



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
FAX (850) 488-8944

www.justiceadmin.org

Justice Administration

Tallahassee, Florida

September 30, 2015

Cynthia Kelly, Director
Office of Policy and Budget
Executive Office of the Governor
1702 The Capitol
Tallahassee, Florida 32399-0001

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

Cindy Kynoch, Staff Director
Senate Committee on Appropriations
201 The Capitol
Tallahassee, Florida 32399-1100

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 2016-17 through Fiscal Year 2020-21. The internet website address that provides the link to the LRPP on the Florida Fiscal Portal is www.justiceamin.com. This submission has been approved by me as Executive Director of the Justice Administrative Commission on behalf of all agencies within the Department.

Sincerely,

Alton L. Colvin, Jr.

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

Enclosure



**Justice Administrative Commission
Long-Range Program Plan
FY 2016-2017 through 2020-2021**

**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 2016-2017 through 2020-2021

September 30, 2015

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 2016-17 THROUGH FY 2020-2021

September 30, 2015

**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 2016-2017 THROUGH FY 2020-2021

September 30, 2015

**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 2016-2017 THROUGH FY 2020-2021**

September 30, 2015

**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 2016-17 through 2020-21

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

September 30, 2015



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

**LONG RANGE PROGRAM PLAN
FY 2016-2017 THROUGH FY 2020-2021**

September 30, 2015

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

**Ita Neymotin
Regional Counsel, Second Region**

**Eugene Zenobi
Regional Counsel, Third Region**

**Antony 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, 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 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 judgement of conviction and sentences.

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.

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:

Increase number of new volunteers.

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.

Baseline/ Year 2014-15	FY 2016-17	FY 2017-18	FY 2018-19	FY 2019-20	FY 2020-21
359,898	360,000	363,600	367,236	370,908	374,617

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

Baseline/ Year 2014-15	FY 2016-17	FY 2017-18	FY 2018-19	FY 2019-20	FY 2020-21
55,847	56,405	56,969	57,539	58,114	58,695

STATEWIDE GUARDIAN AD LITEM

PRIMARY SERVICE OUTCOMES

Outcome: Average number of children represented.

Baseline					
FY 2014/15	FY2016/17	FY2017/18	FY2018/19	FY2019/20	FY2020/21
24,290	25,500	26,700	27,900	29,100	30,000

Explanation: This number is the average of 12 months of data, from July 1 of one year to June 30 of the next. The progression of targets reflects reaching 100% of all dependent children within the next five years.

The Guardian ad Litem (GAL) Program is requesting funding for FY 16-17 that would provide staffing to represent all children currently in out-of-home care, and children in in-home care ages 0 to 3 years. The GAL Program does not control the number of children appointed to the program. These appointments are made by judges in the dependency courts. The five-year goal to represent an estimated 30,000 children assumes that funding is provided to reach this goal, and that the number of dependent children does not exceed 30,000.

**AGENCY SERVICE OUTCOMES AND
PERFORMANCE PROJECTION TABLES**

STATEWIDE GUARDIAN AD LITEM

Outcome: Average percent of children represented.

Baseline					
FY 2014/15	FY2016/17	FY2017/18	FY2018/19	FY2019/20	FY2020/21
83%	85%	89%	93%	97%	100%

Explanation: Showing the average percent of children represented gives the reader an understanding of the proportion of children in the dependency system represented by the GAL Program.

Outcome: Percent of cases closed with Permanency Goal achieved

Baseline					
FY 2014/15	FY2016/17	FY2017/18	FY2018/19	FY2019/20	FY2020/21
65.87%	66%	66%	66%	66%	66%

Explanation: A key outcome measure for children is achievement of permanency through adoption, reunification with family, or a permanent guardianship arrangement. These are true permanency outcomes and, in each case, court supervision, and case management by the Department of Children and Families (DCF) is terminated when those goals are achieved.

Outcome: Number of new volunteers certified as a GAL.

Baseline					
FY 2014/15	FY2016/17	FY2017/18	FY2018/19	FY2019/20	FY2020/21
2,807	2,500	2,500	2,500	2,500	2,500

Explanation: Explanation: The GAL Program cannot increase the number of volunteers without adequate resources for staff to recruit, train and oversee the work of these volunteers. Staff resources are already strained due to appointments of high numbers of children and increased removals of children to out of home care.

Outcome: Number of volunteers on June 30, annually.

Baseline					
FY 2014/15	FY2016/17	FY2017/18	FY2018/19	FY2019/20	FY2020/21
10,000	10,000	10,000	10,000	10,000	10,000

Explanation: At the end of June 2015, the number of volunteers was slightly more than 10,000. Our current volunteer strategy is to maintain at least 10,000 certified volunteers statewide.

**AGENCY SERVICE OUTCOMES AND
PERFORMANCE PROJECTION TABLES**

STATE ATTORNEY

STATE ATTORNEY, FIRST JUDICIAL CIRCUIT

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

	FY 2000-01 BASELINE	FY 2016-17	FY 2017-18	FY 2018-19	FY 2019-20	FY 2020-21
Offenders who qualify for enhanced sentence for whom the State requests enhanced sentence	146	81	81	81	81	81
Offenders for whom the Court orders enhanced sentencing	91	81	81	81	81	81
Percentage of offenders sentenced by the Court to an enhanced sentence	62%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

Outcome: Assistant State Attorney turnover rate.

FY 2000-01 BASELINE	FY 2016-17	FY 2017-18	FY 2018-19	FY 2019-20	FY 2020-21
15.6%	18.87%	18.87%	18.87%	18/87%	18.87%

STATE ATTORNEY, SECOND JUDICIAL CIRCUIT

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

	FY 2000-01 BASELINE	FY 2016-17	FY 2017-18	FY 2018-19	FY 2019-20	FY 2020-21
Offenders who qualify for enhanced sentence for whom the State requests enhanced sentence	152	150	150	150	150	150
Offenders for whom the Court orders enhanced Sentencing	53	150	150	150	150	150
Percentage of offenders sentenced by the Court to an enhanced sentence	37%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

Outcome: Assistant State Attorney turnover rate.

FY 2000-01 BASELINE	FY 2016-17	FY 2017-18	FY 2018-19	FY 2019-20	FY 2020-21
33.4%	30%	25%	20%	20%	20%

**AGENCY SERVICE OUTCOMES AND
PERFORMANCE PROJECTION TABLES**

STATE ATTORNEY, THIRD JUDICIAL CIRCUIT

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

	FY 2000-01 BASELINE	FY 2016-17	FY 2017-18	FY 2018-19	FY 2019-20	FY 2020-21
Offenders who qualify for enhanced sentence for whom the State requests enhanced sentence	7	36	37	38	39	40
Offenders for whom the Court orders enhanced sentencing	6	32	33	35	36	37
Percentage of offenders sentenced by the Court to an enhanced sentence	85.7%	88.9%	89.2%	92.1%	92.3%	92.5%

Outcome: Assistant State Attorney turnover rate.

FY 2000-01 BASELINE	FY 2016-17	FY 2017-18	FY 2018-19	FY 2019-20	FY 2020-21
13.6%	20%	20%	18%	17%	17%

STATE ATTORNEY, FOURTH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT

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

	FY 2000-01 BASELINE	FY 2016-17	FY 2017-18	FY 2018-19	FY 2019-20	FY 2020-21
Offenders who qualify for enhanced sentence for whom the State requests enhanced Sentence	303	950	950	950	950	950
Offenders for whom the Court orders enhanced Sentencing	300	902	902	902	902	902
Percentage of offenders sentenced by the Court to an enhanced sentence	99%	95	95	95	95	95

Outcome: Assistant State Attorney turnover rate.

FY 2000-01 BASELINE	FY 2016-17	FY 2017-18	FY 2018-19	FY 2019-20	FY 2020-21
21%	16	16	16	16	16

**AGENCY SERVICE OUTCOMES AND
PERFORMANCE PROJECTION TABLES**

STATE ATTORNEY, FIFTH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT

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

	FY 2001-02 BASELINE	FY 2016-17	FY 2017-18	FY 2018-19	FY 2019-20	FY 2020-21
Offenders who qualify for enhanced sentence for whom the State requests enhanced sentence	320	397	408	420	432	445
Offenders for whom the Court orders enhanced sentencing	168	391	402	414	426	439
Percentage of offenders sentenced by the Court to an enhanced sentence	52.50%	99%	99%	99%	99%	99%

Outcome: Assistant State Attorney turnover rate.

FY 2000-01 BASELINE	FY 2016-17	FY 2017-18	FY 2018-19	FY 2019-20	FY 2020-21
20.59%	20.59%	19.90%	19.60%	19.00%	18.40%

STATE ATTORNEY, SIXTH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT

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

	FY 2000-01 BASELINE	FY 2016-17	FY 2017-18	FY 2018-19	FY 2019-20	FY 2020-21
Offenders who qualify for enhanced sentence for whom the State requests enhanced sentence	508	450	400	400	350	350
Offenders for whom the Court orders enhanced Sentencing	356	350	300	280	280	275
Percentage of offenders sentenced by the Court to an enhanced sentence	38%	40%	41%	41%	42%	42%

Outcome: Assistant State Attorney turnover rate.

FY 2000-01 BASELINE	FY 2016-17	FY 2017-18	FY 2018-19	FY 2019-20	FY 2020-21
15%	18%	17%	16%	15%	15%

**AGENCY SERVICE OUTCOMES AND
PERFORMANCE PROJECTION TABLES**

STATE ATTORNEY, SEVENTH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT

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

	FY 2000-01 BASELINE	FY 2016-17	FY 2017-18	FY 2018-19	FY 2019-20	FY 2020-21
Offenders who qualify for enhanced sentence for whom the State requests enhanced sentence	223	295	300	305	310	315
Offenders for whom the Court orders enhanced Sentencing	90	280	285	289	294	299
Percentage of offenders sentenced by the Court to an enhanced sentence	40.5%	95%	95%	95%	95%	95%

Outcome: Assistant State Attorney turnover rate.

FY 2000-01 BASELINE	FY 2016-17	FY 2017-18	FY 2018-19	FY 2019-20	FY 2020-21
19.8%	23%	23%	20%	18%	15%

STATE ATTORNEY, EIGHTH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT

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

	FY 2013-14 BASELINE	FY 2016-17	FY 2017-18	FY 2018-19	FY 2019-20	FY 2020-21
Offenders who qualify for enhanced sentence for whom the State requests enhanced sentence	59	55	56	57	58	59

Outcome: Assistant State Attorney turnover rate.

FY 2013-14 BASELINE	FY 2016-17	FY 2017-18	FY 2018-19	FY 2019-20	FY 2020-21
8.16%	10.00%	10.00%	10.00%	10.00%	10.00%

AGENCY SERVICE OUTCOMES AND PERFORMANCE PROJECTION TABLES

STATE ATTORNEY, NINTH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT

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

	FY 2000-01 BASELINE	FY 2016-17	FY 2017-18	FY 2018-19	FY 2019-20	FY 2020-21
Offenders who qualify for enhanced sentence for whom the State requests enhanced sentence	634	300	300	300	300	300

Outcome: Assistant State Attorney turnover rate.

FY 2000-01 BASELINE	FY 2016-17	FY 2017-18	FY 2018-19	FY 2019-20	FY 2020-21
28.14%	20%	20%	20%	20%	20%

STATE ATTORNEY, TENTH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT

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

	FY 2000-01 BASELINE	FY 2016-17	FY 2017-18	FY 2018-19	FY 2019-20	FY 2020-21
Offenders who qualify for enhanced sentence for whom the State requests enhanced sentence	465	1,900	1,900	1,900	1,900	1,900
Offenders for whom the Court orders enhanced sentencing	220	1,900	1,900	1,900	1,900	1,900
Percentage of offenders sentenced by the Court to an enhanced sentence	47.3%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

Outcome: Assistant State Attorney turnover rate.

FY 2000-01 BASELINE	FY 2016-17	FY 2017-18	FY 2018-19	FY 2019-20	FY 2020-21
16.7%	10%	10%	10%	10%	10%

**AGENCY SERVICE OUTCOMES AND
PERFORMANCE PROJECTION TABLES**

STATE ATTORNEY, ELEVENTH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT

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

	FY 2000-01 BASELINE	FY 2016-17	FY 2017-18	FY 2018-19	FY 2019-20	FY 2020-21
Offenders who qualify for enhanced sentence for whom the State requests enhanced sentence	3,683	3,683	2,247	2,359	2,477	2,601

Outcome: Assistant State Attorney turnover rate.

FY 2000-01 BASELINE	FY 2016-17	FY 2017-18	FY 2018-19	FY 2019-20	FY 2020-21
21.85%	16%	16%	16%	16%	16%

STATE ATTORNEY, TWELFTH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT

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

	FY 2000-01 BASELINE	FY 2016-17	FY 2017-18	FY 2018-19	FY 2019-20	FY 2020-21
Offenders who qualify for enhanced sentence for whom the State requests enhanced sentence	210	30	31	32	33	34
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%	33%	35%	40%	39%	41%

Outcome: Assistant State Attorney turnover rate.

FY 2000-01 BASELINE	FY 2016-17	FY 2017-18	FY 2018-19	FY 2019-20	FY 2020-21
20.5%	10.60%	9%	8%	7%	6%

**AGENCY SERVICE OUTCOMES AND
PERFORMANCE PROJECTION TABLES**

STATE ATTORNEY, THIRTEENTH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT

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

	FY 2000-01 BASELINE	FY 2016-17	FY 2017-18	FY 2018-19	FY 2019-20	FY 2020-21
Offenders who qualify for enhanced sentence for whom the State requests enhanced sentence	210	160	160	160	160	160
Offenders for whom the Court orders enhanced Sentencing	203	156	156	156	156	156
Percentage of offenders sentenced by the Court to an enhanced sentence	96.70%	97.50%	97.50%	97.50%	97.50%	97.50%

Outcome: Assistant State Attorney turnover rate.

FY 2000-01 BASELINE	FY 2016-17	FY 2017-18	FY 2018-19	FY 2019-20	FY 2020-21
27.91%	17.86%	18.50%	19.00%	19.75%	20.00%

STATE ATTORNEY, FOURTEENTH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT

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

	FY 2000-01 BASELINE	FY 2016-17	FY 2017-18	FY 2018-19	FY 2019-20	FY 2020-21
Offenders who qualify for enhanced sentence for whom the State requests enhanced sentence	13	50	50	50	50	50
Offenders for whom the Court orders enhanced sentencing	11	40	40	40	40	40
Percentage of offenders sentenced by the Court to an enhanced sentence	87%	80%	80%	80%	80%	80%

Outcome: Assistant State Attorney turnover rate.

FY 2000-01 BASELINE	FY 2016-17	FY 2017-18	FY 2018-19	FY 2019-20	FY 2020-21
12.50%	15%	15%	15%	20%	20%

**AGENCY SERVICE OUTCOMES AND
PERFORMANCE PROJECTION TABLES**

STATE ATTORNEY, FIFTEENTH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT

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

	FY 2000-01 BASELINE	FY 2016-17	FY 2017-18	FY 2018-19	FY 2019-20	FY 2020-21
Offenders who qualify for enhanced sentence for whom the State requests enhanced sentence	313	210	210	215	215	215
Offenders for whom the Court orders enhanced Sentencing	164	168	174	183	193	215
Percentage of offenders sentenced by the Court to an enhanced sentence	52.40%	80%	83%	85%	90%	100%

Outcome: Assistant State Attorney turnover rate.

FY 2000-01 BASELINE	FY 2016-17	FY 2017-18	FY 2018-19	FY 2019-20	FY 2020-21
24.15%	17%	16%	15%	15%	14%

STATE ATTORNEY, SIXTEENTH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT

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

	FY 2000-01 BASELINE	FY 2016-17	FY 2017-18	FY 2018-19	FY 2019-20	FY 2020-21
Offenders who qualify for enhanced sentence for whom the State requests enhanced sentence	44	36	36	36	36	36
Offenders for whom the Court orders enhanced sentencing	42	36	36	36	36	36
Percentage of offenders sentenced by the Court to an enhanced sentence	95%	100	100	100	100	100

Outcome: Assistant State Attorney turnover rate.

FY 2000-01 BASELINE	FY 2016-17	FY 2017-18	FY 2018-19	FY 2019-20	FY 2020-21
77%	25%	25%	25%	25%	25%

**AGENCY SERVICE OUTCOMES AND
PERFORMANCE PROJECTION TABLES**

STATE ATTORNEY, SEVENTEENTH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT

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

	FY 2001-02 BASELINE	FY 2016-17	FY 2017-18	FY 2018-19	FY 2019-20	FY 2020-21
Offenders who qualify for enhanced sentence for whom the State requests enhanced sentence	849	1,079	1,079	1,079	1,079	1,079
Offenders for whom the Court orders enhanced sentencing	501	503	503	503	503	503
Percentage of offenders sentenced by the Court to an enhanced sentence	59%	47%	47%	47%	47%	47%

Outcome: Assistant State Attorney turnover rate.

FY 2000-01 BASELINE	FY 2016-17	FY 2017-18	FY 2018-19	FY 2019-20	FY 2020-21
18%	13.33%	13.33%	13.33%	13.33%	13.33%

STATE ATTORNEY, EIGHTEENTH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT

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

	FY 2000-01 BASELINE	FY 2016-17	FY 2017-18	FY 2018-19	FY 2019-20	FY 2020-21
Offenders who qualify for enhanced sentence for whom the State requests enhanced sentence	121	151	151	151	151	151
Offenders for whom the Court orders enhanced sentencing	97	151	151	151	151	151
Percentage of offenders sentenced by the Court to an enhanced sentence	80.2%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

Outcome: Assistant State Attorney turnover rate.

FY 2000-01 BASELINE	FY 2016-17	FY 2017-18	FY 2018-19	FY 2019-20	FY 2020-21
27.20%	13%	13%	13%	13%	13%

**AGENCY SERVICE OUTCOMES AND
PERFORMANCE PROJECTION TABLES**

STATE ATTORNEY, NINETEENTH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT

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

	FY 2000-01 BASELINE	FY 2016-17	FY 2017-18	FY 2018-19	FY 2019-20	FY 2020-21
Offenders who qualify for enhanced sentence for whom the State requests enhanced sentence	69	17	18	19	20	21
Offenders for whom the Court orders enhanced Sentencing	28	17	18	19	20	21
Percentage of offenders sentenced by the Court to an enhanced sentence	41%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

Outcome: Assistant State Attorney turnover rate.

FY 2000-01 BASELINE	FY 2016-17	FY 2017-18	FY 2018-19	FY 2019-20	FY 2020-21
17.67%	9.17%	9.17%	9.17%	9.17%	9.17%

STATE ATTORNEY, TWENTIETH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT

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

	FY 2000-01 BASELINE	FY 2016-17	FY 2017-18	FY 2018-19	FY 2019-20	FY 2020-21
Offenders who qualify for enhanced sentence for whom the State requests enhanced sentence	257	290	290	290	290	290
Offenders for whom the Court orders enhanced sentencing	105	270	270	270	270	270
Percentage of offenders sentenced by the Court to an enhanced sentence	41.00%	93.10%	93.10%	93.10%	93.10%	93.10%

Outcome: Assistant State Attorney turnover rate.

FY 2000-01 BASELINE	FY 2016-17	FY 2017-18	FY 2018-19	FY 2019-20	FY 2020-21
27.00%	13.56%	13.56%	13.56%	13.56%	13.56%

**AGENCY SERVICE OUTCOMES AND
PERFORMANCE PROJECTION TABLES**

PUBLIC DEFENDER

PUBLIC DEFENDER, FIRST THROUGH TWENTIETH CIRCUITS

Outcome: Percent of attorney turnover rates.

FY 2014-15 BASELINE	FY 2016-17	FY 2017-18	FY 2018-19	FY 2019-20	FY 2020-21
16.53%	14.91%	14.16%	13.45%	12.78%	12.14%

Outcome: Number of cases per attorney.

FY 2014-15 BASELINE	FY 2016-17	FY 2017-18	FY 2018-19	FY 2019-20	FY 2020-21
475	428	407	387	368	350

PUBLIC DEFENDER APPELLATE

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

Outcome: Percent of attorney turnover rates.

FY 2014-15 BASELINE	FY 2016-17	FY 2017-18	FY 2018-19	FY 2019-20	FY 2020-21
10.22%	9.22%	8.76%	8.32%	7.9%	7.5%

Outcome: Percent of appeals resolved annually.

FY 2014-15 BASELINE	FY 2016-17	FY 2017-18	FY 2018-19	FY 2019-20	FY 2020-21
101.73%	112.16%	117.77%	123.66%	129.84%	136.33%

**AGENCY SERVICE OUTCOMES AND
PERFORMANCE PROJECTION TABLES**

CAPITAL COLLATERAL REGIONAL COUNSEL

CAPITAL COLLATERAL REGIONAL COUNSEL, NORTH REGION

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

BASELINE YEAR	FY2016-17	FY2017-18	FY2018-19	FY2019-20	FY2020-21
	1	2	1	1	1

CAPITAL COLLATERAL REGIONAL COUNSEL, MIDDLE REGION

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

FY2000-01 BASELINE	FY2016-17	FY2017-18	FY2018-19	FY2019-20	FY2020-21
3	5	5	5	5	5

CAPITAL COLLATERAL REGIONAL COUNSEL, SOUTH REGION

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

FY2000-01 BASELINE	FY2016-17	FY2017-18	FY2018-19	FY2019-20	FY2020-21
3	5	5	5	5	4

**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.

FY 2014-15 BASELINE	FY 2016-17	FY 2017-18	FY 2018-19	FY 2019-20	FY 2020-21
20%	25%	30%	35%	40%	45%

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

FY 2014-15 BASELINE	FY 2016-17	FY 2017-18	FY 2018-19	FY 2019-20	FY 2020-21
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.

FY 2014-15 BASELINE	FY 2016-17	FY 2017-18	FY 2018-19	FY 2019-20	FY 2020-21
90%	95%	100%	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.

FY 2014-15 BASELINE	FY 2016-17	FY 2017-18	FY 2018-19	FY 2019-20	FY 2020-21
41%	41%	44%	47%	50%	53%

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

FY 2014-15 BASELINE	FY 2016-17	FY 2017-18	FY 2018-19	FY 2019-20	FY 2020-21
81%	81%	82%	83%	84%	85%

**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.

FY 2014-15 BASELINE	FY 2016-17	FY 2017-18	FY 2018-19	FY 2019-20	FY 2020-21
N/A	53%	55%	57%	59%	61%

CRIMINAL CONFLICT AND CIVIL REGIONAL COUNSEL, THIRD REGION

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

FY 2014-15 BASELINE	FY 2016-17	FY 2017-18	FY 2018-19	FY 2019-20	FY 2020-21
25%	30%	30%	30%	30%	30%

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

FY 2014-15 BASELINE	FY 2016-17	FY 2017-18	FY 2018-19	FY 2019-20	FY 2020-21
75%	80%	80%	80%	80%	80%

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

FY 2013-14 BASELINE	FY 2016-17	FY 2017-18	FY 2018-19	FY 2019-20	FY 2020-21
35%	35%	35%	35%	35%	35%

CRIMINAL CONFLICT AND CIVIL REGIONAL COUNSEL, FOURTH REGION

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

FY 2014-15 BASELINE	FY 2016-17	FY 2017-18	FY 2018-19	FY 2019-20	FY 2020-21
33%	34%	34%	35%	35%	35%

**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.

FY 2014-15 BASELINE	FY 2016-17	FY 2017-18	FY 2018-19	FY 2019-20	FY 2020-21
84%	85%	85%	86%	86%	86%

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

FY 2014-15 BASELINE	FY 2016-17	FY 2017-18	FY 2018-19	FY 2019-20	FY 2020-21
N/A					

CRIMINAL CONFLICT AND CIVIL REGIONAL COUNSEL, FIFTH REGION

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

FY 2014-15 BASELINE	FY 2016-17	FY 2017-18	FY 2018-19	FY 2019-20	FY 2020-21
63%	70%	72%	74%	76%	78%

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

FY 2014-15 BASELINE	FY 2016-17	FY 2017-18	FY 2018-19	FY 2019-20	FY 2020-21
83.5%	85%	87%	89%	91%	93%

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.

FY 2014-15 BASELINE	FY 2016-17	FY 2017-18	FY 2018-19	FY 2019-20	FY 2020-21
86%	87%	88%	89%	90%	91%

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

Priority #2 Goal: *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

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

PUBLIC DEFENDERS APPELLATE

Priority #1 Goal: *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)

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

Priority #2 Goal: *Advocate for timely permanency for children.*

STATE ATTORNEYS

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.*

PUBLIC DEFENDERS

Priority #2 Goal: *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

Priority #2 Goal: *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)

The CCRCs 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)

Priority #1 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)

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

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

TRENDS AND CONDITIONS STATEMENT

JUSTICE ADMINISTRATIVE COMMISSION

Pursuant to s. 43.16, F.S., the Justice Administrative Commission (JAC) maintains a central state office providing administrative services and assistance to Florida's Offices of State Attorney, Public Defender, Capital Collateral Regional Counsel, and Criminal Conflict and Civil Regional Counsel, as well as the Statewide Guardian ad Litem Program. Services provided are primarily in the areas of accounting, budget, financial services, and human resources.

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, establishes the State Office as an independent entity within the Justice Administrative Commission.

The GAL Statewide Office has oversight responsibility for providing legal, operational and 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, at <http://guardianadlitem.org/about-us/annual-reports-long-range-program-plans/>

TRENDS AND CONDITIONS STATEMENT

STATEWIDE GUARDIAN AD LITEM (Continued)

Reviewers are invited to read the reports and contact the Statewide Office with any questions. The vision of the GAL Program is to provide quality, effective advocacy for all of Florida's abused, abandoned or neglected children. In order to realize this vision, the Program is leveraging state, county and private funds to meet the needs of the children represented.

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

- The Guardian ad Litem Program grew significantly between FY 2012/13 and FY 2014/15, with the support of Governor Rick Scott and the Florida Legislature. There was a significant injection of new funding over these years and additional employees were hired to recruit, manage and oversee the work of additional volunteers. This was part of a multi-year strategy to obtain funding with the goal of representing all children in the dependency system. The Guardian ad Litem Program projected that by the end of FY 15/16, the program would represent all children in the dependency system in keeping with federal and state mandates.
- Funding to accomplish this goal was not appropriated for FY 15-16, however. Although the program was able to continue growth and reach its goal of more than 10,000 volunteers, this was done by exceeding the caseload standards recommended by the National Association of Court Appointed Special Advocates (NCASA) by a significant margin.
- The numbers of dependent children in Florida have begun to skyrocket. Over the past two years, the numbers of children in out of home care has grown by 22%. Dependency court justices exercise sole authority over appointments of children to the Program and on June 30, 2015, the Program was appointed to more than 25,000 children. Caseload standards indicate that the current level of staffing would support a total caseload of 20,040. Appointment to numbers exceeding 25,000 has created a workload that cannot be sustained through current funding and staffing of the GAL Program.
- Additional funding will be necessary to sustain the current level of representation and to represent all children in out of home care with quality service at the recommended staffing levels. The Guardian ad Litem Program is requesting workload funding in its Legislative Budget Request for FY 2016-17. Funding is being sought to support representation of 22,000+ children in out of home care, and approximately 1,200 children ages 0 to 3 in in-home care.
- **Growth or contraction in the dependency system is often linked with the economic and political climate in the State of Florida, as well as news coverage of high profile child death cases. Recent focus on the capacity and quality of child protective services has led to sizable increases in the number of children removed from their homes in some urban areas of the state. If this trend continues, the number of children served in the dependency system will continue to increase, thereby further reducing the GAL Program's ability to represent all dependent children.**

TRENDS AND CONDITIONS STATEMENT

STATEWIDE GUARDIAN AD LITEM (Continued)

- **The impact of the Department of Children and Families' new safety methodology on the rate of removal of children is yet unclear. Preliminary results suggest that use of the new methodology is directly correlated with higher rates of removal and increased placement of children into foster care.**
- **All targets and projections are contingent upon funding of the Guardian ad Litem legislative budget requests and stability in the number of children in the dependency system. 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' priority is to pursue justice in an effective, efficient and timely manner for all cases presented to or investigated by the State Attorney. This priority includes representing

TRENDS AND CONDITIONS STATEMENT

STATE ATTORNEYS (Continued)

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

JUSTIFICATION OF OUTCOMES WITH IMPACTS RELATING TO DEMAND AND FISCAL IMPLICATIONS

The true test of any agency is their effectiveness in meeting the goals and objectives within the constraints of state and county budgetary restrictions. State Attorneys must be adequately funded in order to comply with their Constitutional and Statutory mandates.

State Attorneys' duties and obligations have not only increased in the criminal justice system but have now expanded into the civil courtrooms. This has resulted in an increased workload of serious and sophisticated criminal and civil actions such as the legislatively mandated Civil Commitment Procedures of Sexual Predators and Baker Act Hearings.

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. This is important to reduce turnover and provide a more stable, efficient and productive staff. Experience and consistency in criminal matters is so important to victims of crimes and their families.

Simply put, there is a direct correlation between public safety concerns and the legislative budgets appropriated to the State Attorneys. When the State Attorney's duties and obligations are increased, funding should be also increased to provide the appropriate budget and staffing for the effective implementation of these new duties and obligations. The citizens of Florida should be able to feel safe in the comfort of their homes and in the economics of their businesses.

Public Safety is the number one responsibility of Government.

CHANGES THAT REQUIRE LEGISLATIVE ACTION

There are no activity or performance measures which require Legislative action this year.

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.

TRENDS AND CONDITIONS STATEMENT

PUBLIC DEFENDERS (Continued)

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.

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.

TRENDS AND CONDITIONS STATEMENT

PUBLIC DEFENDER APPELLATE (Continued)

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 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 Councils (CCRCs) 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.

THE CCRCs LONG RANGE PROGRAM PLAN STORY

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

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

TRENDS AND CONDITIONS STATEMENT

CAPITAL COLLATERAL REGIONAL COUNSEL (Continued)

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. Over the past several years, 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 has dropped to 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, especially to the CCRC North, recently re-established by the Legislature.

The Florida Supreme Court has explicitly indicated to the Florida Legislature that the CCRC model for providing post-conviction legal representation is its preferred choice. This is due to the courts demands for experienced legal representation to avoid case progress disruptions and competency challenges. In response to the Court's concerns, the 2013 Florida Legislature passed the Timely Justice Act recreating the CCRC North office. During committee meetings and debate on the floor, the Legislature concurred with the Court's preference for the CCRC model.

TRENDS AND CONDITIONS STATEMENT

CAPITAL COLLATERAL REGIONAL COUNSEL (Continued)

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

If a court suspects legal representation incompetence, the process shuts down and 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 Budget Reduction Impact

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

If additional budget reductions of 5% occur in FY 2016-17, it is likely that 4 lawyers and 2 investigators will be laid off (about 8% of CCRC Middle and South's case staffing). The loss of highly experienced and competent lawyers and investigators reduces the ability of the CCRC offices to handle current workloads by 10%. The newly re-established CCRC North could not lay off staff due to their having so few staff authorized. They would have to furlough all staff for significant periods of time which would severely limit their capacity to work most of their current caseload. A mandate to cut the CCRC budgets by 5% would severely compromise CCRCs ability to meet court standards.

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 postconviction 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 postconviction 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 STATEMENT

CAPITAL COLLATERAL REGIONAL COUNSEL (Continued)

CCRCs have made excellent progress in attracting, training and keeping post-conviction law experienced attorneys. Currently, 76% of all CCRC Middle and South attorneys have more than 5 years experience in postconviction litigation. Additionally, 84% of their lead attorneys have greater than 10 years of postconviction experience. The newly re-established North CCRC has no attorneys with five or more year's postconviction experience. Lowering staff turnover rates has been a priority in order to meet legislatively mandated performance measures as well as state and federal guidelines for timeliness.

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 was 181. In FY 2014-15 it was 180. In 2015-16 the CCRC caseloads are expected to be 185.

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 based on rulings by the Florida Supreme Court.

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 45-60 day period.

External Issue 2.1 Have the capacity to meet increasing workloads

	in 2011-12	in 2012-13	in 2013-14	in 2014-15	in 2015-16
Death warrants:	4	2	3	1	4 est.

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

TRENDS AND CONDITIONS STATEMENT

CAPITAL COLLATERAL REGIONAL COUNSEL (Continued)

For each warrant, two teams of lawyers and investigators are often required due to the limited time allowed. The teams involved work an average 80 – 90 hours a week until the warrant of execution is carried out or relief is granted. These are significant workloads for CCRCs.

The Timely Justice Act, which became effective July 1, 2013, and was upheld by the Florida Supreme Court on June 12, 2014, makes it mandatory for the Governor to sign death warrants for capital defendants who have completed initial post-conviction proceedings and had clemency. The CCRCs face the potential for extensive warrant litigation unprecedented in recent years and the number of warrants is projected to increase significantly over the next five years. Such litigation could occur in concurrently multiple cases, effect many CCRC attorneys and staff, and have broad implications for CCRC resources and capabilities. Warrant litigation can be costly, is time intensive, and can require multiple attorneys and investigators to prepare a case to go through the state and federal system in as little as 45 days. Because the trend in the foreseeable future is for warrant signings to increase significantly, CCRCs must have the attorney and operational capacities to quickly respond to court requirements.

The Timely Justice Act also contains provisions affecting the Registry attorneys. Since the elimination of the CCRC North in 2003 and the establishment of a private Registry to handle all CCRC North cases, there were serious legal representation problems identified by the state and federal courts. The Registry was often late in filing and had far less experience working postconviction cases. The re-establishment of CCRC North last year resulted in many Registry attorneys withdrawing from their cases, resulting in primarily the new CCRC North being appointed by the circuit courts to work warrant ready cases or other cases further along in the system. Currently, these comprise almost 40% of CCRC North's cases. These cases produce huge workload burdens due to their length of time in the postconviction process and the requirement to work through very large files before each case can proceed or the warrant can be carried out. This unanticipated and unexpected burden of being the agencies of last resort for warrant eligible defendants previously worked by the private Registry will further strain the limited resources of the CCRCs.

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

State and federal law requires CCRCs, within one year, 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 evidentiary hearings on one or more issues per case and require CCRCs to present their findings and argue their issues. State and federal courts set their own calendars throughout the postconviction 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 fiscal years, over 90% of all motions filed by CCRCs were timely filed without requests for extensions. However, the latest Auditor General's Report

TRENDS AND CONDITIONS STATEMENT

CAPITAL COLLATERAL REGIONAL COUNSEL (Continued)

to the Legislature comparing CCRCs with private registry indicated that the private registry attorneys only filed 63% of their motions in a timely fashion.

External Issue 2.3 Be able to respond to changes in Court policies and procedures

The Florida Supreme Court has made it very clear that 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 postconviction 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 overall efficiency of the postconviction process.

During the 2013 Session, the Florida Legislature enacted the Timely Justice Act which addressed a variety of substantive changes in capital postconviction proceedings. Responding to legislative concerns, the Florida Supreme Court created the Capital Postconviction Proceedings Committee to look into possible substantive and procedural changes to the capital post-conviction process.

The Court specifically directed the Committee to conduct a comprehensive review of the postconviction process and to make recommendations as to whether Rule 3.851, or any other rule, should be amended to “improve the efficiency of capital postconviction proceedings.” See, Supreme Court Administrative Order 13-11. The Committee was further directed to seek input from the Criminal Procedure Rules Committee, the CCRCs, Attorney General’s Office and other stakeholders determined appropriate by the Committee.

On July 3, 2014, the Florida Supreme Court adopted most of the Committee’s recommendations and ordered several changes to the postconviction rules which could have a substantial effect on the CCRCs.

First, the Court adopted increased and stricter standards for the qualifications required before an attorney can become a lead attorney in a capital postconviction case. These requirements will have the effect of adding additional years of experience before an attorney can handle capital postconviction matters as a lead attorney despite the fact that most CCRC attorneys have much broader experience in capital postconviction than private attorneys with many years of practice as a criminal attorney with a trial background. This additional requirement, adopted by the Court’s order, could cause problems if turnover in CCRC lead attorneys becomes an issue.

Second, the court ordered that trial counsel in capital cases must retain all the original files, including all work product generated in the representation of the defendant at trial, which is counter to the practice in most jurisdictions where trial counsel routinely provided original files

TRENDS AND CONDITIONS STATEMENT

CAPITAL COLLATERAL REGIONAL COUNSEL (Continued)

to postconviction counsel. The Court further ruled that postconviction counsel is permitted to view and inspect the files, but any copies provided by the trial counsel to the postconviction counsel would be at collateral counsel's expense.

Capital cases are exceedingly complex and substantial and the files created by trial attorneys while performing their responsibilities are voluminous. In order to comply with the new rules imposed by the Court regarding trial attorney files, the CCRCs anticipate that the costs associated with copying the files will run into the thousands of dollars, a substantial increase over current costs, creating a further strain on CCRC resources.

Last, the Court also adopted a rule that any expert who is listed as a witness for an evidentiary hearing must submit a written report which shall be disclosed to opposing counsel prior to the hearing. Traditionally, the CCRCs have not required their experts to submit written reports as a cost saving measure, since the expert will be discussing their findings with counsel during the course of the case. The requirement imposed by the Court will certainly cause expert costs to increase since they will now be required to submit a written report prior to testifying. This will require the expert to put in more hours at an increased cost to the CCRCs.

Internal Issue 2.4 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. In FY 2014-15 it was 10. The Spangenburg Report of 1999 and the American Bar Association recommend 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

TRENDS AND CONDITIONS STATEMENT

CAPITAL COLLATERAL REGIONAL COUNSEL (Continued)

perform the same duties as CCRCs. It is an optional source of legal services for postconviction case representation.

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

1. Average cost per case for legal representation: \$ 15,117 (CCRC) vs. \$ 18,579 Registry.
2. Average per hour cost for attorney time: \$ 38 (CCRC) vs. \$ 100 Registry
3. Average per hour cost for investigators: \$ 26 (CCRC) vs. \$ 40 Registry
4. Average cost per 3.851 court filing of issues: \$ 17,033 (CCRC) vs. \$ 18,359 Registry
5. Average cost per court evidentiary hearing on issues: \$ 17,325 (CCRC) vs. \$ 24,589 Registry
6. Average cost per appellate representation in courts: \$ 12,237 (CCRC) vs. \$ 17,263 Registry
7. Number of cases worked: 169 (CCRC) vs. 153 Registry

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

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

As indicated, there was a slowdown 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 45 – 60 day period is costly. There was one death warrant issued in FY 2007-08, 5 in FY 2008-09, 3 in 2013-14 and 1 in 2014-15. With the passage of the Timely Justice Administration Act, many more are possible annually in the future. The average 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 normally completed in one (1) year.

TRENDS AND CONDITIONS STATEMENT

CAPITAL COLLATERAL REGIONAL COUNSEL (Continued)

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

TRENDS AND CONDITIONS STATEMENT

CAPITAL COLLATERAL REGIONAL COUNSEL (Continued)

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 2013-14, the CCRC Middle and South had, combined, 32 lawyers, 16 investigators, 8 case processing staff and 8 administrative staff. In 2014-15 there were 37 lawyers, 17 investigators, 8 case processing staff and 6 administrative staff in South, Middle and the new CCRC North.

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 annually from 2007 through 2015.

CCRC FOCUS AREA 5 CCRC Operational Improvements

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

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

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.

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 previous years. In addition, newer and faster computers have been provided to CCRC lawyers which should increase their productivity. Currently, research is underway to utilize electronic case files.

Additionally, Box Net and high speed scanners allow the uploading of documents in a much more efficient manner from any mobile or office or court room locations. This saves time and allows attorneys and support staff to be much more efficient and productive.

At the same time it is imperative that CCRCs maintain document management systems and computer stations and servers, annually. Newer document management system capacities may be able to lower maintenance costs over time.

TRENDS AND CONDITIONS STATEMENT

CAPITAL COLLATERAL REGIONAL COUNSEL (Continued)

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 tasks in the most efficient way possible:

1.0 Public Records

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

2.0 Investigations

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

3.0 Legal Counsel

- 3.1. Visit client
- 3.2. Analyze witness information
- 3.3. Draft and publish or transmit the 3.851 motion documents
- 3.4. Prepare other motions as appropriate
- 3.5. Participate in evidentiary hearing(s)
- 3.6. Draft post-hearing orders and pleadings
- 3.7. Review court decisions
- 3.8. Prepare for and participate in state court appeals/Habeas Corpus
- 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

TRENDS AND CONDITIONS STATEMENT

CAPITAL COLLATERAL REGIONAL COUNSEL (Continued)

The CCRCs will continue implementing additional budget management capacities that will allow “unit cost” efficiency analysis and performance evaluations.

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

The combination of output and outcome measures can appropriately integrate financial, operational and results measures to tell the full CCRC story. The CCRC annual budget can be directly integrated with the CCRC Long Range Program Plan with these measures. The Auditor General’s Report found currently authorized measures to be appropriate for telling the postconviction 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

During the 2013-14 Legislative Session, the CCRCs were provided with funds to upgrade their outdated information technology systems. The CCRCs have replaced antiquated computers, servers and printing systems with newer models designed to increase speed, accuracy and efficiency. Investigators have been equipped with electronic tablets for use on the road thereby decreasing the time necessary for investigators to take statements, prepare documents and forward them to the home office for review. Use of the tablets also prevents investigators from having to rely and wait on the home office to provide support and documents, allowing the investigator to see more witnesses in a shorter time therefore decreasing costs.

Additionally, the CCRCs have invested in advanced scanning and document systems that allow quicker retrieval of documents and reduce the need for storage space within the home office for paper records necessary for review. Historically, each client represented by the CCRCs generates records averaging between 35-40 bankers boxes which must be reviewed by the CCRC team assigned to that particular case. In the past, each document was stored in the offices of the CCRCs taking up thousands of square feet, which increased rental costs. The acquisition of advanced scanning systems has allowed the CCRCs to reduce the number of boxes by two-thirds, lessened the need for retail office space, and, thus, reduced rental costs. An added benefit is that document searches take less time, thereby, achieving legal team efficiencies.

These initiatives to maintain and increase efficiencies are ongoing.

TRENDS AND CONDITIONS STATEMENT

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
- Clients requiring removal of disabilities of nonage pursuant to Chapter 743, Florida Statutes

TRENDS AND CONDITIONS STATEMENT

OFFICES OF CRIMINAL CONFLICT AND CIVIL REGIONAL COUNSELS (Continued)

- Clients subject to involuntary civil commitment and removal of civil rights pursuant to the Florida Guardianship Law, Chapter 744, Florida Statutes
- Children and families in need of state services pursuant to Chapter 984, Florida Statutes

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

The goal of the Office of Regional Counsel is to provide quality representation to all clients. Because “quality representation” cannot be defined or measured in wins and losses; therefore, the Office of Regional Counsel is proposing performance measures that are designed to determine the quality of the work in other ways.

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

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

JUSTICE ADMINISTRATION



***LONG RANGE PROGRAM PLAN
FISCAL YEARS 2016-17 THROUGH 2020-21***

PERFORMANCE MEASURES AND STANDARDS – LRPP EXHIBIT II

EXHIBIT II - PERFORMANCE MEASURES AND STANDARDS

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

Program: Justice Administrative Commission	Code: 21300000
Service/Budget Entity: Executive Direction/Support Services	Code: 21308000

Approved Performance Measures for FY 2015-16	Approved Prior Year Standard FY 2014-15	Actual Prior Year Standard FY 2014-15	Approved Standards for FY 2015-16	Requested Standards for FY 2016-17
Percent of invoices processed within statutory time frames	95.00%	96.97%	95.00%	95.00%
Number of public records requests	150	333	150	300
Number of cases where registry lawyers request fees above the statutory caps	2,500	881	2,500	850
Number of cases where the court orders fees above the statutory caps	2,000	754	2,000	750
Total amount of excess fees awarded by the court per circuit	\$6,000,000	\$8,875,059	\$6,000,000	\$8,800,000
Number of budget, payroll, disbursement, revenue and financial report transactions processed	375,000	359,898	375,000	360,000
Number of court-appointed attorney and due process vendor invoices processed	65,000	55,847	65,000	55,000

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

Approved Performance Measures for FY2015-16	Approved Prior Year Standard FY 2014-15	Actual Prior Year Standard FY 2014-15	Approved Standards for FY 2015-16	Requested Standards for FY 2016-17
Average number of children represented	26,500	24,290	26,500	25,000
Average percent of children represented	80%	83%	80%	80%
Percent of cases closed with Permanency Goal achieved	70%	65.87%	70%	70%
Number of new volunteers certified as a GAL	1,464	3,096	1,464	2,500
Average number of active volunteers	5,057	11,040	5,057	10,000

EXHIBIT II - PERFORMANCE MEASURES AND STANDARDS

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

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

Approved Performance Measures for FY 2015-16	Approved Prior Year Standards FY 2014-15	Actual Prior Year Standards FY 2014-15
Percent of offenders who qualify for enhanced sentencing for whom state attorneys requested enhanced sentencing	92.00%	89.81%
Total number of dispositions	1,339,035	1,045,200
Number of dispositions by trial verdicts	14,004	20,135
Number of dispositions by pleas	727,246	541,616
Number of dispositions by non trial	157,990	158,312
Number of dispositions by otherwise	439,795	325,137
Percent of dispositions by trial verdicts	1.05%	1.92%
Percent of dispositions by pleas	54.30%	51.82%
Percent of dispositions by non trial	11.80%	15.15%
Percent of dispositions by otherwise	32.84%	31.11%
Number of substantiated Bar grievances filed annually	0	1
Number of misdemeanor criminal case referrals	1,183,597	796,250
Number of felony criminal case referrals	490,965	367,026
Number of juvenile criminal case referrals	197,338	105,991
Number of misdemeanor filings	792,393	560,361
Number of felony filings	219,752	169,557
Number of juvenile filings	83,616	42,710
Number of post conviction relief responses or Habeas Corpus responses	22,391	315
Number of sexual predator civil commitment proceedings	TBD	4,184
Number of Baker Act hearings	27,686	23,658

EXHIBIT II - PERFORMANCE MEASURES AND STANDARDS

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

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

Approved Performance Measures for FY 2015-16	Approved Prior Year Standard FY 2014-15	Actual Prior Year Standard FY 2014-15	Approved Standards for FY 2015-16	Requested Standards for FY 2016-17
Percent of offenders who qualify for enhanced sentencing for whom state attorneys requested enhanced sentencing		81%		81%
Total number of dispositions		43,631		43,631
Number of dispositions by trial verdicts		359		359
Number of dispositions by pleas		27,779		27,779
Number of dispositions by non trial		1,341		1,341
Number of dispositions by otherwise		12,111		12,111
Percent of dispositions by trial verdicts		1%		1%
Percent of dispositions by pleas		64%		64%
Percent of dispositions by non trial		8%		8%
Percent of dispositions by otherwise		27%		27%
Number of substantiated Bar grievances filed annually		0		0
Number of misdemeanor criminal case referrals		27,594		27,594
Number of felony criminal case referrals		16,735		16,735
Number of juvenile criminal case referrals		5,102		5,102
Number of misdemeanor filings		14,969		14,969
Number of felony filings		10,854		10,854
Number of juvenile filings		2,411		2,411
Number of post conviction relief responses or Habeas Corpus responses		411		411
Number of sexual predator civil commitment proceedings		241		241
Number of Baker Act hearings		1,744		1,744

EXHIBIT II - PERFORMANCE MEASURES AND STANDARDS

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

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

Approved Performance Measures for FY 2015-16	Approved Prior Year Standard FY 2014-15	Actual Prior Year Standard FY 2014-15	Approved Standards for FY 2015-16	Requested Standards for FY 2016-17
Percent of offenders who qualify for enhanced sentencing for whom state attorneys requested enhanced sentencing		100%		100%
Total number of dispositions		20,574		23,000
Number of dispositions by trial verdicts		316		375
Number of dispositions by pleas		9,207		10,500
Number of dispositions by non trial		1,850		1,600
Number of dispositions by otherwise		9,201		10,500
Percent of dispositions by trial verdicts		1.54%		1.45%
Percent of dispositions by pleas		44.8%		47.3%
Percent of dispositions by non trial		9.0%		6.5%
Percent of dispositions by otherwise		44.7%		44.7%
Number of substantiated Bar grievances filed annually		0		0
Number of misdemeanor criminal case referrals		11,106		16,000
Number of felony criminal case referrals		7,201		6,400
Number of juvenile criminal case referrals		1,335		1,350
Number of misdemeanor filings		8,832		10,000
Number of felony filings		4,633		4,400
Number of juvenile filings		948		960
Number of post conviction relief responses or Habeas Corpus responses		55		65
Number of sexual predator civil commitment proceedings		141		120
Number of Baker Act hearings		22		35

EXHIBIT II - PERFORMANCE MEASURES AND STANDARDS

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

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

Approved Performance Measures for FY 2015-16	Approved Prior Year Standard FY 2014-15	Actual Prior Year Standard FY 2014-15	Approved Standards for FY 2015-16	Requested Standards for FY 2016-17
Percent of offenders who qualify for enhanced sentencing for whom state attorneys requested enhanced sentencing		72.73%		85%
Total number of dispositions		15,237		15,237
Number of dispositions by trial verdicts		108		108
Number of dispositions by pleas		5,914		5,914
Number of dispositions by non trial		1,391		1,391
Number of dispositions by otherwise		7,824		7,824
Percent of dispositions by trial verdicts		0.7%		0.7%
Percent of dispositions by pleas		38.8%		38.8%
Percent of dispositions by non trial		9.13%		9.13%
Percent of dispositions by otherwise		51.3%		51.3%
Number of substantiated Bar grievances filed annually		1		0
Number of misdemeanor criminal case referrals		8,649		8,649
Number of felony criminal case referrals		5,367		5,367
Number of juvenile criminal case referrals		1,122		1,122
Number of misdemeanor filings		5,377		5,377
Number of felony filings		2,560		2,560
Number of juvenile filings		633		633
Number of post conviction relief responses or Habeas Corpus responses		5		5
Number of sexual predator civil commitment proceedings		6		6
Number of Baker Act hearings		275		275

EXHIBIT II - PERFORMANCE MEASURES AND STANDARDS

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

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

Approved Performance Measures for FY 2015-16	Approved Prior Year Standard FY 2014-15	Actual Prior Year Standard FY 2014-15	Approved Standards for FY 2015-16	Requested Standards for FY 2016-17
Percent of offenders who qualify for enhanced sentencing for whom state attorneys requested enhanced sentencing		77.43%		77.43%
Total number of dispositions		65,011		65,011
Number of dispositions by trial verdicts		370		370
Number of dispositions by pleas		45,396		45,396
Number of dispositions by non trial		2,247		2,247
Number of dispositions by otherwise		16,962		16,962
Percent of dispositions by trial verdicts		.57%		.57%
Percent of dispositions by pleas		69.82%		69.82%
Percent of dispositions by non trial		3.46%		3.46%
Percent of dispositions by otherwise		26.09%		26.09%
Number of substantiated Bar grievances filed annually		0		0
Number of misdemeanor criminal case referrals		45,480		45,480
Number of felony criminal case referrals		17,715		17,715
Number of juvenile criminal case referrals		4,527		4,527
Number of misdemeanor filings		42,724		42,724
Number of felony filings		9,486		9,486
Number of juvenile filings		2,636		2,636
Number of post conviction relief responses or Habeas Corpus responses		2,223		2,223
Number of sexual predator civil commitment proceedings		332		332
Number of Baker Act hearings		822		822

EXHIBIT II - PERFORMANCE MEASURES AND STANDARDS

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

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

Approved Performance Measures for FY 2015-16	Approved Prior Year Standard FY 2014-15	Actual Prior Year Standard FY 2014-15	Approved Standards for FY 2015-16	Requested Standards for FY 2016-17
Percent of offenders who qualify for enhanced sentencing for whom state attorneys requested enhanced sentencing		73.25%		73.25%
Total number of dispositions		40,465		40,465
Number of dispositions by trial verdicts		246		246
Number of dispositions by pleas		25,090		25,090
Number of dispositions by non trial		1,379		1,379
Number of dispositions by otherwise		13,750		13,750
Percent of dispositions by trial verdicts		1.5%		1.5%
Percent of dispositions by pleas		52.82%		52.82%
Percent of dispositions by non trial		5.25%		5.25%
Percent of dispositions by otherwise		41.44%		41.44%
Number of substantiated Bar grievances filed annually		0		0
Number of misdemeanor criminal case referrals		26,950		26,950
Number of felony criminal case referrals		19,176		19,176
Number of juvenile criminal case referrals		4,028		4,028
Number of misdemeanor filings		13,598		13,598
Number of felony filings		8,907		8,907
Number of juvenile filings		1,802		1,802
Number of post conviction relief responses or Habeas Corpus responses		2		2
Number of sexual predator civil commitment proceedings		214		214
Number of Baker Act hearings		487		487

EXHIBIT II - PERFORMANCE MEASURES AND STANDARDS

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

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

Approved Performance Measures for FY 2015-16	Approved Prior Year Standard FY 2014-15	Actual Prior Year Standard FY 2014-15	Approved Standards for FY 2015-16	Requested Standards for FY 2016-17
Percent of offenders who qualify for enhanced sentencing for whom state attorneys requested enhanced sentencing		100%		100%
Total number of dispositions		72,441		75,000
Number of dispositions by trial verdicts		439		500
Number of dispositions by pleas		49,065		50,000
Number of dispositions by non trial		2,436		3,000
Number of dispositions by otherwise		20,501		21,000
Percent of dispositions by trial verdicts		.6%		.7%
Percent of dispositions by pleas		67.7%		67.3%
Percent of dispositions by non trial		3.4%		3.5%
Percent of dispositions by otherwise		28.3%		28.5%
Number of substantiated Bar grievances filed annually		0		0
Number of misdemeanor criminal case referrals		59,346		60,000
Number of felony criminal case referrals		30,577		32,000
Number of juvenile criminal case referrals		8,154		8,200
Number of misdemeanor filings		35,458		40,000
Number of felony filings		14,203		15,000
Number of juvenile filings		3,335		3,500
Number of post conviction relief responses or Habeas Corpus responses		51		60
Number of sexual predator civil commitment proceedings		280		300
Number of Baker Act hearings		1,653		1,700

EXHIBIT II - PERFORMANCE MEASURES AND STANDARDS

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

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

Approved Performance Measures for FY 2015-16	Approved Prior Year Standard FY 2014-15	Actual Prior Year Standard FY 2014-15	Approved Standards for FY 2015-16	Requested Standards for FY 2016-17
Percent of offenders who qualify for enhanced sentencing for whom state attorneys requested enhanced sentencing		99.66%		100%
Total number of dispositions		48,855		48,900
Number of dispositions by trial verdicts		257		260
Number of dispositions by pleas		22,749		23,000
Number of dispositions by non trial		7,216		7,300
Number of dispositions by otherwise		18,633		18,633
Percent of dispositions by trial verdicts		1%		1.3%
Percent of dispositions by pleas		44%		44%
Percent of dispositions by non trial		14%		14%
Percent of dispositions by otherwise		41%		41%
Number of substantiated Bar grievances filed annually		0		0
Number of misdemeanor criminal case referrals		44,530		45,000
Number of felony criminal case referrals		13,688		13,700
Number of juvenile criminal case referrals		4,920		4,920
Number of misdemeanor filings		28,127		28,200
Number of felony filings		7,907		7,800
Number of juvenile filings		2,078		2,100
Number of post conviction relief responses or Habeas Corpus responses		241		241
Number of sexual predator civil commitment proceedings		210		210
Number of Baker Act hearings		1,216		1,200

EXHIBIT II - PERFORMANCE MEASURES AND STANDARDS

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

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

Approved Performance Measures for FY 2015-16	Approved Prior Year Standard FY 2014-15	Actual Prior Year Standard FY 2014-15	Approved Standards for FY 2015-16	Requested Standards for FY 2016-17
Percent of offenders who qualify for enhanced sentencing for whom state attorneys requested enhanced sentencing		100%		100%
Total number of dispositions		23,419		21,151
Number of dispositions by trial verdicts		152		162
Number of dispositions by pleas		11,043		10,128
Number of dispositions by non trial		3,086		3,118
Number of dispositions by otherwise		9,138		7,742
Percent of dispositions by trial verdicts		0.65%		0.77%
Percent of dispositions by pleas		47.15%		47.89%
Percent of dispositions by non trial		13.18%		14.74%
Percent of dispositions by otherwise		39.02%		36.60%
Number of substantiated Bar grievances filed annually		0		0
Number of misdemeanor criminal case referrals		16,037		14,584
Number of felony criminal case referrals		7,956		8,130
Number of juvenile criminal case referrals		2,015		1,876
Number of misdemeanor filings		10,179		9,609
Number of felony filings		4,083		4,623
Number of juvenile filings		1,103		976
Number of post conviction relief responses or Habeas Corpus responses		307		244
Number of sexual predator civil commitment proceedings		161		156
Number of Baker Act hearings		776		467

EXHIBIT II - PERFORMANCE MEASURES AND STANDARDS

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

Program: State Attorney, 9 th Judicial Circuit	Code: 21.50.09.00	
Service/Budget Entity: State Attorney, 9 th Judicial Circuit	Code: 21.50.09.00	

Approved Performance Measures for FY 2015-16	Approved Prior Year Standard FY 2014-15	Actual Prior Year Standard FY 2014-15	Approved Standards for FY 2015-16	Requested Standards for FY 2016-17
Percent of offenders who qualify for enhanced sentencing for whom state attorneys requested enhanced sentencing		100%		100%
Total number of dispositions		79,466		79,466
Number of dispositions by trial verdicts		840		840
Number of dispositions by pleas		41,164		41,164
Number of dispositions by non trial		8,294		8,294
Number of dispositions by otherwise		29,168		29,168
Percent of dispositions by trial verdicts		1.06%		1.06%
Percent of dispositions by pleas		51.80%		51.80%
Percent of dispositions by non trial		10.44%		10.44%
Percent of dispositions by otherwise		36.71%		36.71%
Number of substantiated Bar grievances filed annually		0		0
Number of misdemeanor criminal case referrals		49,408		49,408
Number of felony criminal case referrals		32,167		32,167
Number of juvenile criminal case referrals		10,748		10,748
Number of misdemeanor filings		32,638		32,638
Number of felony filings		13,899		13,899
Number of juvenile filings		4,426		4,426
Number of post conviction relief responses or Habeas Corpus responses		203		203
Number of sexual predator civil commitment proceedings		248		248
Number of Baker Act hearings		1,666		1,666

EXHIBIT II - PERFORMANCE MEASURES AND STANDARDS

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

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

Approved Performance Measures for FY 2015-16	Approved Prior Year Standard FY 2014-15	Actual Prior Year Standard FY 2014-15	Approved Standards for FY 2015-16	Requested Standards for FY 2016-17
Percent of offenders who qualify for enhanced sentencing for whom state attorneys requested enhanced sentencing		100%		100%
Total number of dispositions		39,833		39,833
Number of dispositions by trial verdicts		528		528
Number of dispositions by pleas		23,588		23,588
Number of dispositions by non trial		3,997		3,997
Number of dispositions by otherwise		11,720		11,720
Percent of dispositions by trial verdicts		1.3%		1.3%
Percent of dispositions by pleas		59.2%		59.2%
Percent of dispositions by non trial		10.0%		10.0%
Percent of dispositions by otherwise		29.5%		29.5%
Number of substantiated Bar grievances filed annually		0		0
Number of misdemeanor criminal case referrals		23,419		23,419
Number of felony criminal case referrals		11,882		11,882
Number of juvenile criminal case referrals		3,788		3,788
Number of misdemeanor filings		12,751		12,751
Number of felony filings		7,756		7,756
Number of juvenile filings		3,078		3,078
Number of post conviction relief responses or Habeas Corpus responses		134		134
Number of sexual predator civil commitment proceedings		256		256
Number of Baker Act hearings		2,185		2,185

EXHIBIT II - PERFORMANCE MEASURES AND STANDARDS

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

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

Approved Performance Measures for FY 2015-16	Approved Prior Year Standard FY 2014-15	Actual Prior Year Standard FY 2014-15	Approved Standards for FY 2015-16	Requested Standards for FY 2016-17
Percent of offenders who qualify for enhanced sentencing for whom state attorneys requested enhanced sentencing		100%		100%
Total number of dispositions		163,156		171,314
Number of dispositions by trial verdicts		11,345		11,912
Number of dispositions by pleas		40,789		42,828
Number of dispositions by non trial		73,742		77,429
Number of dispositions by otherwise		37,280		39,144
Percent of dispositions by trial verdicts		7%		7%
Percent of dispositions by pleas		25%		25%
Percent of dispositions by non trial		45%		45%
Percent of dispositions by otherwise		23%		23%
Number of substantiated Bar grievances filed annually		0		0
Number of misdemeanor criminal case referrals		117,372		123,241
Number of felony criminal case referrals		40,697		42,732
Number of juvenile criminal case referrals		12,661		13,294
Number of misdemeanor filings		114,228		119,939
Number of felony filings		14,799		15,539
Number of juvenile filings		2,869		3,012
Number of post conviction relief responses or Habeas Corpus responses		1,528		1,604
Number of sexual predator civil commitment proceedings		900		945
Number of Baker Act hearings		0		0

EXHIBIT II - PERFORMANCE MEASURES AND STANDARDS

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

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

Approved Performance Measures for FY 2015-16	Approved Prior Year Standard FY 2014-15	Actual Prior Year Standard FY 2014-15	Approved Standards for FY 2015-16	Requested Standards for FY 2016-17
Percent of offenders who qualify for enhanced sentencing for whom state attorneys requested enhanced sentencing		100%		100%
Total number of dispositions		34,795		35,142
Number of dispositions by trial verdicts		288		291
Number of dispositions by pleas		19,918		20,117
Number of dispositions by non trial		1,252		1,264
Number of dispositions by otherwise		13,337		13,470
Percent of dispositions by trial verdicts		1%		1%
Percent of dispositions by pleas		57.2%		57%
Percent of dispositions by non trial		3.5%		3.7%
Percent of dispositions by otherwise		38.3%		38.3%
Number of substantiated Bar grievances filed annually		0		0
Number of misdemeanor criminal case referrals		25,317		26,580
Number of felony criminal case referrals		15,046		15,196
Number of juvenile criminal case referrals		2,772		2,799
Number of misdemeanor filings		17,898		18,076
Number of felony filings		6,521		6,586
Number of juvenile filings		1,016		1,026
Number of post conviction relief responses or Habeas Corpus responses		62		63
Number of sexual predator civil commitment proceedings		30		31
Number of Baker Act hearings		489		493

EXHIBIT II - PERFORMANCE MEASURES AND STANDARDS

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

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

Approved Performance Measures for FY 2015-16	Approved Prior Year Standard FY 2014-15	Actual Prior Year Standard FY 2014-15	Approved Standards for FY 2015-16	Requested Standards for FY 2016-17
Percent of offenders who qualify for enhanced sentencing for whom state attorneys requested enhanced sentencing		53.98%		53.98%
Total number of dispositions		79,396		79,396
Number of dispositions by trial verdicts		1,322		1,322
Number of dispositions by pleas		42,738		42,738
Number of dispositions by non trial		15,681		15,681
Number of dispositions by otherwise		19,655		19,655
Percent of dispositions by trial verdicts		1.66%		1.66%
Percent of dispositions by pleas		53.83%		53.83%
Percent of dispositions by non trial		19.75%		19.75%
Percent of dispositions by otherwise		24.76%		24.76%
Number of substantiated Bar grievances filed annually		0		0
Number of misdemeanor criminal case referrals		55,246		55,246
Number of felony criminal case referrals		32,953		32,953
Number of juvenile criminal case referrals		7,415		7,415
Number of misdemeanor filings		47,859		47,859
Number of felony filings		13,349		13,349
Number of juvenile filings		3,157		3,157
Number of post conviction relief responses or Habeas Corpus responses		1,199		1,199
Number of sexual predator civil commitment proceedings		189		189
Number of Baker Act hearings		4,985		4,985

EXHIBIT II - PERFORMANCE MEASURES AND STANDARDS

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

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

Approved Performance Measures for FY 2015-16	Approved Prior Year Standard FY 2014-15	Actual Prior Year Standard FY 2014-15	Approved Standards for FY 2015-16	Requested Standards for FY 2016-17
Percent of offenders who qualify for enhanced sentencing for whom state attorneys requested enhanced sentencing		95.52%		92%
Total number of dispositions		36,604		33,000
Number of dispositions by trial verdicts		590		350
Number of dispositions by pleas		16,446		16,000
Number of dispositions by non trial		2,734		2,350
Number of dispositions by otherwise		16,834		14,300
Percent of dispositions by trial verdicts		2%		1%
Percent of dispositions by pleas		45%		48%
Percent of dispositions by non trial		7%		7%
Percent of dispositions by otherwise		46%		42%
Number of substantiated Bar grievances filed annually		0		0
Number of misdemeanor criminal case referrals		19,477		19,000
Number of felony criminal case referrals		11,181		10,000
Number of juvenile criminal case referrals		1,781		1,550
Number of misdemeanor filings		16,510		15,000
Number of felony filings		5,830		5,000
Number of juvenile filings		951		800
Number of post conviction relief responses or Habeas Corpus responses		383		375
Number of sexual predator civil commitment proceedings		115		50
Number of Baker Act hearings		357		250

EXHIBIT II - PERFORMANCE MEASURES AND STANDARDS

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

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

Approved Performance Measures for FY 2015-16	Approved Prior Year Standard FY 2014-15	Actual Prior Year Standard FY 2014-15	Approved Standards for FY 2015-16	Requested Standards for FY 2016-17
Percent of offenders who qualify for enhanced sentencing for whom state attorneys requested enhanced sentencing		77.30%		100.00%
Total number of dispositions		63,239		64,504
Number of dispositions by trial verdicts		547		558
Number of dispositions by pleas		28,039		28,600
Number of dispositions by non trial		2,303		2,349
Number of dispositions by otherwise		32,350		32,997
Percent of dispositions by trial verdicts		0.86%		0.86%
Percent of dispositions by pleas		44.34%		44.34%
Percent of dispositions by non trial		3.64%		3.64%
Percent of dispositions by otherwise		51.16%		51.16%
Number of substantiated Bar grievances filed annually		0		0
Number of misdemeanor criminal case referrals		86,803		88,539
Number of felony criminal case referrals		15,487		15,797
Number of juvenile criminal case referrals		4,865		4,962
Number of misdemeanor filings		56,881		58,019
Number of felony filings		8,712		8,886
Number of juvenile filings		2,294		2,340
Number of post conviction relief responses or Habeas Corpus responses		311		318
Number of sexual predator civil commitment proceedings		155		158
Number of Baker Act hearings		1,571		1,603

EXHIBIT II - PERFORMANCE MEASURES AND STANDARDS

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

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

Approved Performance Measures for FY 2015-16	Approved Prior Year Standard FY 2014-15	Actual Prior Year Standard FY 2014-15	Approved Standards for FY 2015-16	Requested Standards for FY 2016-17
Percent of offenders who qualify for enhanced sentencing for whom state attorneys requested enhanced sentencing		39%		36%
Total number of dispositions		6,353		6,353
Number of dispositions by trial verdicts		31		31
Number of dispositions by pleas		3,079		3,079
Number of dispositions by non trial		2,069		2,069
Number of dispositions by otherwise		1,174		1,174
Percent of dispositions by trial verdicts		.49%		.49%
Percent of dispositions by pleas		48.47%		48.47%
Percent of dispositions by non trial		32.57%		32.57%
Percent of dispositions by otherwise		18.48%		18.48%
Number of substantiated Bar grievances filed annually		0		0
Number of misdemeanor criminal case referrals		3,769		3,769
Number of felony criminal case referrals		1,219		1,219
Number of juvenile criminal case referrals		180		180
Number of misdemeanor filings		2,974		2,974
Number of felony filings		1,060		1,060
Number of juvenile filings		157		157
Number of post conviction relief responses or Habeas Corpus responses		28		28
Number of sexual predator civil commitment proceedings		1		1
Number of Baker Act hearings		26		26

EXHIBIT II - PERFORMANCE MEASURES AND STANDARDS

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

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

Approved Performance Measures for FY 2015-16	Approved Prior Year Standard FY 2014-15	Actual Prior Year Standard FY 2014-15	Approved Standards for FY 2015-16	Requested Standards for FY 2016-17
Percent of offenders who qualify for enhanced sentencing for whom state attorneys requested enhanced sentencing		100%		100%
Total number of dispositions		92,688		92,688
Number of dispositions by trial verdicts		1,114		1,114
Number of dispositions by pleas		59,414		59,414
Number of dispositions by non trial		7,792		7,792
Number of dispositions by otherwise		24,368		24,368
Percent of dispositions by trial verdicts		1.20%		1.20%
Percent of dispositions by pleas		64.10%		64.10%
Percent of dispositions by non trial		8.41%		8.41%
Percent of dispositions by otherwise		26.29%		26.29%
Number of substantiated Bar grievances filed annually		0		0
Number of misdemeanor criminal case referrals		47,936		47,936
Number of felony criminal case referrals		23,799		23,799
Number of juvenile criminal case referrals		6,932		6,932
Number of misdemeanor filings		42,229		42,229
Number of felony filings		11,812		11,812
Number of juvenile filings		4,509		4,509
Number of post conviction relief responses or Habeas Corpus responses		863		863
Number of sexual predator civil commitment proceedings		188		188
Number of Baker Act hearings		1,898		1,898

EXHIBIT II - PERFORMANCE MEASURES AND STANDARDS

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

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

Approved Performance Measures for FY 2015-16	Approved Prior Year Standard FY 2014-15	Actual Prior Year Standard FY 2014-15	Approved Standards for FY 2015-16	Requested Standards for FY 2016-17
Percent of offenders who qualify for enhanced sentencing for whom state attorneys requested enhanced sentencing		100%		100%
Total number of dispositions		38,273		38,273
Number of dispositions by trial verdicts		367		367
Number of dispositions by pleas		22,782		22,782
Number of dispositions by non trial		3,999		3,999
Number of dispositions by otherwise		11,125		11,125
Percent of dispositions by trial verdicts		0.96%		0.96%
Percent of dispositions by pleas		59.52%		59.52%
Percent of dispositions by non trial		10.45%		10.45%
Percent of dispositions by otherwise		29.07%		29.07%
Number of substantiated Bar grievances filed annually		0		0
Number of misdemeanor criminal case referrals		24,036		24,036
Number of felony criminal case referrals		10,852		10,852
Number of juvenile criminal case referrals		3,490		3,490
Number of misdemeanor filings		17,425		17,425
Number of felony filings		7,377		7,377
Number of juvenile filings		2,078		2,078
Number of post conviction relief responses or Habeas Corpus responses		477		477
Number of sexual predator civil commitment proceedings		75		75
Number of Baker Act hearings		533		533

EXHIBIT II - PERFORMANCE MEASURES AND STANDARDS

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

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

Approved Performance Measures for FY 2015-16	Approved Prior Year Standard FY 2014-15	Actual Prior Year Standard FY 2014-15	Approved Standards for FY 2015-16	Requested Standards for FY 2016-17
Percent of offenders who qualify for enhanced sentencing for whom state attorneys requested enhanced sentencing		100%		100%
Total number of dispositions		24,313		25,794
Number of dispositions by trial verdicts		353		375
Number of dispositions by pleas		18,019		19,116
Number of dispositions by non trial		2,635		2,795
Number of dispositions by otherwise		3,306		3,506
Percent of dispositions by trial verdicts		2%		2%
Percent of dispositions by pleas		74%		74%
Percent of dispositions by non trial		11%		11%
Percent of dispositions by otherwise		13%		13%
Number of substantiated Bar grievances filed annually		0		0
Number of misdemeanor criminal case referrals		18,712		19,852
Number of felony criminal case referrals		9,069		9,621
Number of juvenile criminal case referrals		2,617		2,776
Number of misdemeanor filings		12,658		13,429
Number of felony filings		5,523		5,859
Number of juvenile filings		1,557		1,652
Number of post conviction relief responses or Habeas Corpus responses		233		247
Number of sexual predator civil commitment proceedings		139		147
Number of Baker Act hearings		785		833

EXHIBIT II - PERFORMANCE MEASURES AND STANDARDS

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

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

Approved Performance Measures for FY 2015-16	Approved Prior Year Standard FY 2014-15	Actual Prior Year Standard FY 2014-15	Approved Standards for FY 2015-16	Requested Standards for FY 2016-17
Percent of offenders who qualify for enhanced sentencing for whom state attorneys requested enhanced sentencing		93.10%		93.10%
Total number of dispositions		57,487		58,062
Number of dispositions by trial verdicts		563		569
Number of dispositions by pleas		29,397		29,691
Number of dispositions by non trial		10,827		10,935
Number of dispositions by otherwise		16,700		16,867
Percent of dispositions by trial verdicts		.979%		.979%
Percent of dispositions by pleas		51.14%		51.14%
Percent of dispositions by non trial		18.83%		18.83%
Percent of dispositions by otherwise		29.05%		29.05%
Number of substantiated Bar grievances filed annually		0		0
Number of misdemeanor criminal case referrals		44,218		44,660
Number of felony criminal case referrals		21,729		21,946
Number of juvenile criminal case referrals		4,929		4,978
Number of misdemeanor filings		29,046		29,336
Number of felony filings		10,286		10,389
Number of juvenile filings		1,672		1,689
Number of post conviction relief responses or Habeas Corpus responses		1,909		1,928
Number of sexual predator civil commitment proceedings		223		225
Number of Baker Act hearings		2,200		2,222

EXHIBIT II - PERFORMANCE MEASURES AND STANDARDS

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

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

Approved Performance Measures for FY 2015-16	Approved Prior Year Standards FY 2014-15	Actual Prior Year Standards FY 2014-15	Approved Standards for FY 2015-16	Requested Standards for FY 2016-17
Annual attorney turnover rate		16.53%		15.7%
Number of appointed and reappointed cases		683,079		717,233
Number of cases closed		646,016		678,317
Number of clients represented		557,378		585,247
Number of cases per attorney		475		451

EXHIBIT II – PERFORMANCE MEASURES AND STANDARDS

EXHIBIT II PERFORMANCE MEASURES AND STANDARDS – BY CIRCUIT FY 2014-15 – July 2015	1st	2nd	3rd	4th	5th	6th	7th	8th	9th	10th	11th	12th	13th	14th	15th	16th	17th	18th	19th	20th	TOTAL
ANNUAL ATTORNEY TURNOVER RATE	6.90%	7.84%	10.81%	21.52%	20.80%	13.85%	18.03%	8.45%	26.07%	17.01%	15.50%	17.43%	24.32%	0.00%	11.83%	12.82%	17.28%	11.86%	17.39%	15.66%	16.53%
NUMBER OF APPOINTED & REAPPOINTED CASES	34,188	16,591	9,313	37,950	30,254	68,845	35,184	17,018	59,257	30,861	67,109	26,460	51,224	20,924	49,854	5,703	39,276	26,621	17,677	38,770	683,079
# CLIENTS	26,648	13,799	8,511	32,809	22,099	61,946	26,744	14,352	45,636	24,469	62,526	16,054	41,097	17,181	32,718	4,501	38,581	23,461	13,984	30,262	557,378
NUMBER OF PLEAS	18,922	7,855	4,505	17,207	17,008	33,801	17,090	6,243	24,839	11,785	16,996	15,687	15,046	8,333	20,800	2,342	16,362	15,270	9,731	18,026	297,848
NUMBER OF TRIALS / CONTESTED HEARINGS	469	400	189	162	314	1,060	119	265	2,180	431	837	645	1,346	88	922	13	1,848	540	105	460	12,393
NUMBER OF CASES NOLLE PROSSED OR DISMISSED	2,877	972	483	2,541	1,193	2,218	1,494	1,237	6,330	2,117	16,199	1,942	5,779	526	11,462	677	6,283	2,510	1,211	5,119	73,170
TOTAL NUMBER OF CASES CLOSED	33,859	13,676	8,643	33,461	29,894	74,217	35,308	13,354	48,908	28,454	60,892	26,232	51,016	17,076	50,226	4,343	33,751	26,564	18,519	37,623	646,016

EXHIBIT II - PERFORMANCE MEASURES AND STANDARDS

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

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

Approved Performance Measures for FY 2015-16	Approved Prior Year Standards FY 2014-15	Actual Prior Year Standards FY 2014-15	Approved Standards for FY 2015-16	Requested Standards for FY 2016-17
Annual attorney turnover rate		10.22%		9.71%
Percent of appeals resolved		101.73%		106.82%
Number of appointed cases		4,683		4,917
Number of clients represented		4,671		4,905
Number of briefs filed		4,660		4,893
Number of writs filed		92		97
Number of cases closed		4,764		5,002

EXHIBIT II - PERFORMANCE MEASURES AND STANDARDS

Public Defender Appellate Offices
PB2 BASELINE DATA COLLECTION FY 2014-2015 -
Date:

Exhibit II – Performance Measures and Standards by Circuit

	2nd	7th	10th	11th	15th	Total
ANNUAL ATTORNEY TURNOVER RATES *	8%	4.46%	19.42%	12.5%	6.76%	10.22%
APPEALS ASSIGNED	1,110	935	1,464	372	802	4,683
NUMBER OF CLIENTS REPRESENTED	1,257	927	1,369	372	476	4,671
PERCENT OF APPEALS RESOLVED	94.68%	101.07%	92.35%	127.69%	117.33%	101.73%
NUMBER OF CASES CLOSED	1,051	945	1,352	475	941	4,764
NUMBER OF BRIEFS FILED	1,236	868	1,353	381	822	4,660
NUMBER OF WRITS FILED	5	14	2	56	15	92

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, North, Middle & Southern Regions Aggregate	Code: 21.70.00.00	
Approved Performance Measures for FY 2015-16	Approved Prior Year Standards FY 2014-15	Actual Prior Year Standards FY 2015-16
Percent of cases in which post-conviction motion, post-conviction appeal, federal habeas corpus motion or federal appeal is timely filed, without extension	90%	86%
Number of substantiated Bar grievances filed annually	0	0
Number of appellate actions	78	81
Number of 3.851 filings	14	24
Number of signed death warrants	5	1
Number of court decisions to release a death row inmate, grant a new trial, grant a new sentencing hearing or grant other appeals	5	7
Number of active cases	171	180
Number of evidentiary hearings	14	17
Number of federal court actions	42	92

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, North Region			Code: 21.70.10.01	
Approved Performance Measures for FY 2015-16	Approved Prior Year Standards FY 2014-15	Actual Prior Year Standards FY 2014-15	Approved Standards for FY 2015-16	Requested Standards for FY 2016-17
Percent of cases in which post-conviction motion, post-conviction appeal, federal habeas corpus motion or federal appeal is timely filed, without extension		100		90
Number of substantiated Bar grievances filed annually		0		0
Number of appellate actions		0		4
Number of 3.851 filings		2		4
Number of signed death warrants		0		1
Number of court decisions to release a death row inmate, grant a new trial, grant a new sentencing hearing, or grant other appeals		0		1
Number of active cases		13		16
Number of evidentiary hearings		0		4
Number of federal court actions		0		2

EXHIBIT II - PERFORMANCE MEASURES AND STANDARDS

Department: Justice Administration Department No.: 21				
Program: Capital Collateral Regional Counsel			Code: 21.70.00.00	
Service/Budget Entity: CCRC, Middle Region			Code: 21.70.20.01	
Approved Performance Measures for FY 2015-16	Approved Prior Year Standards FY 2014-15	Actual Prior Year Standards FY 2014-15	Approved Standards for FY 2015-16	Requested Standards for FY 2016-17
Percent of cases in which post-conviction motion, post-conviction appeal, federal habeas corpus motion or federal appeal is timely filed, without extension		86%		90%
Number of substantiated Bar grievances filed annually		0		0
Number of appellate actions		58		16
Number of 3.851 filings		12		5
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		1		2
Number of active cases		99		87
Number of evidentiary hearings		13		4
Number of federal court actions		55		25

EXHIBIT II - PERFORMANCE MEASURES AND STANDARDS

Department: Justice Administration Department No.: 21				
Program: Capital Collateral Regional Counsel			Code: 21.70.00.00	
Service/Budget Entity: CCRC, South Region			Code: 21.70.30.01	
Approved Performance Measures for FY 2015-16	Approved Prior Year Standards FY 2014-15	Actual Prior Year Standards FY 2014-15	Approved Standards for FY 2015-16	Requested Standards for FY 2016-17
Percent of cases in which post-conviction motion, post-conviction appeal, federal habeas corpus motion or federal appeal is timely filed, without extension		86%		90%
Number of substantiated Bar grievances filed annually		0		0
Number of appellate actions		23		15
Number of 3.851 filings		10		4
Number of signed death warrants		0		2
Number of court decisions to release a death row inmate, grant a new trial, grant a new sentencing hearing, or grant other appeals		6		2
Number of active cases		68		68
Number of evidentiary hearings		4		4
Number of federal court actions		37		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 st Region	Code: 21.80.01.00	

Proposed Performance Measures for FY 2015-16	Approved Prior Year Standards FY 2014-15	Actual Prior Year Standards FY 2014-15	Approved Standards for FY 2015-16	Requested Standards for FY 2016-17
“New Measure” – Annual percentage of appellate briefs filed within 30 days of receipt of record.	N/A	20%	N/A	25%
“New Measure” – Annual percentage of misdemeanor cases closed with 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	90%	N/A	95%

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	

Proposed Performance Measures for FY 2015-16	Approved Prior Year Standards FY 2014-15	Actual Prior Year Standards FY 2014-15	Approved Standards for FY 2015-16	Requested Standards for FY 2016-17
“New Measure” – Annual percentage of appellate briefs filed within 30 days of receipt of record.	N/A	41%	N/A	38%
“New Measure” – Annual percentage of misdemeanor cases closed with 120 days of appointment.	N/A	81%	N/A	77%
“New Measure” –In cases where there is either an adjudication or a withhold of adjudication, the percentage of case plans approved by the court within 90 days of appointment.	N/A	N/A	N/A	53%

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	

Proposed Performance Measures for FY 2015-16	Approved Prior Year Standards FY 2014-15	Actual Prior Year Standards FY 2014-15	Approved Standards for FY 2015-16	Requested Standards for FY 2016-17
. “New Measure” – Annual percentage of appellate briefs filed within 30 days of receipt of record	N/A	25%	N/A	30%
“New Measure” – Annual percentage of misdemeanor cases closed with 120 days of appointment.	N/A	75%	N/A	80%
“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	35%	N/A	35%

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, 4th Region	Code: 21.80.04.00	

Proposed Performance Measures for FY 2015-16	Approved Prior Year Standards FY 2014-15	Actual Prior Year Standards FY 2014-15	Approved Standards for FY 2015-16	Requested Standards for FY 2016-17
“New Measure” – Annual percentage of appellate briefs filed within 30 days of receipt of record.	N/A	33.3%	N/A	34%
“New Measure” – Annual percentage of misdemeanor cases closed with 120 days of appointment.	N/A	84%	N/A	85%
“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	N/A	N/A	N/A

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	

Proposed Performance Measures for FY 2015-16	Approved Prior Year Standards FY 2014-15	Actual Prior Year Standards FY 2014-15	Approved Standards for FY 2015-16	Requested Standards for FY 2016-17
. “New Measure” – Annual percentage of appellate briefs filed within 30 days of receipt of record	N/A	63%	N/A	70%
“New Measure” – Annual percentage of misdemeanor cases closed with 120 days of appointment.	N/A	83.5%	N/A	85%
“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	86%	N/A	87%

JUSTICE ADMINISTRATION



***LONG RANGE PROGRAM PLAN
FISCAL YEARS 2016-17 THROUGH 2020-21***

***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 public records requests

Action:

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

Approved Standard	Actual Performance Results	Difference (Over/Under)	Percentage Difference
150	333	183	122%

Factors Accounting for the Difference:

Internal Factors (check all that apply):

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

Explanation:

External Factors (check all that apply):

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

Explanation:

The number of public records requests received fluctuates annually.

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

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

Recommendations:

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

EXHIBIT III – ASSESSMENT OF PERFORMANCE MEASURES

Department: Justice Administration
Program: Justice Administrative Commission
Service/Budget Entity: Executive Direction/Support Services
Measure: Number of cases where 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	881	(1,619)	(64.76%)

Factors Accounting for the Difference:

Internal Factors (check all that apply):

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

Explanation:

External Factors (check all that apply):

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

Explanation:

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.

Modifications made to s. 27.5304, F.S. in 2012 further reduced the number of these orders by 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.

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

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

Recommendations:

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

EXHIBIT III – ASSESSMENT OF PERFORMANCE MEASURES

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

Action:

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

Approved Standard	Actual Performance Results	Difference (Over/Under)	Percentage Difference
2,000	754	(1,246)	(62.3%)

Factors Accounting for the Difference:

Internal Factors (check all that apply):

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

Explanation:

External Factors (check all that apply):

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

Explanation:

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.

Modifications made to s. 27.5304, F.S. in 2012 further reduced the number of these orders by 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.

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

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

Recommendations:

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

EXHIBIT III – ASSESSMENT OF PERFORMANCE MEASURES

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

Action:

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

Approved Standard	Actual Performance Results	Difference (Over/Under)	Percentage Difference
\$6,000,000	\$8,875,059	\$2,875,059	47.9%

Factors Accounting for the Difference:

Internal Factors (check all that apply):

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

Explanation:

External Factors (check all that apply):

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

Explanation:

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

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

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

Recommendations:

Modify the approved standard to reflect the most recent results.

EXHIBIT III – ASSESSMENT OF PERFORMANCE MEASURES

Department: Justice Administration
Program: Justice Administrative Commission
Service/Budget Entity: Executive Direction/Support Services
Measure: Number of budget, payroll, disbursement, revenue and financial reports transactions processed

Action:

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

Approved Standard	Actual Performance Results	Difference (Over/Under)	Percentage Difference
375,000	359,898	(15,102)	(4.03%)

Factors Accounting for the Difference:

Internal Factors (check all that apply):

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

Explanation:

External Factors (check all that apply):

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

Explanation:

The number of budget, payroll, and accounting transactions fluctuate annually.

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

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

Recommendations:

Modify the current standard to reflect the most recent 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	55,847	(9,153)	(14.08%)

Factors Accounting for the Difference:

Internal Factors (check all that apply):

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

Explanation:

External Factors (check all that apply):

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

Explanation:

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

Recommendations:

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

EXHIBIT III – ASSESSMENT OF PERFORMANCE MEASURES

Department: Justice Administration	
Program: Statewide Guardian ad Litem	
Service/Budget Entity: Statewide Guardian ad Litem	
Measure: Average number of children represented	
Action:	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Performance Assessment of <u>Outcome</u> Measure	<input type="checkbox"/> Revision of Measure
<input type="checkbox"/> Performance Assessment of <u>Output</u> Measure	<input type="checkbox"/> Deletion of Measure
<input type="checkbox"/> Adjustment of GAA Performance Standards	

Approved Standard	Actual Performance Results	Difference (Over/Under)	Percentage Difference
26,500	24,290	(2,210)	(8%)

Factors Accounting for the Difference:

Internal Factors (check all that apply):

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

Explanation:
The number of children in out of home care has risen dramatically over the past two years. The Guardian ad Litem Program is serving more children than it is staffed and funded to serve, based on national staffing standards.

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

Explanation:
See item above. The Guardian ad Litem Program is seeking additional resources each year to reach its statutory mandate to serve all children in the dependency system. The number of children in out of home care has risen dramatically over the past two years.

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

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

Recommendations:
Funding is being sought for workload needs brought on by dramatic increases in the number of children in out of home care.

EXHIBIT III – ASSESSMENT OF PERFORMANCE MEASURES

Department: Justice Administration	
Program: Statewide Guardian ad Litem	
Service/Budget Entity: Statewide Guardian ad Litem	
Measure: Average percent of children represented	
Action:	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Performance Assessment of <u>Outcome</u> Measure	<input type="checkbox"/> Revision of Measure
<input type="checkbox"/> Performance Assessment of <u>Output</u> Measure	<input type="checkbox"/> Deletion of Measure
<input type="checkbox"/> Adjustment of GAA Performance Standards	

Approved Standard	Actual Performance Results	Difference (Over/Under)	Percentage Difference
80%	83%	3%	4%

Factors Accounting for the Difference: Not applicable. Target Exceeded.

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:
The GAL Program has exceeded its recommended capacity to serve children through caseloads that exceed national standards.

External Factors (check all that apply):

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

Explanation:

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

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

Recommendations:

EXHIBIT III – ASSESSMENT OF PERFORMANCE MEASURES

Department: Justice Administration	
Program: Statewide Guardian ad Litem	
Service/Budget Entity: Statewide Guardian ad Litem	
Measure: Percent of cases closed with permanency goal achieved	
Action:	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Performance Assessment of <u>Outcome</u> Measure	<input type="checkbox"/> Revision of Measure
<input type="checkbox"/> Performance Assessment of <u>Output</u> Measure	<input type="checkbox"/> Deletion of Measure
<input type="checkbox"/> Adjustment of GAA Performance Standards	

Approved Standard	Actual Performance Results	Difference (Over/Under)	Percentage Difference
70%	66%	(4%)	(6%)

Factors Accounting for the Difference:

Internal Factors (check all that apply):

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

Explanation:
 The number of children in out of home care has risen dramatically over the past two years. The Guardian ad Litem Program is serving more children than it is staffed and funded to serve, based on national staffing standards. This caseload level impacts outcomes.

External Factors (check all that apply):

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

Explanation:

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

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

Recommendations:
 The GAL Program has submitted legislative budget requests to address workload needs.

EXHIBIT III – ASSESSMENT OF PERFORMANCE MEASURES

Department: Justice Administration																									
Program: Statewide Guardian ad Litem																									
Service/Budget Entity: Statewide Guardian ad Litem																									
Measure: Number of new volunteers certified as a GAL																									
Action:																									
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Performance Assessment of <u>Outcome</u> Measure <input type="checkbox"/> Revision of Measure <input type="checkbox"/> Performance Assessment of <u>Output</u> Measure <input type="checkbox"/> Deletion of Measure <input type="checkbox"/> Adjustment of GAA Performance Standards																									
Approved Standard	Actual Performance Results	Difference (Over/Under)	Percentage Difference																						
1,464	3,096	1,632	111%																						
<p>Factors Accounting for the Difference: Not Applicable. Target Exceeded</p> <p>Internal Factors (check all that apply):</p> <table style="width: 100%;"> <tr> <td><input type="checkbox"/> Personnel Factors</td> <td><input type="checkbox"/> Staff Capacity</td> </tr> <tr> <td><input type="checkbox"/> Competing Priorities</td> <td><input type="checkbox"/> Level of Training</td> </tr> <tr> <td><input type="checkbox"/> Previous Estimate Incorrect</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td><input type="checkbox"/> Other (Identify)</td> <td></td> </tr> </table> <p>Explanation:</p> <p>External Factors (check all that apply):</p> <table style="width: 100%;"> <tr> <td><input type="checkbox"/> Resources Unavailable</td> <td><input type="checkbox"/> Technological Problems</td> </tr> <tr> <td><input type="checkbox"/> Legal/Legislative Change</td> <td><input type="checkbox"/> Natural Disaster</td> </tr> <tr> <td><input type="checkbox"/> Target Population Change</td> <td><input type="checkbox"/> Other (Identify)</td> </tr> <tr> <td><input type="checkbox"/> This Program/Service Cannot Fix The Problem</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td><input type="checkbox"/> Current Laws Are Working Against The Agency Mission</td> <td></td> </tr> </table> <p>Explanation:</p> <p>Management Efforts to Address Differences/Problems (check all that apply):</p> <table style="width: 100%;"> <tr> <td><input type="checkbox"/> Training</td> <td><input type="checkbox"/> Technology</td> </tr> <tr> <td><input type="checkbox"/> Personnel</td> <td><input type="checkbox"/> Other (Identify)</td> </tr> </table> <p>Recommendations:</p>				<input type="checkbox"/> Personnel Factors	<input type="checkbox"/> Staff Capacity	<input type="checkbox"/> Competing Priorities	<input type="checkbox"/> Level of Training	<input type="checkbox"/> Previous Estimate Incorrect		<input type="checkbox"/> Other (Identify)		<input type="checkbox"/> 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		<input type="checkbox"/> Training	<input type="checkbox"/> Technology	<input type="checkbox"/> Personnel	<input type="checkbox"/> Other (Identify)
<input type="checkbox"/> Personnel Factors	<input type="checkbox"/> Staff Capacity																								
<input type="checkbox"/> Competing Priorities	<input type="checkbox"/> Level of Training																								
<input type="checkbox"/> Previous Estimate Incorrect																									
<input type="checkbox"/> Other (Identify)																									
<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																									
<input type="checkbox"/> Training	<input type="checkbox"/> Technology																								
<input type="checkbox"/> Personnel	<input type="checkbox"/> Other (Identify)																								

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

Approved Standard	Actual Performance Results	Difference (Over/Under)	Percentage Difference
5,057	11,040	5,983	118%

Factors Accounting for the Difference: Not Applicable. Target Exceeded.

Internal Factors (check all that apply):

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

Explanation:

External Factors (check all that apply):

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

Explanation:

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

Training Technology
 Personnel Other (Identify)

Recommendations:

EXHIBIT III - ASSESSMENT OF PERFORMANCE MEASURES

Department: Justice Administration	
Program: State Attorneys	
Service/Budget Entity: First – Twentieth Judicial Circuits	
Measure: Percent of offenders who qualify for enhanced sentencing for whom state attorneys requested enhanced sentencing	
Action:	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Performance Assessment of <u>Outcome</u> Measure	<input type="checkbox"/> Revision of Measure
<input type="checkbox"/> Performance Assessment of <u>Output</u> Measure	<input type="checkbox"/> Deletion of Measure
<input type="checkbox"/> Adjustment of GAA Performance Standards	

Approved Standard	Actual Performance Results	Difference (Over/Under)	Percentage Difference
92.00%	89.81%	(2.19)	(2.38%)

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

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

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

Recommendations:

EXHIBIT III - ASSESSMENT OF PERFORMANCE MEASURES

Department: Justice Administration
Program: State Attorneys
Service/Budget Entity: First – Twentieth Judicial Circuits
Measure: Total number of dispositions
Action:
 Performance Assessment of Outcome Measure Revision of Measure
 Performance Assessment of Output Measure Deletion of Measure
 Adjustment of GAA Performance Standards

Approved Standard	Actual Performance Results	Difference (Over/Under)	Percentage Difference
1,339,035	1,045,200	(293,835)	(21.94%)

Factors Accounting for the Difference:

Internal Factors (check all that apply):

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

Explanation:

External Factors (check all that apply):

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

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

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

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

Recommendations:

EXHIBIT III - ASSESSMENT OF PERFORMANCE MEASURES

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

Approved Standard	Actual Performance Results	Difference (Over/Under)	Percentage Difference
14,004	20,135	6,131	43.78%

Factors Accounting for the Difference: Target exceeded.

Internal Factors (check all that apply):

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

Explanation:

External Factors (check all that apply):

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

Explanation:

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

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

Recommendations:

EXHIBIT III - ASSESSMENT OF PERFORMANCE MEASURES

Department: Justice Administration
Program: State Attorneys
Service/Budget Entity: First – Twentieth Judicial Circuits
Measure: Number of dispositions by pleas
Action:
 Performance Assessment of Outcome Measure Revision of Measure
 Performance Assessment of Output Measure Deletion of Measure
 Adjustment of GAA Performance Standards

Approved Standard	Actual Performance Results	Difference (Over/Under)	Percentage Difference
727,246	541,616	(185,630)	(25.53%)

Factors Accounting for the Difference:

Internal Factors (check all that apply):

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

Explanation:

External Factors (check all that apply):

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

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

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

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

Recommendations:

EXHIBIT III - ASSESSMENT OF PERFORMANCE MEASURES

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

Approved Standard	Actual Performance Results	Difference (Over/Under)	Percentage Difference
157,990	158,312	322	.20%

Factors Accounting for the Difference: Target exceeded.

Internal Factors (check all that apply):

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

Explanation:

External Factors (check all that apply):

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

Explanation:

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

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

Recommendations:

EXHIBIT III - ASSESSMENT OF PERFORMANCE MEASURES

Department: Justice Administration
Program: State Attorneys
Service/Budget Entity: First – Twentieth Judicial Circuits
Measure: Number of dispositions by otherwise
Action:
 Performance Assessment of Outcome Measure Revision of Measure
 Performance Assessment of Output Measure Deletion of Measure
 Adjustment of GAA Performance Standards

Approved Standard	Actual Performance Results	Difference (Over/Under)	Percentage Difference
439,795	325,137	(114,658)	(26.07%)

Factors Accounting for the Difference:

Internal Factors (check all that apply):

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

Explanation:

External Factors (check all that apply):

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

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

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

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

Recommendations:

EXHIBIT III - ASSESSMENT OF PERFORMANCE MEASURES

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

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

Approved Standard	Actual Performance Results	Difference (Over/Under)	Percentage Difference
1.05%	1.92%	.87	82.86%

Factors Accounting for the Difference: Target exceeded.

Internal Factors (check all that apply):

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

Explanation:

External Factors (check all that apply):

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

Explanation:

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

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

Recommendations:

EXHIBIT III - ASSESSMENT OF PERFORMANCE MEASURES

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

Approved Standard	Actual Performance Results	Difference (Over/Under)	Percentage Difference
54.30%	51.82%	(2.48)	(4.57%)

Factors Accounting for the Difference:

Internal Factors (check all that apply):

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

Explanation:

External Factors (check all that apply):

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

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

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

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

Recommendations:

EXHIBIT III - ASSESSMENT OF PERFORMANCE MEASURES

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

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
11.80%	15.15%	3.35%	28.39%

Factors Accounting for the Difference: Target exceeded.

Internal Factors (check all that apply):

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

Explanation:

External Factors (check all that apply):

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

Explanation:

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

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

Recommendations:

EXHIBIT III - ASSESSMENT OF PERFORMANCE MEASURES

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

Approved Standard	Actual Performance Results	Difference (Over/Under)	Percentage Difference
32.84%	31.11%	(1.73)	(5.27%)

Factors Accounting for the Difference:

Internal Factors (check all that apply):

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

Explanation:

External Factors (check all that apply):

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

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

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

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

Recommendations:

EXHIBIT III - ASSESSMENT OF PERFORMANCE MEASURES

Department: Justice Administration
Program: State Attorneys
Service/Budget Entity: First – Twentieth Judicial Circuits
Measure: Number of substantiated Bar grievances filed annually
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
0	1	1	N/A

Factors Accounting for the Difference:

Internal Factors (check all that apply):

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

Explanation:

The number of Bar grievances filed in a given year is difficult to anticipate.

External Factors (check all that apply):

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

Explanation:

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

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

Recommendations:

EXHIBIT III - ASSESSMENT OF PERFORMANCE MEASURES

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

Approved Standard	Actual Performance Results	Difference (Over/Under)	Percentage Difference
1,183,597	796,250	(387,347)	(32.73%)

Factors Accounting for the Difference:

Internal Factors (check all that apply):

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

Explanation:

External Factors (check all that apply):

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

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

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

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

Recommendations:

EXHIBIT III - ASSESSMENT OF PERFORMANCE MEASURES

Department: Justice Administration	
Program: State Attorneys	
Service/Budget Entity: First – Twentieth Judicial Circuits	
Measure: Number of felony criminal case referrals	
Action:	
<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	367,026	(123,939)	(25.24%)

Factors Accounting for the Difference:

Internal Factors (check all that apply):

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

Explanation:

External Factors (check all that apply):

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

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

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

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

Recommendations:

EXHIBIT III - ASSESSMENT OF PERFORMANCE MEASURES

Department: Justice Administration
Program: State Attorneys
Service/Budget Entity: First – Twentieth Judicial Circuits
Measure: Number of juvenile criminal case referrals
Action:
 Performance Assessment of Outcome Measure Revision of Measure
 Performance Assessment of Output Measure Deletion of Measure
 Adjustment of GAA Performance Standards

Approved Standard	Actual Performance Results	Difference (Over/Under)	Percentage Difference
197,338	105,991	(91,347)	(46.29%)

Factors Accounting for the Difference:

Internal Factors (check all that apply):

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

Explanation:

External Factors (check all that apply):

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

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

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

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

Recommendations:

EXHIBIT III - ASSESSMENT OF PERFORMANCE MEASURES

Department: Justice Administration
Program: State Attorneys
Service/Budget Entity: First – Twentieth Judicial Circuits
Measure: Number of misdemeanor filings
Action:
 Performance Assessment of Outcome Measure Revision of Measure
 Performance Assessment of Output Measure Deletion of Measure
 Adjustment of GAA Performance Standards

Approved Standard	Actual Performance Results	Difference (Over/Under)	Percentage Difference
792,393	560,361	(232,032)	(29.28%)

Factors Accounting for the Difference:

Internal Factors (check all that apply):

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

Explanation:

External Factors (check all that apply):

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

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

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

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

Recommendations:

EXHIBIT III - ASSESSMENT OF PERFORMANCE MEASURES

Department: Justice Administration
Program: State Attorneys
Service/Budget Entity: First – Twentieth Judicial Circuits
Measure: Number of felony filings
Action:
 Performance Assessment of Outcome Measure Revision of Measure
 Performance Assessment of Output Measure Deletion of Measure
 Adjustment of GAA Performance Standards

Approved Standard	Actual Performance Results	Difference (Over/Under)	Percentage Difference
219,752	169,557	(50,195)	(22.84%)

Factors Accounting for the Difference:

Internal Factors (check all that apply):

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

Explanation:

External Factors (check all that apply):

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

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

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

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

Recommendations:

EXHIBIT III - ASSESSMENT OF PERFORMANCE MEASURES

Department: Justice Administration	
Program: State Attorneys	
Service/Budget Entity: First – Twentieth Judicial Circuits	
Measure: Number of juvenile filings	
Action:	
<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
83,616	42,710	(40,906)	(48.92%)

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	315	(22,076)	(98.59%)

Factors Accounting for the Difference:

Internal Factors (check all that apply):

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

Explanation:

External Factors (check all that apply):

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

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

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

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

Recommendations:

EXHIBIT III - ASSESSMENT OF PERFORMANCE MEASURES

Department: Justice Administration	
Program: State Attorneys	
Service/Budget Entity: First – Twentieth Judicial Circuits	
Measure: Number of Baker Act hearings	
Action:	
<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	23,658	(4,028)	(14.55%)

Factors Accounting for the Difference:

Internal Factors (check all that apply):

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

Explanation:

External Factors (check all that apply):

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

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

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

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

Recommendations:

EXHIBIT III – ASSESSMENT OF PERFORMANCE MEASURES

Department: Justice Administration
Program: Public Defenders
Service/Budget Entity: Public Defenders, Circuits 1-20
Measure: Annual attorney turnover rate

Action:

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

Approved Standard	Actual Performance Results	Difference (Over/Under)	Percentage Difference
18%	16.53%	(1.47)	(8.17%)

Factors Accounting for the Difference:

Internal Factors (check all that apply):

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

Explanation:

External Factors (check all that apply):

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

Explanation: There has been little change in the turnover rate. The slight decrease may signal that, not as many trial attorneys are not seeking employment outside the Public Defenders' Offices.

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

- Training Technology
 Personnel Other (Identify)

Recommendations:

EXHIBIT III – ASSESSMENT OF PERFORMANCE MEASURES

Department: Justice Administration
Program: Public Defenders
Service/Budget Entity: Public Defenders, Circuits 1-20
Measure: Number of cases per attorney

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
547	475	(72)	(13.16%)

Factors Accounting for the Difference:

Internal Factors (check all that apply):

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

Explanation: The number of offenses and arrests reported to FDLE are down, based on FDLE Uniform Crime Reports. This has resulted in fewer filings by the State Attorneys and fewer cases assigned to Public Defenders.

External Factors (check all that apply):

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

Explanation: Although Public Defenders were appointed to fewer cases and clients than projected, offices remain inadequately funded as a result of years of excessive caseloads combined with increased penalties for criminal offenses and without corresponding increases in staffing levels.

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

- Training Technology
 Personnel Other (Identify)

Recommendations:

Adequate staffing must be provided.

EXHIBIT III – ASSESSMENT OF PERFORMANCE MEASURES

Department: Justice Administration
Program: Public Defender, Appellate
Service/Budget Entity: Public Defender, Appellate
Measure: Annual attorney turnover rate

Action:

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

Approved Standard	Actual Performance Results	Difference (Over/Under)	Percentage Difference
8%	10.22%	2.22%	27.75%

Factors Accounting for the Difference:

Internal Factors (check all that apply):

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

Explanation:

External Factors (check all that apply):

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

Explanation: The increase in turnover rates may signal that more appellate attorneys are seeking employment outside the Public Defender’s Office or long time appellate attorneys are retiring.

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

- Training Technology
 Personnel Other (Identify)

Recommendations:

.

EXHIBIT III – ASSESSMENT OF PERFORMANCE MEASURES

Department: Justice Administration
Program: Public Defender, Appellate
Service/Budget Entity: Public Defender, Appellate
Measure: Number of appointed cases

Action:

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

Approved Standard	Actual Performance Results	Difference (Over/Under)	Percentage Difference
5,643	4,683	(960)	(17.01%)

Factors Accounting for the Difference:

Internal Factors (check all that apply):

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

Explanation: Public Defenders were appointed to fewer trial cases and clients and disposed of fewer cases than projected, which lead to a decrease in appeals filed.

External Factors (check all that apply):

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

Explanation:

Although Public Defenders were appointed to fewer cases and clients than projected, offices remain inadequately funded as a result of years of excessive caseloads combined with increased penalties for criminal offenses and without corresponding increases in staffing levels.

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

- Training Technology
 Personnel Other (Identify)

Recommendations:

EXHIBIT III – ASSESSMENT OF PERFORMANCE MEASURES

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

Action:

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

Approved Standard	Actual Performance Results	Difference (Over/Under)	Percentage Difference
5,810	4,671	(1139)	(19.60%)

Factors Accounting for the Difference:

Internal Factors (check all that apply):

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

Explanation: Public Defenders were appointed to fewer trial cases and clients and disposed of fewer cases than projected, which lead to a decrease in appeals filed.

External Factors (check all that apply):

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

Explanation: Although Public Defenders were appointed to fewer cases and clients than projected, offices remain inadequately funded as a result of years of excessive caseloads.

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

- Training Technology
 Personnel Other (Identify)

Recommendations:

EXHIBIT III – ASSESSMENT OF PERFORMANCE MEASURES

Department: Justice Administration
Program: Public Defender, Appellate
Service/Budget Entity: Public Defender, Appellate
Measure: Number of cases closed

Action:

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

Approved Standard	Actual Performance Results	Difference (Over/Under)	Percentage Difference
5,612	4764	(848)	(15.11%)

Factors Accounting for the Difference:

Internal Factors (check all that apply):

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

Explanation:

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: Although Public Defenders closed fewer cases than projected, offices remain inadequately funded as a result of years of excessive caseloads.

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

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

Recommendations:

Adequate staffing is needed.

EXHIBIT III - ASSESSMENT OF PERFORMANCE MEASURE

Department: Justice Administration	
Program: Capital Collateral Regional Counsels	
Service/Budget Entity: Legal Representation	
Measure: Number of signed death warrants	
Action:	
<input type="checkbox"/> Performance Assessment of <u>Outcome</u> Measure	<input type="checkbox"/> Revision of Measure
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Performance Assessment of <u>Output</u> Measure	<input type="checkbox"/> Deletion of Measure
<input type="checkbox"/> Adjustment of GAA Performance Standards	

Approved Standard	Actual Performance Results	Difference (Over/Under)	Percentage Difference
5	1	(4)	(80%)

Factors Accounting for the Difference:

Internal Factors (check all that apply):

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

Explanation:

External Factors (check all that apply):

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

Explanation: The Governor signed one Death Warrant to CCRCs in FY 2014-15.

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: Justice Administration	
Program: Capital Collateral Regional Counsels	
Service/Budget Entity: Legal Representation	
Measure: Percent of cases in which post-conviction motion, post conviction appeal, federal habeas corpus motion or federal appeal is timely filed, without extension	
Action:	
<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
90%	86%	(4)	(4.44%)

Factors Accounting for the Difference:

Internal Factors (check all that apply):

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

Explanation: As cases proceed through the later stages of the post-conviction process, there will be an occasional need to work past a standard timeline. A higher percentage of Capital Collateral Regional Counsel, Middle and South cases are their later stages.

External Factors (check all that apply):

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

Explanation:

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

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

Recommendations:

EXHIBIT III - ASSESSMENT OF PERFORMANCE MEASURES

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

Exhibit III is not applicable

Action:

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

Approved Standard	Actual Performance Results	Difference (Over/Under)	Percentage Difference

Factors Accounting for the Difference:

Internal Factors (check all that apply):

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

Explanation:

External Factors (check all that apply):

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

Explanation:

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

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

Recommendations:

JUSTICE ADMINISTRATION



***LONG RANGE PROGRAM PLAN
FISCAL YEARS 2016-17 THROUGH 2020-21***

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 public records requests

Action (check one):

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

Data Sources and Methodology:

Requests for public records are received via phone request or email and each request is tracked in a database.

Validity:

All requests for public records are forwarded to the JAC Public Records Coordinator who is responsible for gathering the information and responding to the requestor.

Reliability:

The number of requests received are tracked and maintained in a public records database and can be queried.

**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:

Fee requests are tracked in 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 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:

Court ordered fees are tracked in the Justice Administrative Commission's Court Appointed Attorney Tracking System (CAATS) and Hearings Database.

Validity:

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

Reliability:

The number of transactions processed in CAATS and motions requesting fees above statutory caps maintained in the Hearings Database can be queried each year.

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

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

Action (check one):

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

Data Sources and Methodology:

Court ordered fees and payments are tracked in the Justice Administrative Commission's Court Appointed Attorney Tracking System (CAATS) and Hearings Database.

Validity:

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

Reliability:

The amount of court ordered fees 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 budget, payroll, disbursement, revenue and financial report transactions processed

Action (check one):

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

Data Sources and Methodology:

Budget, disbursement, revenue and financial report transactions are recorded in FLAIR (Florida Accounting Information Resource) and payroll transactions are recorded in People First.

Validity:

Budget transactions (TR 20 allotments, TR 21 approved budget & TR 22 releases) are processed through FLAIR, disbursement transactions (TR 51 unencumbered disbursements, TR 70 encumbered disbursements) are processed through FLAIR, revenue transactions (TR 30 direct deposit receipts, TR 96 JT receipts) are processed through FLAIR, financial reporting transactions (TR 10 general accounting) are processed through FLAIR and payroll transactions are processed through People First.

Reliability:

The number of transactions processed in these systems 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:

Court appointed invoices are tracked in 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.
- NA

Data Sources and Methodology:

Validity:

Reliability:

**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: All Performance Measures

Action (check one):

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

Data Sources and Methodology:

Validity:

Reliability:

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

Department: _____ **Justice Administration** _____
Program: _____ **Public Defenders** _____
Service/Budget Entity: _____ **Public Defenders** _____
Measure: All Performance Measures

Action (check one):

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

Data Sources and Methodology:

Validity:

Reliability:

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

Department: _____ **Justice Administration** _____
Program: _____ **Public Defender, Appellate** _____
Service/Budget Entity: _____ **Public Defender, Appellate** _____
Measure: All Performance Measures

Action (check one):

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

Data Sources and Methodology:

Validity:

Reliability:

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

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

Capital Collateral Regional Counsel (CCRC) attorney records clearly indicate when filings occur within 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: Criminal Conflict and Civil Regional Councils
Service/Budget Entity: Regional Conflict Councils, 1st – 5th Regions
Measure: Annual percentage of briefs filed within 30 days of receipt of record.

Action (check one):

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

Data Sources and Methodology:

The Criminal Conflict and Civil Regional 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, 1st – 5th Regions
Measure: Annual percentage of misdemeanor cases closed within 120 days of appointment.

Action (check one):

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

Data Sources and Methodology:

The Criminal Conflict and Civil Regional 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, 1st – 5th 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 2016-17 THROUGH 2020-21***

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

EXHIBIT V – ASSOCIATED ACTIVITIES CONTRIBUTING TO PERFORMANCE MEASURES

Measure Number	Approved Performance Measures for FY 2015-16		Associated Activities Title
1	Percent of invoices processed within statutory time frames		Executive Direction Pass Through - Due Process and Court Appointed Costs Pass Through – Transfer to Department of Management Services
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 – Transfer to Department of Management Services Pass Through – JAC Qualified Transportation Benefits Program
7	Number of court appointed attorney and due process vendor invoices		Pass Through – Due Process and Court Appointed Costs

EXHIBIT V - ASSOCIATED ACTIVITIES CONTRIBUTING TO PERFORMANCE MEASURES

Measure Number	Approved Performance Measures for FY 2015-16		Associated Activities Title (From Exhibit VI)
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	Average number of active volunteers		Represent children

EXHIBIT V - ASSOCIATED ACTIVITIES CONTRIBUTING TO PERFORMANCE MEASURES

Measure Number	Approved Performance Measures for FY 2015-16		Associated Activity Titles (From Exhibit VI)
1	Percent of offenders who qualify for enhanced sentencing for whom state attorneys requested enhanced sentencing		Felony Prosecution Services Misdemeanor Prosecution Services Juvenile Prosecution Services Child Support Enforcement Services Civil Action Services
2	Total number of dispositions		Felony Prosecution Services Misdemeanor Prosecution Services Juvenile Prosecution Services Child Support Enforcement Services Civil Action Services
3	Number of dispositions by trial verdicts		Felony Prosecution Services Misdemeanor Prosecution Services Juvenile Prosecution Services Child Support Enforcement Services Civil Action Services
4	Number of dispositions by pleas		Felony Prosecution Services Misdemeanor Prosecution Services Juvenile Prosecution Services Child Support Enforcement Services Civil Action Services
5	Number of dispositions by non trial		Felony Prosecution Services Misdemeanor Prosecution Services Juvenile Prosecution Services Child Support Enforcement Services Civil Action Services

EXHIBIT V - ASSOCIATED ACTIVITIES CONTRIBUTING TO PERFORMANCE MEASURES

Measure Number	Approved Performance Measures for FY 2015-16		Associated Activity Titles (From Exhibit VI)
6	Number of dispositions by otherwise		Felony Prosecution Services Misdemeanor Prosecution Services Juvenile Prosecution Services Child Support Enforcement Services Civil Action Services
7	Percent of dispositions by trial verdicts		Felony Prosecution Services Misdemeanor Prosecution Services Juvenile Prosecution Services Child Support Enforcement Services Civil Action Services
8	Percent of dispositions by pleas		Felony Prosecution Services Misdemeanor Prosecution Services Juvenile Prosecution Services Child Support Enforcement Services Civil Action Services
9	Percent of dispositions by non trial		Felony Prosecution Services Misdemeanor Prosecution Services Juvenile Prosecution Services Child Support Enforcement Services Civil Action Services
10	Percent of dispositions by otherwise		Felony Prosecution Services Misdemeanor Prosecution Services Juvenile Prosecution Services Child Support Enforcement Services Civil Action Services

EXHIBIT V - ASSOCIATED ACTIVITIES CONTRIBUTING TO PERFORMANCE MEASURES

Measure Number	Approved Performance Measures for FY 2015-16		Associated Activity Titles (From Exhibit VI)
11	Number of substantiated Bar grievances filed annually		Felony Prosecution Services Misdemeanor Prosecution Services Juvenile Prosecution Services Child Support Enforcement Services Civil Action Services
12	Number of misdemeanor criminal case referrals		Misdemeanor Prosecution Services
13	Number of felony criminal case referrals		Felony Prosecution Services
14	Number of juvenile criminal case referrals		Juvenile Prosecution Services
15	Number of misdemeanor filings		Misdemeanor Prosecution Services
16	Number of felony filings		Felony Prosecution Services
17	Number of juvenile filings		Juvenile Prosecution Services
18	Number of post conviction relief responses or Habeas Corpus responses		Felony Prosecution Services Misdemeanor Prosecution Services Juvenile Prosecution Services Child Support Enforcement Services Civil Action Services
19	Number of sexual predator civil commitment proceedings		Civil Action Services
20	Number of Baker Act hearings		Civil Action Services

EXHIBIT V - ASSOCIATED ACTIVITIES CONTRIBUTING TO PERFORMANCE MEASURES

Measure Number	Approved Performance Measures for FY 2015-16		Associated Activity Titles (From Exhibit VI)
1	Annual attorney turnover rate		Civil Trial Indigent Defense Civil Investigative Services Criminal Trial Indigent Defense Criminal Investigative Services
2	Number of appointed & re-opened cases		Civil Trial Indigent Defense Civil Investigative Services Criminal Trial Indigent Defense Criminal Investigative Services
3	Number of cases closed		Civil Trial Indigent Defense Civil Investigative Services Criminal Trial Indigent Defense Criminal Investigative Services
4	Number of clients represented		Civil Trial Indigent Defense Civil Investigative Services Criminal Trial Indigent Defense Criminal Investigative Services
5	Number of cases per attorney		Civil Trial Indigent Defense Civil Investigative Services Criminal Trial Indigent Defense Criminal Investigative Services

EXHIBIT V - ASSOCIATED ACTIVITIES CONTRIBUTING TO PERFORMANCE MEASURES

Measure Number	Approved Performance Measures for FY 2015-16		Associated Activity Titles (From Exhibit VI)
1	Annual attorney turnover rates		Indigent Appellate Defense
2	Percent of appeals resolved		Indigent Appellate Defense
3	Number of appointed cases		Indigent Appellate Defense
4	Number of clients represented		Indigent Appellate Defense
5	Number of briefs filed		Indigent Appellate Defense
6	Number of writs filed		Indigent Appellate Defense
7	Number of cases closed		Indigent Appellate Defense

EXHIBIT V - ASSOCIATED ACTIVITIES CONTRIBUTING TO PERFORMANCE MEASURES

Measure Number	Approved Performance Measures for FY 2015-16		Associated Activities Title (From Exhibit VI)
1	Percent of cases in which post-conviction motion, post-conviction appeal, federal habeas corpus motion or federal appeal is timely filed, without extension		Death Penalty Legal Counsel
			Death Row Case Preparation
2	Number of substantiated Bar grievances filed annually		Death Penalty Legal Counsel
3	Number of appellate actions		Death Penalty Legal Counsel
			Death Row Case Preparation
4	Number of 3.850/3.851 filings		Death Penalty Legal Counsel
			Death Row Case Preparation
5	Number of signed death warrants		Death Penalty Legal Counsel
			Death Row Case Preparation
6	Number of court decisions to release a death row inmate, grant a new trial, grant a new sentencing hearing, or grant other appeals		Death Penalty Legal Counsel
			Death Row Case Preparation
7	Number of active cases		Death Penalty Legal Counsel
			Death Row Case Preparation
8	Number of evidentiary hearings		Death Penalty Legal Counsel
			Death Row Case Preparation
9	Number of federal court actions		Death Penalty Legal Counsel
			Death Row Case Preparation

EXHIBIT V ASSOCIATED ACTIVITIES CONTRIBUTING TO PERFORMANCE MEASURES

Measure Number	Proposed Performance Measures for FY 2015-16		Approved Associated Activity Titles (From Exhibit VI)
1	“New Measure” – Annual percentage of appellate briefs filed within 30 days of receipt of record.		Regional Counsel Workload
2	“New Measure” – Annual percentage of misdemeanor cases closed within 120 days of appointment.		Regional Counsel Workload
3	“New Measure” – In cases where there is an adjudication or a withhold of adjudication, the percentage of case plans approved by the court within 90 days of appointment.		Regional Counsel Workload

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