and FY 2011-12, the Program’s budget was 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 was able to represent. For fiscal years 2009-10 and 2010-11, and 2011-12 funding levels stabilized.
- In fiscal year 2012-13, \$1.8 million in non-recurring dollars allowed the GAL Program to increase our volunteer base and once again work toward ensuring that every child in the dependency system has a GAL volunteer.
- Florida Legislators appropriated new recurring funding in the amount of \$3.8 million for the Guardian ad Litem Program for FY 2013-14. This funding increase brought the Guardian ad Litem Program back to the level of funding that it had before the reductions of FY 2007-08. It will allow the Program to increase the numbers of children represented and we project that an estimated 75% of all children in the dependency system will be represented by GAL volunteers and staff by the end of June 2014.
- We believe that a volunteer assigned to every child is critical to the protection of a child’s best interests and by July 1, 2017, our plan is to ensure that all of our currently assigned children have that community resource. This plan lays out a strategy to ensure that all children assigned to the program have a volunteer advocate by the end of FY 2016-17.
- Additional funding will be necessary to fund volunteer growth and an increase in the percentage of children represented beyond June 30, 2014. The Guardian ad Litem Program is requesting such funding in its Legislative Budget Request for FY 2014-15.

---

## TRENDS AND CONDITIONS

---

### STATEWIDE GUARDIAN AD LITEM

- **All targets and projections are contingent upon funding of the Guardian ad Litem budget requests, and are based on the assumption that the number of children in the dependency system does not grow beyond an estimated 30,000 children. Variations in these factors will result in adjustments in the projections provided herein.**

### STATE ATTORNEYS

#### AGENCIES PRIMARY RESPONSIBILITIES AND STATUTORY AUTHORITY

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

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

and the general public. In addition, the State Attorney must provide personnel and procedures for the orderly, efficient and effective intake and processing of several statutorily mandated civil actions.

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

#### AGENCY PRIORITIES AND THEIR APPLICATIONS

The State Attorneys' priorities are to pursue justice through prosecution effectively, efficiently and in a timely manner for all criminal cases presented to or investigated by the State Attorney. In addition, these priorities include representing the State of Florida

---

## **TRENDS AND CONDITIONS**

---

### **STATE ATTORNEYS**

efficiently and effectively in all civil suits, motions or actions in which the state is a party or civil actions which are mandated by the Florida Statutes.

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

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

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

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

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

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

### **PUBLIC DEFENDERS**

Public Defenders protect the constitutional and statutory rights of all citizens through the effective legal representation of court appointed clients, pursuant to Chapters 27, 394, and 985, Florida Statutes; the Criminal, Juvenile, and Appellate Rules of Procedure; and the Rules of Professional Conduct.

Public Defenders 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.

---

## **TRENDS AND CONDITIONS**

---

### **PUBLIC DEFENDERS**

CIVIL TRIAL COURT - Represent appointed clients subject to involuntary commitment under the Florida Mental Health Act or as a sexually violent predator pursuant to Chapters 394 and 916, Florida Statutes; and appointments pursuant to civil contempt.

The Public Defender's goal is to provide quality representation to all appointed clients. "Quality representation" cannot be defined or measured in wins and losses, and therefore requires performance measures that have been developed to demonstrate quality of the work in other ways (e.g., time for case resolution, cases per attorney, and attorney retention rates).

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

1. Provide quality representation to all appointed clients.
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 and fair salaries and benefits for employees to reduce employee turnover and improve retention.

### **PUBLIC DEFENDER APPELLATE**

The Public Defenders of Florida carry out their mission to provide legal representation of court appointed clients through the appellate court program.

Public Defenders protect the constitutional and statutory rights of all citizens through the effective legal representation of court appointed clients, pursuant to Chapters 27, 394, and 985, Florida Statutes; the Criminal, Juvenile, and Appellate Rules of Procedure; and the Rules of Professional Conduct.

The measures developed for this program are designed to determine the quality of the work by examining case resolution, adherence to a standardized number of cases per attorney, and attorney retention rates.

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

1. Provide quality representation to all appointed clients.

---

## TRENDS AND CONDITIONS

---

### **PUBLIC DEFENDER APPELLATE**

2. Establish standard reasonable caseloads for appellate attorneys at 2.5 capital appeals or 40 weighted non-capital records per year.
3. Provide equitable and fair salaries and benefits for employees to reduce turnover and improve retention.

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

### **CCRC Statutory Responsibilities:**

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

### **CCRC GOAL:**

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

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

### **THE CCRC'S PROFESSIONAL FOCUS**

**CCRCs strive to meet professional standards for providing post-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

---

### CAPITAL COLLATERAL REGIONAL COUNSEL

**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.

**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.**

**CCRC FOCUS AREA 1:  
Meet State & Federal Court Expectations for Competent  
Representation  
in Post-Conviction/Death Penalty Cases**

### 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 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.



---

## TRENDS AND CONDITIONS

---

### CAPITAL COLLATERAL REGIONAL COUNSEL

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

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

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

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

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.

During the recent economic downturn, the CCRCs suffered 4 years of budget reductions. If additional budget reductions of 5% occur in FY 2014-15, it is likely that 4 lawyers and 2 investigators will be laid off (about 8% of CCRC case staffing). The loss of highly experienced and competent lawyers and investigators reduces the capacity of the CCRC offices to handle workloads. A mandate to cut the CCRC budgets by 5% 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 12%. 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 CCRC 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 CCRC 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.

---

## TRENDS AND CONDITIONS

---

### CAPITAL COLLATERAL REGIONAL COUNSEL

CCRCs have made excellent progress in attracting, training and keeping post-conviction law experienced attorneys. Currently, 96.7 % of CCRC attorneys have greater than 3 years experience in post conviction law. Additionally, 70% of CCRC attorneys have greater than 10 years experience. Lowering staff turnover rates has been a priority.

### 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 2013-14, the CCRC workload is expected to be 181.

The State and federal court systems are focusing more attention on issues related to death penalty review cases. Their dockets reflect a growing interest in conducting more evidentiary hearings on these issues.

The CCRCs perform 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 where 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   in 2012-13**

Death warrants:	1	1	4	2
-----------------	---	---	---	---

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

---

### **CAPITAL COLLATERAL REGIONAL COUNSEL**

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

The Timely Justice Act, which became effective July 1, 2013, makes it mandatory for the Governor to sign death warrants for capital defendants who have completed initial post-conviction proceedings and had clemency. CCRC faces the potential for extensive warrant litigation unprecedented in recent years. Such litigation could occur in multiple cases, effect many CCRC attorneys and staff, and have broad implications for CCRC's resources and capabilities. The number of warrants signed by the Governor has increased dramatically. Warrant litigation can be costly, is time intensive, and requires multiple attorneys and investigators to prepare a case to go through the state and federal system in as little as 45 days. The trend in the foreseeable future is for warrant signings to increase dramatically and CCRC's must have the attorney and operational capacities to quickly respond to court requirements.

The Timely Justice Act also contains provisions affecting the Registry attorneys as well. The Timely Justice Act changed the manager of the Registry attorney's contracts from the Department of Financial Services to the Justice Administration Commission. The Justice Administration Commission changed some of the requirements in the contract between the Registry attorneys and the State of Florida, causing several Registry attorneys to withdraw from their cases, resulting in the CCRC's being appointed to warrant ready cases or other cases further along in the system. The unanticipated and unexpected burden of being the agencies of last resort for warrant eligible defendants will further strain the limited resources of the CCRC's.

### **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 96% 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.

---

## TRENDS AND CONDITIONS

---

### CAPITAL COLLATERAL REGIONAL COUNSEL

#### **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 factual claims, leading to a significant increase in the number of issues raised by CCRCs that are granted an evidentiary hearing.

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

---

## TRENDS AND CONDITIONS

---

### CAPITAL COLLATERAL REGIONAL COUNSEL

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 was 13, 2. In FY 2012-13 it is estimated to be 12. The Spangenburg Report of 1999 and the American Bar Association recommended a caseload of less than 6 per attorney.

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

**CCRC FOCUS AREA 3:  
Keeping CCRC costs as low as possible and being accountable  
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.

---

## TRENDS AND CONDITIONS

---

### CAPITAL COLLATERAL REGIONAL COUNSEL

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 \$ 20,000 - \$ 30,000.

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

#### **4.0 Trends and Conditions**

The time it takes to properly investigate a case is affected by the ability to locate documents, interview original trial witnesses, and family members, search for other crime witnesses not involved in the original trial, interview inmates and develop investigative results for legal analysis and case preparation.

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

---

## TRENDS AND CONDITIONS

---

### CAPITAL COLLATERAL REGIONAL COUNSEL

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

---

## TRENDS AND CONDITIONS

---

### CAPITAL COLLATERAL REGIONAL COUNSEL

to the increased frequency of status conferences by the trial courts required under the new rules promulgated by the Florida Supreme Court.

Additionally, the problem continues of death row cases represented by private attorneys being sent to the CCRCs by Circuit Courts for representation following the signing 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. The 2013 Timely Adjustment Act likely will increase the number of cases assigned to CCRC Middle and South.

#### **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 2012-13, the CCRCs, combined, had 29 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 2012. 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.

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

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

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

The CCRC's 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.



---

## TRENDS AND CONDITIONS

---

### **CAPITAL COLLATERAL REGIONAL COUNSEL**

The CCRCs have continued 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. Currently, research is underway to utilize electronic case files.

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

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 follow:

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

#### 1.0 Public Records

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

#### 2.0 Investigations

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

#### 3.0 Legal Counsel

- 3.1. Visit client
- 3.2. Analyze witness information
- 3.3. Draft and publish or transmit the 3.851 motion documents
- 3.4. Prepare other motions as appropriate
- 3.5. Participate in evidentiary hearing(s)

---

## TRENDS AND CONDITIONS

---

### CAPITAL COLLATERAL REGIONAL COUNSEL

- 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

The CCRCs will continue implementing additional budget management capacities that will allow “unit cost” efficiency analysis and performance evaluations. In FY 2013-14, Middle and South CCRCs plan to further develop their “unit costing” budget systems to build in automatic management reports that will document cost trends, help identify efficiency improvement candidates and better manage scarce resources needed to perform effectively and meet judicial system standards.

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

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

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

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.

---

## TRENDS AND CONDITIONS

---

### OFFICES OF CRIMINAL CONFLICT AND CIVIL REGIONAL COUNSELS

The Offices of Criminal Conflict and Civil Regional Counsels (“the Office of Regional Counsel”) protect the constitutional rights of all citizens through the cost efficient and effective legal representation of court appointed clients pursuant to Chapter 27, Florida Statutes.

The Offices of Regional Counsel carries out its mission to provide legal representation of court appointed clients in four (4) specific areas:

**A. CRIMINAL TRIAL COURT** – The Office of Regional Counsel represents appointed clients arrested for or charged with a felony, violation of probation or community control, misdemeanor, criminal traffic offense, criminal contempt, violation of a municipal or county ordinance, and juveniles alleged to be delinquent when the Public Defender has declared a conflict of interest or is otherwise prohibited by law from representation. Additionally, The Office of Regional Counsel represents appointed clients seeking correction, reduction, or modification of a sentence under 3.800, Florida Rules of Criminal Procedure and appointed clients seeking post conviction relief under rule 3.850, Florida Rules of Criminal Procedure when the Public Defender has declared a conflict of interest or is otherwise prohibited by law from representation.

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

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

- Clients subject to the Tuberculosis Control Act pursuant to Chapter 392, Florida Statutes
- Clients subject to the developmental disabilities law pursuant to Chapter 393, Florida Statutes
- Clients subject to the Florida Mental Health Act (“Baker Act”) proceedings regarding involuntary civil commitment pursuant to Chapter 394, Florida Statutes, when the public defender has a conflict
- Clients subject to involuntary commitment under the Jimmy Ryce Act, pursuant to Chapter 394, Part 5, Florida Statutes
- Clients subject to a Hal S. Marchman Alcohol and Other Drug Services Act of 1993 (“Marchman Act”) pursuant to Chapter 397, Florida Statutes
- Clients subject to involuntary civil commitment and removal of civil rights pursuant to the Adjust Protective Services Act, Chapter 415, Florida Statutes

---

## TRENDS AND CONDITIONS

---

### OFFICES OF CRIMINAL CONFLICT AND CIVIL REGIONAL COUNSELS

- 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 insure cases are processed in a timely and cost effective manner.

***JUSTICE ADMINISTRATION***



***LONG RANGE PROGRAM PLAN  
FISCAL YEARS 2014-15 THROUGH 2018-19***

***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
---	----------------

<b>Approved Performance Measures for FY 2013-14</b>	<b>Approved Prior Year Standard FY 2012-13</b>	<b>Prior Year Actual FY 2012-13</b>	<b>Approved Standards for FY 2013-14</b>	<b>Requested FY 2014-15 Standard</b>
Percent of invoices processed within statutory time frames	95.00%	92.69%	95.00%	95.00%
Number of public records requests	150	110	150	150
Number of cases where registry lawyers request fees above the statutory caps	2,500	795	2,500	800
Number of cases where the court orders fees above the statutory cap	2,000	681	2,000	700
Total amount of excess fees awarded by the court per circuit	\$6,000,000	\$6,451,535	\$6,000,000	\$6,000,000
Number of budget, payroll, disbursement, revenue and financial report transactions processed	375,000	384,033	375,000	375,000
Number of court-appointed attorney and due process vendor invoices processed	65,000	52,868	65,000	50,000

**EXHIBIT II - PERFORMANCE MEASURES AND STANDARDS**

Department: Justice Administrative Commission	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

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

<b>Approved Performance Measures for FY 2013-14</b>	<b>Approved Prior Year Standards FY 2012-13</b>	<b>Actual Prior Year Standards FY 2012-13</b>	<b>Approved Standards For FY 2013-14</b>	<b>Requested FY 2014-15 Standard</b>
Average number of children represented	26,500	21,397	26,500	23,250
Average percent of children represented	80%	69.78%	80%	77.5%
Percent of cases closed with Permanency Goal achieved.	70%	69%	70%	77%
Number of new volunteers certified as a GAL	1,464	2,895	1,464	1,091
“Propose Deletion of Measure”: Average number of active volunteers	5,057	6,239	5,057	0
“Propose New Measure”: Number of volunteers on June 30, annually*	Not applicable	8,566	Not applicable	9,500
*This is a proposed new measure to replace the measure “Average number of active volunteers.”				

**EXHIBIT II - PERFORMANCE MEASURES AND STANDARDS**

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

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

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

Approved Performance Measures for FY 2013-14	Approved Prior Year Standards FY 2012-13	Actual Prior Year Standards FY 2012-13
Percent of offenders who qualify for enhanced sentencing for whom state attorneys requested enhanced sentencing	92.00%	93.34%
Total number of dispositions	1,339,035	1,185,385
Number of dispositions by trial verdicts	14,004	25,258
Number of dispositions by pleas	727,246	615,925
Number of dispositions by non trial	157,990	187,450
Number of dispositions by otherwise	439,795	356,752
Percent of dispositions by trial verdicts	1.05%	2.13%
Percent of dispositions by pleas	54.30%	51.96%
Percent of dispositions by non trial	11.80%	15.81%
Percent of dispositions by otherwise	32.84%	30.10%
Number of substantiated Bar grievances filed annually	0	3
Number of misdemeanor criminal case referrals	1,183,597	880,935
Number of felony criminal case referrals	490,965	394,880
Number of juvenile criminal case referrals	197,338	115,391
Number of misdemeanor filings	792,393	668,221
Number of felony filings	219,752	182,122
Number of juvenile filings	83,616	46,246
Number of post conviction relief responses or Habeas Corpus responses	22,391	13,937
Number of sexual predator civil commitment proceedings	TBD	3,549
Number of Baker Act hearings	27,686	19,212



**EXHIBIT II - PERFORMANCE MEASURES AND STANDARDS**

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

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

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

Approved Performance Measures for FY 2013-14	Approved Prior Year Standards FY 2012-13	Actual Prior Year Standards FY 2012-13	Approved Standards for FY 2013-14	Requested Standards for FY 2014-15
Percent of offenders who qualify for enhanced sentencing for whom state attorneys requested enhanced sentencing		100%		100%
Total number of dispositions		52,341		52,341
Number of dispositions by trial verdicts		530		530
Number of dispositions by pleas		29,387		29,387
Number of dispositions by non trial		4,005		4,005
Number of dispositions by otherwise		18,419		18,419
Percent of dispositions by trial verdicts		1%		1%
Percent of dispositions by pleas		56%		56%
Percent of dispositions by non trial		8%		8%
Percent of dispositions by otherwise		35%		35%
Number of substantiated Bar grievances filed annually		0		0
Number of misdemeanor criminal case referrals		35,659		35,659
Number of felony criminal case referrals		17,535		17,535
Number of juvenile criminal case referrals		5,613		5,613
Number of misdemeanor filings		18,776		18,776
Number of felony filings		11,649		11,649
Number of juvenile filings		2,594		2,594
Number of post conviction relief responses or Habeas Corpus responses		704		704
Number of sexual predator civil commitment proceedings		169		169
Number of Baker Act hearings		1,690		1,690

**EXHIBIT II - PERFORMANCE MEASURES AND STANDARDS**

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

Program: State Attorney, 2 <sup>nd</sup> Judicial Circuit	Code: 21.50.02.00	
Service/Budget Entity: State Attorney, 2 <sup>nd</sup> Judicial Circuit	Code: 21.50.02.00	

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

Approved Performance Measures for FY 2013-14	Approved Prior Year Standards FY 2012-13	Actual Prior Year Standards FY 2012-13	Approved Standards for FY 2013-14	Requested Standards for FY 2014-15)
Percent of offenders who qualify for enhanced sentencing for whom state attorneys requested enhanced sentencing		100.00%		100.00%
Total number of dispositions		24,996		25,775
Number of dispositions by trial verdicts		353		375
Number of dispositions by pleas		11,866		12,300
Number of dispositions by non trial		1,889		1,600
Number of dispositions by otherwise		10,888		11,500
Percent of dispositions by trial verdicts		1.41%		1.45%
Percent of dispositions by pleas		47.47%		47.72%
Percent of dispositions by non trial		7.56%		6.21%
Percent of dispositions by otherwise		43.56%		44.62%
Number of substantiated Bar grievances filed annually		0		0
Number of misdemeanor criminal case referrals		15,061		16,000
Number of felony criminal case referrals		6,759		6,800
Number of juvenile criminal case referrals		1,234		1,350
Number of misdemeanor filings		6,494		13,500
Number of felony filings		4,533		4,700
Number of juvenile filings		872		960
Number of post conviction relief responses or Habeas Corpus responses		130		62
Number of sexual predator civil commitment proceedings		106		120
Number of Baker Act hearings		30		35

**EXHIBIT II - PERFORMANCE MEASURES AND STANDARDS**

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

Program: State Attorney, 3 <sup>rd</sup> Judicial Circuit	Code: 21.50.03.00	
Service/Budget Entity: State Attorney, 3 <sup>rd</sup> Judicial Circuit	Code: 21.50.03.00	

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

Approved Performance Measures for FY 2013-14	Approved Prior Year Standards FY 2012-13	Actual Prior Year Standards FY 2012-13	Approved Standards for FY 2013-14	Requested Standards for FY 2014-15
Percent of offenders who qualify for enhanced sentencing for whom state attorneys requested enhanced sentencing				
Total number of dispositions		15,250		15,250
Number of dispositions by trial verdicts		105		105
Number of dispositions by pleas		6,488		6,488
Number of dispositions by non trial		1,385		1,385
Number of dispositions by otherwise		7,272		7,272
Percent of dispositions by trial verdicts		0.7%		0.7%
Percent of dispositions by pleas		42.5%		42.5%
Percent of dispositions by non trial		9.1%		9.1%
Percent of dispositions by otherwise		47.7%		47.7%
Number of substantiated Bar grievances filed annually		0		0
Number of misdemeanor criminal case referrals		8,995		8,995
Number of felony criminal case referrals		5,665		5,665
Number of juvenile criminal case referrals		987		987
Number of misdemeanor filings		5,427		5,427
Number of felony filings		2,623		2,623
Number of juvenile filings		536		536
Number of post conviction relief responses or Habeas Corpus responses		11		11
Number of sexual predator civil commitment proceedings		257		257
Number of Baker Act hearings		325		325

**EXHIBIT II - PERFORMANCE MEASURES AND STANDARDS**

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

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

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

Approved Performance Measures for FY 2013-14	Approved Prior Year Standards FY 2012-13	Actual Prior Year Standards FY 2012-13	Approved Standards for FY 2013-14	Requested Standards for FY 2014-15
Percent of offenders who qualify for enhanced sentencing for whom state attorneys requested enhanced sentencing		82.08%		82.08%
Total number of dispositions		76,676		76,676
Number of dispositions by trial verdicts		521		521
Number of dispositions by pleas		47,942		47,942
Number of dispositions by non trial		12,572		12,572
Number of dispositions by otherwise		15,641		15,641
Percent of dispositions by trial verdicts		0.68%		0.68%
Percent of dispositions by pleas		62.52%		62.52%
Percent of dispositions by non trial		16.40%		16.40%
Percent of dispositions by otherwise		20.40%		20.40%
Number of substantiated Bar grievances filed annually		0		0
Number of misdemeanor criminal case referrals		49,124		49,124
Number of felony criminal case referrals		20,132		20,132
Number of juvenile criminal case referrals		6,249		6,249
Number of misdemeanor filings		43,312		43,312
Number of felony filings		11,948		11,948
Number of juvenile filings		2,729		2,729
Number of post conviction relief responses or Habeas Corpus responses		2,321		2,321
Number of sexual predator civil commitment proceedings		275		275
Number of Baker Act hearings		56		56

**EXHIBIT II - PERFORMANCE MEASURES AND STANDARDS**

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

Program: State Attorney, 5 <sup>th</sup> Judicial Circuit	Code: 21.50.05.00	
Service/Budget Entity: State Attorney, 5 <sup>th</sup> Judicial Circuit	Code: 21.50.05.00	

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

Approved Performance Measures for FY 2013-14	Approved Prior Year Standards FY 2012-13	Actual Prior Year Standards FY 2012-13	Approved Standards for FY 2013-14	Requested Standards for FY 2014-15
Percent of offenders who qualify for enhanced sentencing for whom state attorneys requested enhanced sentencing		76.46%		76.46%
Total number of dispositions		43,469		43,469
Number of dispositions by trial verdicts		346		346
Number of dispositions by pleas		27,228		27,228
Number of dispositions by non trial		1,725		1,725
Number of dispositions by otherwise		14,170		14,170
Percent of dispositions by trial verdicts		0.79%		0.79%
Percent of dispositions by pleas		62.64%		62.64%
Percent of dispositions by non trial		3.97%		3.97%
Percent of dispositions by otherwise		32.60%		32.60%
Number of substantiated Bar grievances filed annually		0		0
Number of misdemeanor criminal case referrals		31,210		31,210
Number of felony criminal case referrals		23,312		23,312
Number of juvenile criminal case referrals		4,630		4,630
Number of misdemeanor filings		14,967		14,967
Number of felony filings		9,667		9,667
Number of juvenile filings		2,002		2,002
Number of post conviction relief responses or Habeas Corpus responses		154		154
Number of sexual predator civil commitment proceedings		221		221
Number of Baker Act hearings		324		324

**EXHIBIT II - PERFORMANCE MEASURES AND STANDARDS**

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

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

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

Approved Performance Measures for FY 2013-14	Approved Prior Year Standards FY 2012-13	Actual Prior Year Standards FY 2012-13	Approved Standards for FY 2013-14	Requested Standards for FY 2014-15
Percent of offenders who qualify for enhanced sentencing for whom state attorneys requested enhanced sentencing		100.00%		100.00%
Total number of dispositions		101,148		100,500
Number of dispositions by trial verdicts		706		800
Number of dispositions by pleas		69,594		69,500
Number of dispositions by non trial		3,244		3,200
Number of dispositions by otherwise		27,604		27,000
Percent of dispositions by trial verdicts		0.70%		0.80%
Percent of dispositions by pleas		68.80%		69.15%
Percent of dispositions by non trial		3.21%		3.18%
Percent of dispositions by otherwise		27.29%		26.87%
Number of substantiated Bar grievances filed annually		0		0
Number of misdemeanor criminal case referrals		69,490		70,000
Number of felony criminal case referrals		33,121		33,000
Number of juvenile criminal case referrals		7,924		8,000
Number of misdemeanor filings		41,034		42,000
Number of felony filings		15,611		16,000
Number of juvenile filings		3,054		3,500
Number of post conviction relief responses or Habeas Corpus responses		89		80
Number of sexual predator civil commitment proceedings		219		200
Number of Baker Act hearings		1,332		1,300

**EXHIBIT II - PERFORMANCE MEASURES AND STANDARDS**

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

Program: State Attorney, <u>7<sup>th</sup></u> Judicial Circuit	Code: 21.50.07.00	
Service/Budget Entity: State Attorney, <u>7<sup>th</sup></u> Judicial Circuit	Code: 21.50.07.00	

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

Approved Performance Measures for FY 2013-14	Approved Prior Year Standards FY 2012-13	Actual Prior Year Standards FY 2012-13	Approved Standards for FY 2013-14	Requested Standards for FY 2014-15
Percent of offenders who qualify for enhanced sentencing for whom state attorneys requested enhanced sentencing		98.92%		98.00%
Total number of dispositions		50,620		52,325
Number of dispositions by trial verdicts		309		325
Number of dispositions by pleas		20,968		21,500
Number of dispositions by non trial		6,932		7,500
Number of dispositions by otherwise		22,411		23,000
Percent of dispositions by trial verdicts		0.61%		0.62%
Percent of dispositions by pleas		41.42%		41.09%
Percent of dispositions by non trial		13.70%		14.33%
Percent of dispositions by otherwise		44.27%		43.96%
Number of substantiated Bar grievances filed annually		0		0
Number of misdemeanor criminal case referrals		50,533		52,000
Number of felony criminal case referrals		20,353		21,000
Number of juvenile criminal case referrals		5,476		6,000
Number of misdemeanor filings		25,920		26,500
Number of felony filings		9,622		10,000
Number of juvenile filings		1,882		1,950
Number of post conviction relief responses or Habeas Corpus responses		219		225
Number of sexual predator civil commitment proceedings		146		165
Number of Baker Act hearings		627		650

**EXHIBIT II - PERFORMANCE MEASURES AND STANDARDS**

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

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

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

Approved Performance Measures for FY 2013-14	Approved Prior Year Standards FY 2012-13	Actual Prior Year Standards FY 2012-13	Approved Standards for FY 2013-14	Requested Standards for FY 2014-15
Percent of offenders who qualify for enhanced sentencing for whom state attorneys requested enhanced sentencing		100.00%		100.00%
Total number of dispositions		31,042		29,368
Number of dispositions by trial verdicts		138		137
Number of dispositions by pleas		12,560		11,760
Number of dispositions by non trial		5,884		6,197
Number of dispositions by otherwise		12,460		11,274
Percent of dispositions by trial verdicts		0.44%		0.47%
Percent of dispositions by pleas		40.46%		40.04%
Percent of dispositions by non trial		18.96%		21.10%
Percent of dispositions by otherwise		40.14%		38.39%
Number of substantiated Bar grievances filed annually		0		0
Number of misdemeanor criminal case referrals		20,806		18,344
Number of felony criminal case referrals		8,547		7,985
Number of juvenile criminal case referrals		2,169		1,877
Number of misdemeanor filings		13,069		12,098
Number of felony filings		4,455		4,344
Number of juvenile filings		1,017		869
Number of post conviction relief responses or Habeas Corpus responses		338		351
Number of sexual predator civil commitment proceedings		107		91
Number of Baker Act hearings		625		635



**EXHIBIT II - PERFORMANCE MEASURES AND STANDARDS**

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

Program: State Attorney, <u>9<sup>th</sup></u> Judicial Circuit	Code: 21.50.09.00	
Service/Budget Entity: State Attorney, <u>9<sup>th</sup></u> Judicial Circuit	Code: 21.50.09.00	

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

Approved Performance Measures for FY 2013-14	Approved Prior Year Standards FY 2012-13	Actual Prior Year Standards FY 2012-13	Approved Standards for FY 2013-14	Requested Standards for FY 2014-15
Percent of offenders who qualify for enhanced sentencing for whom state attorneys requested enhanced sentencing		100.00%		100.00%
Total number of dispositions		82,200		82,200
Number of dispositions by trial verdicts		907		907
Number of dispositions by pleas		37,819		37,819
Number of dispositions by non trial		8,567		8,567
Number of dispositions by otherwise		34,907		34,907
Percent of dispositions by trial verdicts		1.10%		1.10%
Percent of dispositions by pleas		46.01%		46.01%
Percent of dispositions by non trial		10.42%		10.42%
Percent of dispositions by otherwise		42.47%		42.47%
Number of substantiated Bar grievances filed annually		0		0
Number of misdemeanor criminal case referrals		45,929		45,929
Number of felony criminal case referrals		32,475		32,475
Number of juvenile criminal case referrals		9,993		9,993
Number of misdemeanor filings		29,398		29,398
Number of felony filings		13,764		13,764
Number of juvenile filings		4,042		4,042
Number of post conviction relief responses or Habeas Corpus responses		603		603
Number of sexual predator civil commitment proceedings		220		220
Number of Baker Act hearings		1,330		1,330

**EXHIBIT II - PERFORMANCE MEASURES AND STANDARDS**

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

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

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

Approved Performance Measures for FY 2013-14	Approved Prior Year Standards FY 2012-13	Actual Prior Year Standards FY 2012-13	Approved Standards for FY 2013-14	Requested Standards for FY 2014-15
Percent of offenders who qualify for enhanced sentencing for whom state attorneys requested enhanced sentencing		100.00%		100.00%
Total number of dispositions		48,098		47,700
Number of dispositions by trial verdicts		641		550
Number of dispositions by pleas		28,433		28,000
Number of dispositions by non trial		2,703		2,650
Number of dispositions by otherwise		16,321		16,500
Percent of dispositions by trial verdicts		1.3%		1.2%
Percent of dispositions by pleas		59.1%		58.7%
Percent of dispositions by non trial		5.6%		5.6%
Percent of dispositions by otherwise		34.0%		34.5%
Number of substantiated Bar grievances filed annually		0		0
Number of misdemeanor criminal case referrals		31,929		30,000
Number of felony criminal case referrals		18,514		18,200
Number of juvenile criminal case referrals		7,306		7,200
Number of misdemeanor filings		25,603		25,000
Number of felony filings		8,337		8,200
Number of juvenile filings		3,249		3,100
Number of post conviction relief responses or Habeas Corpus responses		156		150
Number of sexual predator civil commitment proceedings		311		150
Number of Baker Act hearings		2,378		2,000

**EXHIBIT II - PERFORMANCE MEASURES AND STANDARDS**

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

Program: State Attorney, 11 <sup>th</sup> Judicial Circuit	Code: 21.50.11.00	
Service/Budget Entity: State Attorney, 11 <sup>th</sup> Judicial Circuit	Code: 21.50.11.00	

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

Approved Performance Measures for FY 2013-14	Approved Prior Year Standards FY 2012-13	Actual Prior Year Standards FY 2012-13	Approved Standards for FY 2013-14	Requested Standards for FY 2014-15
Percent of offenders who qualify for enhanced sentencing for whom state attorneys requested enhanced sentencing		100%		100%
Total number of dispositions		187,977		197,376
Number of dispositions by trial verdicts		15,839		16,631
Number of dispositions by pleas		50,262		52,775
Number of dispositions by non trial		80,953		85,001
Number of dispositions by otherwise		40,923		42,969
Percent of dispositions by trial verdicts		8%		8%
Percent of dispositions by pleas		27%		27%
Percent of dispositions by non trial		43%		43%
Percent of dispositions by otherwise		22%		22%
Number of substantiated Bar grievances filed annually		0		0
Number of misdemeanor criminal case referrals		117,323		123,189
Number of felony criminal case referrals		43,973		46,172
Number of juvenile criminal case referrals		20,405		21,425
Number of misdemeanor filings		129,516		135,992
Number of felony filings		17,941		18,838
Number of juvenile filings		3,999		4,199
Number of post conviction relief responses or Habeas Corpus responses		1,555		1,633
Number of sexual predator civil commitment proceedings		705		740
Number of Baker Act hearings		0		0

**EXHIBIT II - PERFORMANCE MEASURES AND STANDARDS**

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

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

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

Approved Performance Measures for FY 2013-14	Approved Prior Year Standards FY 2012-13	Actual Prior Year Standards FY 2012-13	Approved Standards for FY 2013-14	Requested Standards for FY 2014-15
Percent of offenders who qualify for enhanced sentencing for whom state attorneys requested enhanced sentencing		100%		100%
Total number of dispositions		36,833		37,202
Number of dispositions by trial verdicts		341		345
Number of dispositions by pleas		20,173		20,375
Number of dispositions by non trial		1,393		1,407
Number of dispositions by otherwise		14,926		15,075
Percent of dispositions by trial verdicts		1%		1%
Percent of dispositions by pleas		55%		55%
Percent of dispositions by non trial		3%		3%
Percent of dispositions by otherwise		41%		41%
Number of substantiated Bar grievances filed annually		0		0
Number of misdemeanor criminal case referrals		25,831		26,089
Number of felony criminal case referrals		14,448		14,592
Number of juvenile criminal case referrals		3,349		3,382
Number of misdemeanor filings		15,707		15,864
Number of felony filings		6,750		6,818
Number of juvenile filings		1,098		1,109
Number of post conviction relief responses or Habeas Corpus responses		54		55
Number of sexual predator civil commitment proceedings		80		81
Number of Baker Act hearings		408		412

## EXHIBIT II - PERFORMANCE MEASURES AND STANDARDS

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

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

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

Approved Performance Measures for FY 2013-14	Approved Prior Year Standards FY 2012-13	Actual Prior Year Standards FY 2012-13	Approved Standards for FY 2013-14	Requested Standards for FY 2014-15
Percent of offenders who qualify for enhanced sentencing for whom state attorneys requested enhanced sentencing		58.56%		58.56%
Total number of dispositions		86,302		86,302
Number of dispositions by trial verdicts		1,204		1,204
Number of dispositions by pleas		51,355		51,355
Number of dispositions by non trial		13,578		13,578
Number of dispositions by otherwise		20,165		20,165
Percent of dispositions by trial verdicts		1.39%		1.39%
Percent of dispositions by pleas		59.51%		59.51%
Percent of dispositions by non trial		15.73%		15.73%
Percent of dispositions by otherwise		23.37%		23.37%
Number of substantiated Bar grievances filed annually		0		0
Number of misdemeanor criminal case referrals		61,538		61,538
Number of felony criminal case referrals		33,294		33,294
Number of juvenile criminal case referrals		7,920		7,920
Number of misdemeanor filings		53,851		53,851
Number of felony filings		13,020		13,020
Number of juvenile filings		3,685		3,685
Number of post conviction relief responses or Habeas Corpus responses		1,577		1,577
Number of sexual predator civil commitment proceedings		190		190
Number of Baker Act hearings		3,825		3,825

## EXHIBIT II - PERFORMANCE MEASURES AND STANDARDS

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

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

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

Approved Performance Measures for FY 2013-14	Approved Prior Year Standards FY 2012-13	Actual Prior Year Standards FY 2012-13	Approved Standards for FY 2013-14	Requested Standards for FY 2014-15
Percent of offenders who qualify for enhanced sentencing for whom state attorneys requested enhanced sentencing		100%		100%
Total number of dispositions		34,786		34,786
Number of dispositions by trial verdicts		329		329
Number of dispositions by pleas		17,750		17,750
Number of dispositions by non trial		2,313		2,313
Number of dispositions by otherwise		14,394		14,394
Percent of dispositions by trial verdicts		1%		1%
Percent of dispositions by pleas		51%		51%
Percent of dispositions by non trial		7%		7%
Percent of dispositions by otherwise		41%		41%
Number of substantiated Bar grievances filed annually		0		0
Number of misdemeanor criminal case referrals		19,451		19,451
Number of felony criminal case referrals		9,915		9,915
Number of juvenile criminal case referrals		1,486		1,486
Number of misdemeanor filings		16,693		16,693
Number of felony filings		5,410		5,410
Number of juvenile filings		816		816
Number of post conviction relief responses or Habeas Corpus responses		582		582
Number of sexual predator civil commitment proceedings		26		26
Number of Baker Act hearings		253		253

**EXHIBIT II - PERFORMANCE MEASURES AND STANDARDS**

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

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

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

Approved Performance Measures for FY 2013-14	Approved Prior Year Standards FY 2012-13	Actual Prior Year Standards FY 2012-13	Approved Standards for FY 2013-14	Requested Standards for FY 2014-15
Percent of offenders who qualify for enhanced sentencing for whom state attorneys requested enhanced sentencing		80.95%		100.00%
Total number of dispositions		92,783		94,638
Number of dispositions by trial verdicts		701		715
Number of dispositions by pleas		42,366		43,213
Number of dispositions by non trial		8,248		8,413
Number of dispositions by otherwise		41,468		42,297
Percent of dispositions by trial verdicts		0.76%		0.76%
Percent of dispositions by pleas		45.66%		45.66%
Percent of dispositions by non trial		8.89%		8.89%
Percent of dispositions by otherwise		44.69%		44.69%
Number of substantiated Bar grievances filed annually		0		0
Number of misdemeanor criminal case referrals		102,781		104,837
Number of felony criminal case referrals		21,758		22,193
Number of juvenile criminal case referrals		7,033		7,174
Number of misdemeanor filings		93,595		95,467
Number of felony filings		10,250		10,455
Number of juvenile filings		2,435		2,484
Number of post conviction relief responses or Habeas Corpus responses		833		850
Number of sexual predator civil commitment proceedings		83		85
Number of Baker Act hearings		1,154		1,177

**EXHIBIT II - PERFORMANCE MEASURES AND STANDARDS**

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

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

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

Approved Performance Measures for FY 2013-14	Approved Prior Year Standards FY 2012-13	Actual Prior Year Standards FY 2012-13	Approved Standards for FY 2013-14	Requested Standards for FY 2014-15
Percent of offenders who qualify for enhanced sentencing for whom state attorneys requested enhanced sentencing		100.00%		100.00%
Total number of dispositions		6,655		6,655
Number of dispositions by trial verdicts		58		58
Number of dispositions by pleas		3,612		3,612
Number of dispositions by non trial		1,723		1,723
Number of dispositions by otherwise		1,262		1,262
Percent of dispositions by trial verdicts		0.87%		0.87%
Percent of dispositions by pleas		54.28%		54.28%
Percent of dispositions by non trial		25.89%		25.89%
Percent of dispositions by otherwise		18.96%		18.96%
Number of substantiated Bar grievances filed annually		0		0
Number of misdemeanor criminal case referrals		4,154		4,154
Number of felony criminal case referrals		1,969		1,969
Number of juvenile criminal case referrals		260		260
Number of misdemeanor filings		3,258		3,258
Number of felony filings		1,144		1,144
Number of juvenile filings		181		181
Number of post conviction relief responses or Habeas Corpus responses		10		10
Number of sexual predator civil commitment proceedings		0		0
Number of Baker Act hearings		24		24



**EXHIBIT II - PERFORMANCE MEASURES AND STANDARDS**

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

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

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

Approved Performance Measures for FY 2013-14	Approved Prior Year Standards FY 2012-13	Actual Prior Year Standards FY 2012-13	Approved Standards for FY 2013-14	Requested Standards for FY 2014-15
Percent of offenders who qualify for enhanced sentencing for whom state attorneys requested enhanced sentencing		100.00%		100.00%
Total number of dispositions		88,010		88,010
Number of dispositions by trial verdicts		1,108		1,108
Number of dispositions by pleas		61,395		61,395
Number of dispositions by non trial		12,557		12,557
Number of dispositions by otherwise		12,950		12,950
Percent of dispositions by trial verdicts		1.26%		1.26%
Percent of dispositions by pleas		69.76%		69.76%
Percent of dispositions by non trial		14.27%		14.27%
Percent of dispositions by otherwise		14.71%		14.71%
Number of substantiated Bar grievances filed annually		0		0
Number of misdemeanor criminal case referrals		95,618		95,618
Number of felony criminal case referrals		36,453		36,453
Number of juvenile criminal case referrals		9,810		9,810
Number of misdemeanor filings		64,814		64,814
Number of felony filings		13,773		13,773
Number of juvenile filings		6,358		6,358
Number of post conviction relief responses or Habeas Corpus responses		838		838
Number of sexual predator civil commitment proceedings		128		128
Number of Baker Act hearings		1,659		1,659

**EXHIBIT II - PERFORMANCE MEASURES AND STANDARDS**

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

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

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

Approved Performance Measures for FY 2013-14	Approved Prior Year Standards FY 2012-13	Actual Prior Year Standards FY 2012-13	Approved Standards for FY 2013-14	Requested Standards for FY 2014-15
Percent of offenders who qualify for enhanced sentencing for whom state attorneys requested enhanced sentencing		100.00%		100.00%
Total number of dispositions		41,667		42,093
Number of dispositions by trial verdicts		371		450
Number of dispositions by pleas		24,153		24,395
Number of dispositions by non trial		3,958		3,998
Number of dispositions by otherwise		13,185		13,250
Percent of dispositions by trial verdicts		0.89%		1.07%
Percent of dispositions by pleas		57.97%		57.96%
Percent of dispositions by non trial		9.50%		9.50%
Percent of dispositions by otherwise		31.64%		31.47%
Number of substantiated Bar grievances filed annually		0		0
Number of misdemeanor criminal case referrals		28,359		28,642
Number of felony criminal case referrals		16,842		17,010
Number of juvenile criminal case referrals		4,250		4,292
Number of misdemeanor filings		22,143		22,364
Number of felony filings		7,344		7,417
Number of juvenile filings		1,795		1,812
Number of post conviction relief responses or Habeas Corpus responses		872		880
Number of sexual predator civil commitment proceedings		92		93
Number of Baker Act hearings		487		492

**EXHIBIT II - PERFORMANCE MEASURES AND STANDARDS**

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

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

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

Approved Performance Measures for FY 2013-14	Approved Prior Year Standards FY 2012-13	Actual Prior Year Standards FY 2012-13	Approved Standards for FY 2013-14	Requested Standards for FY 2014-15
Percent of offenders who qualify for enhanced sentencing for whom state attorneys requested enhanced sentencing		100.00%		100.00%
Total number of dispositions		25,427		25,427
Number of dispositions by trial verdicts		325		325
Number of dispositions by pleas		18,013		18,013
Number of dispositions by non trial		3,137		3,137
Number of dispositions by otherwise		3,952		3,952
Percent of dispositions by trial verdicts		1.28%		1.28%
Percent of dispositions by pleas		70.84%		70.84%
Percent of dispositions by non trial		12.34%		12.34%
Percent of dispositions by otherwise		15.54%		15.54%
Number of substantiated Bar grievances filed annually		0		0
Number of misdemeanor criminal case referrals		18,956		18,956
Number of felony criminal case referrals		10,263		10,263
Number of juvenile criminal case referrals		3,176		3,176
Number of misdemeanor filings		12,636		12,636
Number of felony filings		5,036		5,036
Number of juvenile filings		1,767		1,767
Number of post conviction relief responses or Habeas Corpus responses		200		200
Number of sexual predator civil commitment proceedings		80		80
Number of Baker Act hearings		1,195		1,195

## EXHIBIT II - PERFORMANCE MEASURES AND STANDARDS

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

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

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

Approved Performance Measures for FY 2013-14	Approved Prior Year Standards FY 2012-13	Actual Prior Year Standards FY 2012-13	Approved Standards for FY 2013-14	Requested Standards for FY 2014-15
Percent of offenders who qualify for enhanced sentencing for whom state attorneys requested enhanced sentencing		74.15%		74.15%
Total number of dispositions		59,568		60,164
Number of dispositions by trial verdicts		414		418
Number of dispositions by pleas		32,689		33,016
Number of dispositions by non trial		11,073		11,184
Number of dispositions by otherwise		15,392		15,546
Percent of dispositions by trial verdicts		0.69%		0.69%
Percent of dispositions by pleas		54.88%		54.88%
Percent of dispositions by non trial		18.59%		18.59%
Percent of dispositions by otherwise		25.84%		25.84%
Number of substantiated Bar grievances filed annually		3		0
Number of misdemeanor criminal case referrals		49,790		50,288
Number of felony criminal case referrals		19,583		19,779
Number of juvenile criminal case referrals		6,038		6,098
Number of misdemeanor filings		32,721		33,048
Number of felony filings		9,191		9,283
Number of juvenile filings		1,981		2,001
Number of post conviction relief responses or Habeas Corpus responses		2,497		2,522
Number of sexual predator civil commitment proceedings		155		157
Number of Baker Act hearings		1,473		1,488

**EXHIBIT II - PERFORMANCE MEASURES AND STANDARDS**

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

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

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

Approved Performance Measures for FY 2013-14	Approved Prior Year Standards FY 2012-13	Actual Prior Year Standards FY 2012-13	Approved Standards for FY 2013-14	Requested Standards for FY 2014-15
Annual attorney turnover rate	18%	18.62%	18%	17.69%
Number of appointed & re-opened cases	875,837	744,095	875,837	781,300
Number of cases closed	784,964	679,300	784,964	713,265
Number of clients represented	705,061	603,965	705,061	634,163
Number of cases per attorney	547	521	547	495

**EXHIBIT II - PERFORMANCE MEASURES AND STANDARDS**

EXHIBIT II PERFORMANCE MEASURES AND STANDARDS - BY CIRCUIT FY 2012-13 - July 2013	1 <sup>st</sup>	2 <sup>nd</sup>	3 <sup>rd</sup>	4 <sup>th</sup>	5 <sup>th</sup>	6 <sup>th</sup>	7 <sup>th</sup>	8 <sup>th</sup>	9 <sup>th</sup>	10 <sup>th</sup>	11 <sup>th</sup>	12 <sup>th</sup>	13 <sup>th</sup>	14 <sup>th</sup>	15 <sup>th</sup>	16 <sup>th</sup>	17 <sup>th</sup>	18 <sup>th</sup>	19 <sup>th</sup>	20 <sup>th</sup>	TOTAL
ANNUAL ATTORNEY TURNOVER RATE	35.32%	8.36%	31.43%	15.64%	12.21%	12.33%	13.65%	16.90%	28.93%	7.35%	15.50%	11.55%	23.79%	14.81%	19.47%	17.65%	23.13%	9.80%	23.88%	22.93%	18.62%
NUMBER OF APPOINTED & RE-OPENED CASES	35,160	17,797	9,242	38,368	29,820	75,448	35,683	18,526	69,884	33,428	82,309	29,568	54,229	18,809	61,865	5,859	43,875	27,700	19,435	37,090	744,095
# CLIENTS	27,398	14,364	8,271	34,554	24,863	75,448	30,068	15,689	47,713	27,145	74,064	18,858	43,472	15,694	35,292	5,080	36,712	22,659	17,335	29,286	603,965
NUMBER OF PLEAS	20,450	8,370	3,239	17,848	16,061	32,145	18,748	7,029	23,949	12,815	23,308	9,704	17,165	8,215	23,378	2,691	17,676	15,983	10,474	18,236	307,484
NUMBER OF TRIALS / CONTESTED HEARINGS	403	563	230	231	418	1,159	199	145	1,966	635	1,189	250	1,693	190	650	25	566	470	130	441	11,553
NUMBER OF CASES NOLLE PROSSED OR DISMISSED	2,906	997	495	3,011	1,369	2,023	2,006	1,800	5,993	2,358	18,731	941	6,189	313	13,269	508	5,943	2,670	1,228	4,539	77,289
TOTAL NUMBER OF CASES CLOSED	33,251	14,255	8,512	35,633	29,076	77,986	36,345	14,977	48,035	33,356	71,793	20,751	54,774	13,636	61,465	4,584	37,269	27,749	19,544	36,309	679,300

## EXHIBIT II - PERFORMANCE MEASURES AND STANDARDS

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

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

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

Approved Performance Measures for FY 2013-14	Approved Prior Year Standards <b>FY 2012-13</b>	Actual Prior Year Standards <b>FY 2012-13</b>	Approved Standards for <b>FY 2013-14</b>	Requested Standards for <b>FY 2014-15</b>
Annual attorney turnover rate	8%	9.41%	8%	8.94%
Percent of appeals resolved	99.99%	124.30%	99.99%	130.52%
Number of appointed cases	5,643	5,197	5,643	5,457
Number of clients represented	5,810	5,350	5,810	5,618
Number of briefs filed	5,968	5,334	5,968	5,601
Number of writs filed	106	201	106	211
Number of cases closed	5,612	6,460	5,612	6,783

---

**EXHIBIT II - PERFORMANCE MEASURES AND STANDARDS**

---

**Public Defender Appellate Offices  
PB2 BASELINE DATA COLLECTION FY 2012-2013**

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

	<b>2nd</b>	<b>7th</b>	<b>10th</b>	<b>11th</b>	<b>15th</b>	<b>Total</b>
ANNUAL ATTORNEY TURNOVER RATES *	12.77%	14.08%	4.3%	18.75%	0%	9.41%
APPEALS ASSIGNED	997	1,123	1,655	538	884	5,197
NUMBER OF CLIENTS REPRESENTED	1,218	1,116	1,609	538	869	5,350
PERCENT OF APPEALS RESOLVED	135.91%	132.59%	126.53%	94.24%	114.82%	124.30%
NUMBER OF CASES CLOSED	1,355	1,489	2,094	507	1,015	6,460
NUMBER OF BRIEFS FILED	1,082	1,151	1,605	524	972	5,334
NUMBER OF WRITS FILED	9	14	129	37	12	201

**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

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

Approved Performance Measures for FY 2013-14	Approved Prior Year Standards FY 2012-13	Actual Prior Year Standards FY 2012-13
Percent of cases in which post-conviction motion, post-conviction appeal, federal habeas corpus motion or federal appeal is timely filed, without extension	90%	93.75%
Number of substantiated Bar grievances filed annually	0	0
Number of appellate actions	78	99
Number of 3.851 filings	26	22
Number of signed death warrants	5	2
Number of court decisions to release a death row inmate, grant a new trial, grant a new sentencing hearing or grant other appeals	5	8
Number of active cases	171	181
Number of evidentiary hearings	16	14
Number of federal court actions	42	110

**EXHIBIT II - PERFORMANCE MEASURES AND STANDARDS**

Department: Justice Administration Department No.: 21

Program: Capital Collateral Regional Counsel

Code: 21.70.00.00

Service/Budget Entity: CCRC, **Middle Region**

Code: 21.70.20.01

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

Approved Performance Measures for FY 2013-14	Approved Prior Year Standards FY 2012-13	Actual Prior Year Standards FY 2012-13	Approved Standards for FY 2013-14	Requested Standards for FY 2014-15
Percent of cases in which post-conviction motion, post-conviction appeal, federal habeas corpus motion or federal appeal is timely filed, without extension		93.5%		90%
Number of substantiated Bar grievances filed annually		0		0
Number of appellate actions		60		40
Number of 3.851 filings		11		6
Number of signed death warrants		1		3
Number of court decisions to release a death row inmate, grant a new trial, grant a new sentencing hearing, or grant other appeals		4		2
Number of active cases		109		100
Number of evidentiary hearings		6		8
Number of federal court actions		71		30

**EXHIBIT II - PERFORMANCE MEASURES AND STANDARDS**

Department: Justice Administration Department No.: 21

Program: Capital Collateral Regional Counsel

Code: 21.70.00.00

Service/Budget Entity: CCRC, **South Region**

Code: 21.70.30.01

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

Approved Performance Measures for FY 2013-14	Approved Prior Year Standards FY 2012-13	Actual Prior Year Standards FY 2012-13	Approved Standards for FY 2013-14	Requested Standards for FY 2014-15
Percent of cases in which post-conviction motion, post-conviction appeal, federal habeas corpus motion or federal appeal is timely filed, without extension		94%		90%
Number of substantiated Bar grievances filed annually		0		0
Number of appellate actions		39		38
Number of 3.851 filings		11		6
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		4		3
Number of active cases		72		71
Number of evidentiary hearings		8		6
Number of federal court actions		39		20

## EXHIBIT II - PERFORMANCE MEASURES AND STANDARDS

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

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

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

<b><u>Proposed</u> Performance Measures for FY 2013-14</b>	<b>Approved Prior Year Standards FY 2012-13</b>	<b>Actual Prior Year Standards FY 2012-13</b>	<b>Approved Standards for FY 2013-14</b>	<b>Requested Standards for FY 2014-15</b>
“New Measure” – Annual percentage of appellate briefs filed within 30 days of receipt of record.	N/A	17%	N/A	22%
“New Measure” – Annual percentage of misdemeanor cases closed within 120 days of appointment.	N/A	95%	N/A	100%
“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	87%	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, 2nd Region	Code: 21.80.02.00	

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

<b><u>Proposed</u> Performance Measures for FY 2013-14</b>	<b>Approved Prior Year Standards FY 2012-13</b>	<b>Actual Prior Year Standards FY 2012-13</b>	<b>Approved Standards for FY 2013-14</b>	<b>Requested Standards for FY 2014-15</b>
“New Measure” – Annual percentage of appellate briefs filed within 30 days of receipt of record.	N/A	53%	N/A	56%
“New Measure” – Annual percentage of misdemeanor cases closed with 120 days of appointment.	N/A	79%	N/A	79%
“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	44%	N/A	44%

**EXHIBIT II - PERFORMANCE MEASURES AND STANDARDS**

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

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

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

<b><u>Proposed</u> Performance Measures for FY 2013-14</b>	<b>Approved Prior Year Standards FY 2012-13</b>	<b>Actual Prior Year Standards FY 2012-13</b>	<b>Approved Standards for FY 2013-14</b>	<b>Requested Standards for FY 2014-15</b>
“New Measure” – Annual percentage of appellate briefs filed within 30 days of receipt of record.	N/A	20%	N/A	20%
“New Measure” – Annual percentage of misdemeanor cases closed with 120 days of appointment.	N/A	84%	N/A	84%
“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	50%	N/A	50%

**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 <sup>th</sup> Region	Code: 21.80.04.00	

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

<b><u>Proposed</u> Performance Measures for FY 2013-14</b>	<b>Approved Prior Year Standards FY 2012-13</b>	<b>Actual Prior Year Standards FY 2012-13</b>	<b>Approved Standards for FY 2013-14</b>	<b>Requested Standards for FY 2014-15</b>
“New Measure” – Annual percentage of appellate briefs filed within 30 days of receipt of record.	N/A	33%	N/A	33%
“New Measure” – Annual percentage of misdemeanor cases closed within 120 days of appointment.	N/A	85%	N/A	86.7%
“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	0%	N/A	3%

## 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, 5th Region	Code: 21.80.05.00	

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

<b><u>Proposed</u> Performance Measures for FY 2013-14</b>	<b>Approved Prior Year Standards FY 2012-13</b>	<b>Actual Prior Year Standards FY 2012-13</b>	<b>Approved Standards for FY 2013-14</b>	<b>Requested Standards for FY 2014-15</b>
“New Measure” – Annual percentage of appellate briefs filed within 30 days of receipt of record.	N/A	81%	N/A	81%
“New Measure” – Annual percentage of misdemeanor cases closed within 120 days of appointment.	N/A	75%	N/A	75%
“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	85%



***JUSTICE ADMINISTRATION***



***LONG RANGE PROGRAM PLAN  
FISCAL YEARS 2014-15 THROUGH 2018-19***

***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	946	-1,554	-62%

**Factors Accounting for the Difference:**

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

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

**Explanation:**

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

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

**Explanation:**

With the implementation of the Offices of Criminal Conflict and Civil Regional Counsel in FY 2007-08, the number of conflict cases handled by private court appointed counsel has been greatly reduced. This is the primary reason the number of requests for fees above statutory caps has decreased.

In addition, the modifications during the 2012 Legislative Session to s. 27.5304, F.S., provided a schedule of how attorneys fees in excess of the flat fee would be paid (first from funds provided to the Justice Administrative Commission, with the remainder paid from funds provided to the State Courts System), establishing limited registries, and requiring that the chief judge or single designee hold hearings for fees above the statutory caps rather than the trial judge have all further reduced the number of these orders.

---

## 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 (continued)

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

Training  
 Personnel

Technology  
 Other (Identify)

**Recommendations:**

Modify the approved standard to reflect the most recent performance results.

## EXHIBIT III – ASSESSMENT OF PERFORMANCE MEASURES

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

**Action:**

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

Approved Standard	Actual Performance Results	Difference (Over/Under)	Percentage Difference
2,000	681	-1,319	-65%

**Factors Accounting for the Difference:**

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

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

**Explanation:**

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

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

**Explanation:**

With the implementation of the Offices of Criminal Conflict and Civil Regional Counsel in FY 2007-08, the number of conflict cases handled by private court appointed counsel has been greatly reduced. This is the primary reason the number of court orders for fees above statutory caps has decreased.

In addition, the modifications during the 2012 Legislative Session to s. 27.5304, F.S., provided a schedule of how attorneys fees in excess of the flat fee would be paid (first from funds provided to the Justice Administrative Commission, with the remainder paid from funds provided to the State Courts System), establishing limited registries, and requiring that the chief judge or single designee hold hearings for fees above the statutory caps rather than the trial judge have all further reduced the number of these orders.

---

## EXHIBIT III – ASSESSMENT OF PERFORMANCE MEASURES

---

**Department:** Justice Administration  
**Program:** Justice Administrative Commission  
**Service/Budget Entity:** Executive Direction/Support Services  
**Measure:** Number of cases where the court orders fees above the statutory caps (continued)

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

Training  
 Personnel

Technology  
 Other (Identify)

**Recommendations:**

Modify the approved standard to reflect the most recent performance results.







## EXHIBIT III – ASSESSMENT OF PERFORMANCE MEASURES

**Department:** Justice Administration  
**Program:** Justice Administrative Commission  
**Service/Budget Entity:** Executive Direction/Support Services  
**Measure:** Number of court appointed attorney and due process vendor invoices processed

**Action:**

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

Approved Standard	Actual Performance Results	Difference (Over/Under)	Percentage Difference
65,000	52,868	-12,132	-18%

**Factors Accounting for the Difference:**

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

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

**Explanation:**

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

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

**Explanation:**

The number of court appointed attorney fees and due process vendor invoices received fluctuates annually.

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

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

**Recommendations:**

Modify the approved standard to reflect the most recent performance results.

**EXHIBIT III - ASSESSMENT OF PERFORMANCE MEASURES**

**Department:** Justice Administration  
**Program:** Statewide Guardian ad Litem  
**Service/Budget Entity:** Statewide Guardian ad Litem  
**Measure:** Average Number of Children Represented  
**Action:**  
 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
26,500	21,397	5,103	19%

**Factors Accounting for the Difference:**

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

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

**Explanation:** The previous target was based on estimates of staffing and recruitment that were not supportable with the FY 2012-13 budget.

**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:** The previous target was based on estimates of staffing and recruitment that were not supportable with the FY 2012-13 budget.

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

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

**Recommendations:**

We are aggressively pursuing training that will equip staff with the tools necessary to manage volunteers and recruit sufficient volunteer resources. Our Legislative Budget Request for FY 2014-15 and beyond will recommend a three-year phased in approach to serving all children in the dependency system. Currently, we are able to serve 73% of all children in the child welfare system, and project reaching 75% by the end of the fiscal year. Further growth beyond June 30, 2014 is contingent on stable numbers of children in the system and on additional staff resources.









**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	1,185,385	(153,650)	(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**

<b>Department:</b> Justice Administration	
<b>Program:</b> State Attorneys	
<b>Service/Budget Entity:</b> First – Twentieth Judicial Circuits	
<b>Measure:</b> Number of felony criminal case referrals	
<b>Action:</b>	
<input type="checkbox"/> Performance Assessment of <u>Outcome</u> Measure	<input type="checkbox"/> Revision of Measure
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Performance Assessment of <u>Output</u> Measure	<input type="checkbox"/> Deletion of Measure
<input type="checkbox"/> Adjustment of GAA Performance Standards	

  

Approved Standard	Actual Performance Results	Difference (Over/Under)	Percentage Difference
490,965	394,880	(96,085)	(20%)

  

**Factors Accounting for the Difference:**

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

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

**Explanation:**

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

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

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

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

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

**Recommendations:**











**EXHIBIT III - ASSESSMENT OF PERFORMANCE MEASURES**

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

**Action:**  
 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
22,391	13,937	(8,454)	(38%)

**Factors Accounting for the Difference:**  
**Internal Factors** (check all that apply):

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

**Explanation:**

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

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

**Explanation:** 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**

<b>Department:</b> Justice Administration	
<b>Program:</b> State Attorneys	
<b>Service/Budget Entity:</b> First – Twentieth Judicial Circuits	
<b>Measure:</b> Number of Baker Act hearings	
<b>Action:</b>	
<input type="checkbox"/> Performance Assessment of <u>Outcome</u> Measure	<input type="checkbox"/> Revision of Measure
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Performance Assessment of <u>Output</u> Measure	<input type="checkbox"/> Deletion of Measure
<input type="checkbox"/> Adjustment of GAA Performance Standards	

  

Approved Standard	Actual Performance Results	Difference (Over/Under)	Percentage Difference
27,686	19,212	(8,474)	(31%)

  

**Factors Accounting for the Difference:**

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

<input type="checkbox"/> Personnel Factors	<input type="checkbox"/> Staff Capacity
<input type="checkbox"/> Competing Priorities	<input type="checkbox"/> Level of Training
<input type="checkbox"/> Previous Estimate Incorrect	<input 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 MEASURE**

**Department:** Capital Collateral Regional Counsels  
**Program:** Legal Representation  
**Service/Budget Entity:** Legal Representation  
**Measure:** Number of 3.850/3.851 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
26	11	-15	-58%

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

**Explanation:** The Supreme Court Assigned fewer cases to the CCRCs than estimated.

**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 MEASURE**

**Department:** Capital Collateral Regional Counsels  
**Program:** Legal Representation  
**Service/Budget Entity:** Legal Representation  
**Measure:** Number of evidentiary hearings

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

Approved Standard	Actual Performance Results	Difference (Over/Under)	Percentage Difference
16	14	-2	13%

**Factors Accounting for the Difference:**  
**Internal Factors** (check all that apply):

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

**Explanation:**

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

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

**Explanation:** The courts scheduled fewer hearings than projected.

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

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

**Recommendations:**

**EXHIBIT III - ASSESSMENT OF PERFORMANCE MEASURES**

**Department:** Justice Administration  
**Program:** Criminal Conflict and Civil Regional Councils  
**Service/Budget Entity:** Regional Councils, 1<sup>st</sup> – 5<sup>th</sup> Regions  
**Measure:**

**Exhibit III is not applicable**

**Action:**

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| <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 2014-15 THROUGH 2018-19***

***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 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:** 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 measures.
- 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:** 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** \_\_\_\_\_  
**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:**

Most Public Defenders throughout the state use the same business office management system for tracking personnel information. Personnel turnover information is reported to the Justice Administrative Commission, which calculates the turnover rate. 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 in order to provide accurate information for all stakeholders has been a priority of the FPDA.

**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** \_\_\_\_\_  
**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. However, all offices use some type of electronic case management system. 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. A representative sample of the cases counted and reported as appointments and reopens by each circuit was verified for accuracy.

**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:** There are two sources of reliability: (1) an analysis of each circuit's data compiled over the past ten years indicates little variation, despite changes in technology and/or individual agency operations; and (2) "peer review" of a representative sample of reported cases

---

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

---

**Department:** \_\_\_\_\_ **Justice Administration** \_\_\_\_\_  
**Program:** \_\_\_\_\_ **Public Defenders** \_\_\_\_\_  
**Service/Budget Entity:** \_\_\_\_\_ **Public Defenders** \_\_\_\_\_  
**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. However, all offices use some type of case management system. 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 reported number of closed cases.

**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:** An analysis of each circuit's data compiled over the past ten years indicates little variation, despite changes in technology and/or individual agency operations.



---

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

---

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

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

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

**Measure:** **Number of clients represented**

**Action** (check one):

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

**Data Sources and Methodology:**

Each Public Defender Office has a different method of collecting data and caseload numbers. However, all offices use some type of case management system. 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. A representative sample of the cases counted and reported as appointments and reopens by each circuit was verified for accuracy.

**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:** There are two sources of reliability: an analysis of each circuit's data compiled over the past ten years indicates little variation, despite changes in technology and/or individual agency operations; and peer review of a representative sample of reported cases.

---

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

---

**Department:** \_\_\_\_\_ **Justice Administration** \_\_\_\_\_  
**Program:** \_\_\_\_\_ **Public Defenders** \_\_\_\_\_  
**Service/Budget Entity:** \_\_\_\_\_ **Public Defenders** \_\_\_\_\_  
**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. However, all offices use some type of case management system. 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. A representative sample of the cases counted and reported as appointments and reopens by each circuit was verified for accuracy.

**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:** There are two sources of reliability: an analysis of each circuit's data compiled over the past ten years indicates little variation, despite changes in technology and/or individual agency operations; and peer review of a representative sample of reported cases indicated accurate reporting.

---

**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:**

Most Public Defenders throughout the state use the same business office management system for tracking personnel information. Personnel turnover information is reported to the Justice Administrative Commission, which calculates the turnover rate. 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:** Quality assurance for each office's data input and reporting in order to provide accurate information for all stakeholders has been a priority of the FPDA.

**Reliability:** In 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:** Quality assurance for each office's data input and reporting in order to provide accurate information for all stakeholders has been a priority of the FPDA.

**Reliability:** In 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:** Quality assurance for each office's data input and reporting in order to provide accurate information for all stakeholders has been a priority of the FPDA.

**Reliability:** In 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:** Quality assurance for each office's data input and reporting in order to provide accurate information for all stakeholders has been a priority of the FPDA.

**Reliability:** In 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:** Quality assurance for each office's data input and reporting in order to provide accurate information for all stakeholders has been a priority of the FPDA.

**Reliability:** In 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:** Quality assurance for each office's data input and reporting in order to provide accurate information for all stakeholders has been a priority of the FPDA.

**Reliability:** In 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:** Quality assurance for each office's data input and reporting in order to provide accurate information for all stakeholders has been a priority of the FPDA.

**Reliability:** In 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**

---

<b>Department:</b>	<b>Justice Administration</b>
<b>Program:</b>	<b>Capital Collateral Regional Counsels</b>
<b>Service/Budget Entity:</b>	<b>Capital Collateral Regional Counsels</b>
<b>Measure:</b>	<b>Percent of cases in which post-conviction motion, post-conviction appeal, federal habeas corpus motion or federal appeal is timely filed, without extension</b>

**Action** (check one):

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

**Data Sources and Methodology:**

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:**

In independent court files for the jurisdiction where the decision was rendered and in CCRC files.



---

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

---

**Department:** Justice Administration  
**Program:** Capital Collateral Regional Counsels  
**Service/Budget Entity:** Capital Collateral Regional Counsels  
**Measure:** Number of evidentiary hearings

**Action** (check one):

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

**Data Sources and Methodology:**

The Court system maintains this data base in its official records and the CCRC also records this data in its case related data files when evidentiary hearings are conducted.

**Validity:**

This measure is essential to document workload levels and prepare workload related budget requests going from one year to the next.

**Reliability:**

The data is highly reliable due to CCRC attorneys record each evidentiary hearing conducted and the courts also can verify evidentiary hearing numbers and dates.

---

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

---

**Department:** Justice Administration  
**Program:** Capital Collateral Regional Counsels  
**Service/Budget Entity:** Capital Collateral Regional Counsels  
**Measure:** Number of federal court actions

**Action** (check one):

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

**Data Sources and Methodology:**

The Court system maintains this data base in its official records and the CCRC also records this data in its case related data files when federal court actions occur.

**Validity:**

This measure is essential to document workload levels and prepare workload related budget requests going from one year to the next.

**Reliability:**

The data is highly reliable due to CCRC attorneys record each evidentiary hearing conducted and the courts also can verify court action numbers and dates.

---

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

---

**Department:** Justice Administration  
**Program:** Criminal Conflict and Civil Regional Councils  
**Service/Budget Entity:** Regional Conflict Councils, 1<sup>st</sup> – 5<sup>th</sup> 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 Councils record all appellate cases appointed to offices in a case tracking database. Regional Council 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 Councils' 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 Councils' case tracking program.

---

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

---

**Department:** Justice Administration  
**Program:** Criminal Conflict and Civil Regional Councils  
**Service/Budget Entity:** Regional Conflict Councils, 1<sup>st</sup> – 5<sup>th</sup> 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 Councils record all misdemeanor cases appointed to the Regional Council 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 Councils' 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 Councils' case tracking program.

---

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

---

**Department:** Justice Administration  
**Program:** Criminal Conflict and Civil Regional Councils  
**Service/Budget Entity:** Regional Conflict Councils, 1<sup>st</sup> – 5<sup>th</sup> Regions  
**Measure:** In cases where there is either an adjudication or a withhold of adjudication, a case plan to be 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 Councils 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 Councils' 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 Councils' case tracking program.

***JUSTICE ADMINISTRATION***



***LONG RANGE PROGRAM PLAN  
FISCAL YEARS 2014-15 THROUGH 2018-19***

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

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

Measure Number	Approved Performance Measures for FY 2013-14		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**

<b>Measure Number</b>	<b>Approved Performance Measures for FY 2013-14 (Words)</b>		<b>Associated Activities Title</b>
1	Average number of children represented		Represent children
2	Average percent of children represented		Represent children
3	Percent of cases closed with permanency goal achieved		Represent children
4	Number of new volunteers certified as a GAL		Represent children
5	“Propose Deletion of Measure”: Average number of active volunteers		Represent children
6	“Propose New Measure”: Number of Volunteers on June 30, annually		Represent children



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

<b>Measure Number</b>	<b>Approved Performance Measures for FY 2013-14 (Words)</b>		<b>Associated Activity Titles (From Exhibit VI)</b>
1	Percent of offenders who qualify for enhanced sentencing for whom state attorneys requested enhanced sentencing		Felony Prosecution Services Misdemeanor Prosecution Services Juvenile Prosecution Services Child Support Enforcement Services Civil Action Services
2	Total number of dispositions		Felony Prosecution Services Misdemeanor Prosecution Services Juvenile Prosecution Services Child Support Enforcement Services Civil Action Services
3	Number of dispositions by trial verdicts		Felony Prosecution Services Misdemeanor Prosecution Services Juvenile Prosecution Services Child Support Enforcement Services Civil Action Services
4	Number of dispositions by pleas		Felony Prosecution Services Misdemeanor Prosecution Services Juvenile Prosecution Services Child Support Enforcement Services Civil Action Services
5	Number of dispositions by non trial		Felony Prosecution Services Misdemeanor Prosecution Services Juvenile Prosecution Services Child Support Enforcement Services Civil Action Services

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

<b>Measure Number</b>	<b>Approved Performance Measures for FY 2013-14 (Words)</b>		<b>Associated Activity Titles (From Exhibit VI)</b>
6	Number of dispositions by otherwise		Felony Prosecution Services Misdemeanor Prosecution Services Juvenile Prosecution Services Child Support Enforcement Services Civil Action Services
7	Percent of dispositions by trial verdicts		Felony Prosecution Services Misdemeanor Prosecution Services Juvenile Prosecution Services Child Support Enforcement Services Civil Action Services
8	Percent of dispositions by pleas		Felony Prosecution Services Misdemeanor Prosecution Services Juvenile Prosecution Services Child Support Enforcement Services Civil Action Services
9	Percent of dispositions by non trial		Felony Prosecution Services Misdemeanor Prosecution Services Juvenile Prosecution Services Child Support Enforcement Services Civil Action Services
10	Percent of dispositions by otherwise		Felony Prosecution Services Misdemeanor Prosecution Services Juvenile Prosecution Services Child Support Enforcement Services Civil Action Services

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

<b>Measure Number</b>	<b>Approved Performance Measures for FY 2013-14 (Words)</b>		<b>Associated Activity Titles (From Exhibit VI)</b>
11	Number of substantiated Bar grievances filed annually		Felony Prosecution Services Misdemeanor Prosecution Services Juvenile Prosecution Services Child Support Enforcement Services Civil Action Services
12	Number of misdemeanor criminal case referrals		Misdemeanor Prosecution Services
13	Number of felony criminal case referrals		Felony Prosecution Services
14	Number of juvenile criminal case referrals		Juvenile Prosecution Services
15	Number of misdemeanor filings		Misdemeanor Prosecution Services
16	Number of felony filings		Felony Prosecution Services
17	Number of juvenile filings		Juvenile Prosecution Services
18	Number of post conviction relief responses or Habeas Corpus responses		Felony Prosecution Services Misdemeanor Prosecution Services Juvenile Prosecution Services Child Support Enforcement Services Civil Action Services
19	Number of sexual predator civil commitment proceedings		Civil Action Services
20	Number of Baker Act hearings		Civil Action Services

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

<b>Measure Number</b>	<b>Approved Performance Measures for FY 2013-14 (Words)</b>		<b>Associated Activity Titles (From Exhibit VI)</b>
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**

<b>Measure Number</b>	<b>Approved Performance Measures for FY 2013-14 (Words)</b>		<b>Associated Activity Titles (From Exhibit VI)</b>
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**

<b>Measure Number</b>	<b>Approved Performance Measures for FY 2013-14 (Words)</b>		<b>Associated Activities Title</b>
1	Percent of cases in which post-conviction motion, post-conviction appeal, federal habeas corpus motion or federal appeal is timely filed, without extension		Death Penalty Legal Counsel
			Death Row Case Preparation
2	Number of substantiated Bar grievances filed annually		Death Penalty Legal Counsel
3	Number of appellate actions		Death Penalty Legal Counsel
			Death Row Case Preparation
4	Number of 3.850/3.851 filings		Death Penalty Legal Counsel
			Death Row Case Preparation
5	Number of signed death warrants		Death Penalty Legal Counsel
			Death Row Case Preparation
6	Number of court decisions to release a death row inmate, grant a new trial, grant a new sentencing hearing, or grant other appeals		Death Penalty Legal Counsel
			Death Row Case Preparation
7	Number of active cases		Death Penalty Legal Counsel
			Death Row Case Preparation
8	Number of evidentiary hearings		Death Penalty Legal Counsel
			Death Row Case Preparation
9	Number of federal court actions		Death Penalty Legal Counsel
			Death Row Case Preparation

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

<b>Measure Number</b>	<b>“Proposed” Performance Measures for FY 2013-14 (Words)</b>		<b>Approved Associated Activity Titles (From Exhibit VI)</b>
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





NUCSSP03 LAS/PBS SYSTEM  
BUDGET PERIOD: 2004-2015  
STATE OF FLORIDA

SP 09/27/2013 17:01  
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):	1,229,105,243	
TOTAL BUDGET FOR AGENCY (SECTION III):	1,229,105,344	
	-----	-----
DIFFERENCE:	101-	
(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.

**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

---

## GLOSSARY OF TERMS AND ACRONYMS

---

**Legislative Budget Commission (cont.)** 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 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.

---

## GLOSSARY OF TERMS AND ACRONYMS

---

**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.

**Primary Service Outcome Measure:** The service outcome measure which is approved as the performance measure that best reflects and measures the intended outcome of a service. Generally, there is only one primary service outcome measure for each agency service.

**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.

---

## **GLOSSARY OF TERMS AND ACRONYMS**

---

**CIO** - Chief Information Officer

**CIP** - Capital Improvements Program Plan

**EOG** - Executive Office of the Governor

**FCO** - Fixed Capital Outlay

**FFMIS** - Florida Financial Management Information System

**FLAIR** - Florida Accounting Information Resource Subsystem

**F.S.** - Florida Statutes GAA - General Appropriations Act

**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

**LBR** - Legislative Budget Request

**L.O.F.** - Laws of Florida **LRPP** - Long-Range Program Plan

**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

**SWOT** - Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities and Threats

**TCS** - Trends and Conditions Statement

**TF** - Trust Fund

**WAN** - wide area network (information technology)

**ZBB** - Zero-Based Budgeting