



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

Justice Administration

Tallahassee, Florida

September 30, 2016

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

**Brad King, Chair**  
*State Attorney*  
**Diamond R. Litty**  
*Public Defender*  
**Jerry Hill**  
*State Attorney*  
**Kathleen A. Smith**  
*Public Defender*

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 2017-18 through Fiscal Year 2021-22. The internet website address that provides the link to the LRPP on the Florida Fiscal Portal is [www.justiceadmin.org](http://www.justiceadmin.org). 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. "Rip" Colvin, Jr.  
Executive Director

Enclosure

The Justice Administrative Commission administratively serves the offices of State Attorney, Public Defender, Capital Collateral Regional Counsel, the Statewide Guardian ad Litem Program, and the Criminal Conflict and Civil Regional Counsel; and provides compliance and financial review of court appointed attorney due process costs.



**Justice Administrative Commission  
Long-Range Program Plan  
FY 2017-2018 through 2021-2022**

**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 2017-2018 through 2021-2022

September 30, 2016

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 2017-18 THROUGH FY 2021-2022**

**September 30, 2016**

**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 2017-2018 THROUGH FY 2021-2022**

**September 30, 2016**

**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 2017-2018 THROUGH FY 2021-2022**

**September 30, 2016**

**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 2017-18 through 2021-22**

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

**September 30, 2016**



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

**LONG RANGE PROGRAM PLAN  
FY 2017-2018 THROUGH FY 2021-2022**

**September 30, 2016**

**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:** *“I am for the Child”*

**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.*

**Priority #2 Goal:**

*Advocate for timely permanency for children.*

---

## AGENCY MISSION AND GOALS

---

### STATEWIDE GUARDIAN AD LITEM

**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.

<b>Baseline/ Year 2015-16</b>	<b>FY 2017-18</b>	<b>FY 2018-19</b>	<b>FY 2019-20</b>	<b>FY 2020-21</b>	<b>FY 2021-22</b>
353,381	356,915	360,484	364,089	367,730	371,407

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

<b>Baseline/ Year 2015-16</b>	<b>FY 2017-18</b>	<b>FY 2018-19</b>	<b>FY 2019-20</b>	<b>FY 2020-21</b>	<b>FY 2021-22</b>
66,366	67,029	67,699	68,375	69,058	69,748

**STATEWIDE GUARDIAN AD LITEM**

**PRIMARY SERVICE OUTCOMES**

Outcome: Average number of children represented.

<b>Baseline</b>					
<b>FY 2015/16</b>	<b>FY2017/18</b>	<b>FY2018/19</b>	<b>FY2019/20</b>	<b>FY2020/21</b>	<b>FY2021/22</b>
<b>25,091</b>	<b>26,500</b>	<b>26,500</b>	<b>26,500</b>	<b>26,500</b>	<b>26,500</b>

Explanation: This number is the average of 12 months of data, from July 1 of one year to June 30 of the next. The Guardian ad Litem Program is charged by Florida Statute, Ch. 39, to represent all children in the dependency system. The Program is currently funded to represent all children in out-of-home care, and children ages 0 to 3 years in their own homes (in-home care). These two groups total an estimated 24,345 children, although this number fluctuates daily depending upon removals and discharges. [The number of children in out of home care on June 30, 2016 is 22,948. There are an estimated 1,397 children under age 3 years in in-home care.] In addition to fluctuations in numbers, 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 GAL Program has historically sought increasing resources to serve ever larger segments of all dependent children, however, the focus for resource requests for FY 17-18 will be stabilization of the workforce, which has been affected significantly by low salaries and high caseloads leading to high turnover.

---

**AGENCY SERVICE OUTCOMES AND  
PERFORMANCE PROJECTION TABLES**

---

**STATEWIDE GUARDIAN AD LITEM**

For FY 15-16, People First data indicate turnover in critical classes that have client contact and court responsibility, as well as volunteer recruitment and supervision, as follows:

- Child Advocate Manager – 50.3%
- Sr. Child Advocate Manager – 20.9%
- Volunteer Recruiter – 64.5%
- Program Attorney – 61%
- Sr. Program Attorney – 37.8%

The GAL Program has implemented a variety of no- or low-cost options to promote retention among critical classes. In addition, the Program has submitted a request for funding in FY 17-18 to support salary adjustments in the five key classes of positions listed above. Slowing staff attrition and reducing the lost productivity that results from turnover is essential before additional resources are requested for staff expansion.

Once the high turnover is addressed, the Program will then address a key policy decision with the Office of the Governor and the Legislature; that is, 1) whether the Program should request additional resources to pursue representation of all children in the dependency system (out-of-home and all in their own home), or 2) work with the Legislature to limit its statutory mandate to representing only children in out-of-home care and children 0 to 3 years living in their own homes (as current funding levels permit).

Outcome: Average percent of children represented.

<u>Baseline</u>					
<b>FY 2015/16</b>	<b>FY2017/18</b>	<b>FY2018/19</b>	<b>FY2019/20</b>	<b>FY2020/21</b>	<b>FY2021/22</b>
<b>80.1%</b>	<b>80%</b>	<b>80%</b>	<b>80%</b>	<b>80%</b>	<b>80%</b>

Explanation: The percentages reflected in the chart above show the proportion of ALL children in the dependency system served and projected to be served by the GAL Program. The percent of all dependent children represented has declined due to the dramatic increase in children coming into the dependency system. Additionally, in certain highly populated areas of the state, time to permanency has increased, preventing the GAL Program from closing cases and reducing the average number of children represented. The Guardian ad Litem Program is currently funded to serve children in out-of-home care, and the children under age 3 in their own homes (in-home care).

---

**AGENCY SERVICE OUTCOMES AND  
PERFORMANCE PROJECTION TABLES**

---

**STATEWIDE GUARDIAN AD LITEM**

Outcome: Percent of cases closed with Permanency Goal achieved

<b>Baseline</b>					
<b>FY 2015/16</b>	<b>FY2017/18</b>	<b>FY2018/19</b>	<b>FY2019/20</b>	<b>FY2020/21</b>	<b>FY2021/22</b>
<b>64%</b>	<b>70%</b>	<b>70%</b>	<b>70%</b>	<b>70%</b>	<b>70%</b>

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. In certain highly populated areas of the state, time to permanency has increased, preventing the GAL Program from closing cases and reducing the average number of children represented.

Outcome: Number of new volunteers certified as a GAL.

<b>Baseline</b>					
<b>FY 2015/16</b>	<b>FY2017/18</b>	<b>FY2018/19</b>	<b>FY2019/20</b>	<b>FY2020/21</b>	<b>FY2021/22</b>
<b>2,448</b>	<b>1,464</b>	<b>1,464</b>	<b>1,464</b>	<b>1,464</b>	<b>1,464</b>

Explanation: The Program topped its goal of more than 10,000 volunteers statewide in February 2016. The GAL Program is limited by funding on the number of staff to recruit, train and oversee the work of volunteers in the Program.

Outcome: Average number of volunteers.

<b>Baseline</b>					
<b>FY 2015/16</b>	<b>FY2017/18</b>	<b>FY2018/19</b>	<b>FY2019/20</b>	<b>FY2020/21</b>	<b>FY2021/22</b>
<b>10,945</b>	<b>5,057</b>	<b>5,057</b>	<b>5,057</b>	<b>5,057</b>	<b>5,057</b>

Explanation: This number includes a small proportion of volunteers who do not carry a caseload but rather perform administrative and office work for the Program. The Program's goal is to maintain at least 10,000 volunteers at all times.

---

**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.

	<b>FY 2000-01 BASELINE</b>	<b>FY 2017-18</b>	<b>FY 2018-19</b>	<b>FY 2019-20</b>	<b>FY 2020-21</b>	<b>FY 2021-22</b>
Offenders who qualify for enhanced sentence for whom the State requests enhanced sentence	146	180	180	180	180	180
Offenders for whom the Court orders enhanced sentencing	91	180	180	180	180	180
Percentage of offenders sentenced by the Court to an enhanced sentence	62%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

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

<b>FY 2000-01 BASELINE</b>	<b>FY 2017-18</b>	<b>FY 2018-19</b>	<b>FY 2019-20</b>	<b>FY 2020-21</b>	<b>FY 2021-22</b>
15.6%	11.04%	11.04%	11.04%	11.04%	11.04%

**STATE ATTORNEY, SECOND JUDICIAL CIRCUIT**

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

	<b>FY 2000-01 BASELINE</b>	<b>FY 2017-18</b>	<b>FY 2018-19</b>	<b>FY 2019-20</b>	<b>FY 2020-21</b>	<b>FY 2021-22</b>
Offenders who qualify for enhanced sentence for whom the State requests enhanced sentence	152	100	100	100	100	100
Offenders for whom the Court orders enhanced Sentencing	53	100	100	100	100	100
Percentage of offenders sentenced by the Court to an enhanced sentence	37%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

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

<b>FY 2000-01 BASELINE</b>	<b>FY 2017-18</b>	<b>FY 2018-19</b>	<b>FY 2019-20</b>	<b>FY 2020-21</b>	<b>FY 2021-22</b>
33.4%	30%	20%	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.

	<b>FY 2000-01 BASELINE</b>	<b>FY 2017-18</b>	<b>FY 2018-19</b>	<b>FY 2019-20</b>	<b>FY 2020-21</b>	<b>FY 2021-22</b>
Offenders who qualify for enhanced sentence for whom the State requests enhanced sentence	7	25	26	28	30	33
Offenders for whom the Court orders enhanced sentencing	6	10	11	12	13	14
Percentage of offenders sentenced by the Court to an enhanced sentence	85.7%	40%	40%	42%	43%	43%

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

<b>FY 2000-01 BASELINE</b>	<b>FY 2017-18</b>	<b>FY 2018-19</b>	<b>FY 2019-20</b>	<b>FY 2020-21</b>	<b>FY 2021-22</b>
13.6%	20%	17%	15%	14%	14%

**STATE ATTORNEY, FOURTH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT**

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

	<b>FY 2000-01 BASELINE</b>	<b>FY 2017-18</b>	<b>FY 2018-19</b>	<b>FY 2019-20</b>	<b>FY 2020-21</b>	<b>FY 2021-22</b>
Offenders who qualify for enhanced sentence for whom the State requests enhanced Sentence	303	950	950	950	950	950
Offenders for whom the Court orders enhanced Sentencing	300	902	902	902	902	902
Percentage of offenders sentenced by the Court to an enhanced sentence	99%	95%	95%	95%	95%	95%

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

<b>FY 2000-01 BASELINE</b>	<b>FY 2017-18</b>	<b>FY 2018-19</b>	<b>FY 2019-20</b>	<b>FY 2020-21</b>	<b>FY 2021-22</b>
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.

	<b>FY 2001-02 BASELINE</b>	<b>FY 2017-18</b>	<b>FY 2018-19</b>	<b>FY 2019-20</b>	<b>FY 2020-21</b>	<b>FY 2021-22</b>
Offenders who qualify for enhanced sentence for whom the State requests enhanced sentence	320	397	408	420	432	443
Offenders for whom the Court orders enhanced sentencing	168	391	402	414	426	438
Percentage of offenders sentenced by the Court to an enhanced sentence	52.50%	98.49%	100%	100%	100%	100%

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

<b>FY 2000-01 BASELINE</b>	<b>FY 2017-18</b>	<b>FY 2018-19</b>	<b>FY 2019-20</b>	<b>FY 2020-21</b>	<b>FY 2021-22</b>
20.59%	12.75%	12.36%	11.98%	11.86%	11.82%

**STATE ATTORNEY, SIXTH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT**

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

	<b>FY 2000-01 BASELINE</b>	<b>FY 2017-18</b>	<b>FY 2018-19</b>	<b>FY 2019-20</b>	<b>FY 2020-21</b>	<b>FY 2021-22</b>
Offenders who qualify for enhanced sentence for whom the State requests enhanced sentence	508	500	475	450	425	400
Offenders for whom the Court orders enhanced Sentencing	356	500	475	450	425	400
Percentage of offenders sentenced by the Court to an enhanced sentence	38%	40%	41%	42%	43%	44%

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

<b>FY 2000-01 BASELINE</b>	<b>FY 2017-18</b>	<b>FY 2018-19</b>	<b>FY 2019-20</b>	<b>FY 2020-21</b>	<b>FY 2021-22</b>
15%	14%	15%	14%	13%	12%

---

**AGENCY SERVICE OUTCOMES AND  
PERFORMANCE PROJECTION TABLES**

---

**STATE ATTORNEY, SEVENTH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT**

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

	<b>FY 2000-01 BASELINE</b>	<b>FY 2017-18</b>	<b>FY 2018-19</b>	<b>FY 2019-20</b>	<b>FY 2020-21</b>	<b>FY 2021-22</b>
Offenders who qualify for enhanced sentence for whom the State requests enhanced sentence	223	238	238	238	238	238
Offenders for whom the Court orders enhanced Sentencing	90	214	214	214	214	214
Percentage of offenders sentenced by the Court to an enhanced sentence	40.5%	90%	90%	90%	90%	90%

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

<b>FY 2000-01 BASELINE</b>	<b>FY 2017-18</b>	<b>FY 2018-19</b>	<b>FY 2019-20</b>	<b>FY 2020-21</b>	<b>FY 2021-22</b>
19.8%	20%	20%	20%	20%	20%

**STATE ATTORNEY, EIGHTH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT**

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

	<b>FY 2014-15 BASELINE</b>	<b>FY 2017-18</b>	<b>FY 2018-19</b>	<b>FY 2019-20</b>	<b>FY 2020-21</b>	<b>FY 2021-22</b>
Offenders who qualify for enhanced sentence for whom the State requests enhanced sentence	54	90	90	90	90	90

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

<b>FY 2014-15 BASELINE</b>	<b>FY 2017-18</b>	<b>FY 2018-19</b>	<b>FY 2019-20</b>	<b>FY 2020-21</b>	<b>FY 2021-22</b>
8.25%	13%	13%	13%	13%	13%



---

**AGENCY SERVICE OUTCOMES AND  
PERFORMANCE PROJECTION TABLES**

---

**STATE ATTORNEY, NINTH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT**

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

	<b>FY 2000-01 BASELINE</b>	<b>FY 2017-18</b>	<b>FY 2018-19</b>	<b>FY 2019-20</b>	<b>FY 2020-21</b>	<b>FY 2021-22</b>
Offenders who qualify for enhanced sentence for whom the State requests enhanced sentence	634	370	370	370	370	370

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

<b>FY 2000-01 BASELINE</b>	<b>FY 2017-18</b>	<b>FY 2018-19</b>	<b>FY 2019-20</b>	<b>FY 2020-21</b>	<b>FY 2021-22</b>
28.14%	20%	17%	17%	17%	17%

**STATE ATTORNEY, TENTH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT**

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

	<b>FY 2000-01 BASELINE</b>	<b>FY 2017-18</b>	<b>FY 2018-19</b>	<b>FY 2019-20</b>	<b>FY 2020-21</b>	<b>FY 2021-22</b>
Offenders who qualify for enhanced sentence for whom the State requests enhanced sentence	465	2000	2000	2000	2000	2000
Offenders for whom the Court orders enhanced sentencing	220	2000	2000	2000	2000	2000
Percentage of offenders sentenced by the Court to an enhanced sentence	47.3%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

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

<b>FY 2000-01 BASELINE</b>	<b>FY 2017-18</b>	<b>FY 2018-19</b>	<b>FY 2019-20</b>	<b>FY 2020-21</b>	<b>FY 2021-22</b>
16.7%	20%	20%	20%	20%	20%

---

**AGENCY SERVICE OUTCOMES AND  
PERFORMANCE PROJECTION TABLES**

---

**STATE ATTORNEY, ELEVENTH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT**

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

	<b>FY 2000-01 BASELINE</b>	<b>FY 2017-18</b>	<b>FY 2018-19</b>	<b>FY 2019-20</b>	<b>FY 2020-21</b>	<b>FY 2021-22</b>
Offenders who qualify for enhanced sentence for whom the State requests enhanced sentence	3,683	646	678	712	747	785

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

<b>FY 2000-01 BASELINE</b>	<b>FY 2017-18</b>	<b>FY 2018-19</b>	<b>FY 2019-20</b>	<b>FY 2020-21</b>	<b>FY 2021-22</b>
21.85%	17.11%	18%	18%	18%	18%

**STATE ATTORNEY, TWELFTH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT**

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

	<b>FY 2000-01 BASELINE</b>	<b>FY 2017-18</b>	<b>FY 2018-19</b>	<b>FY 2019-20</b>	<b>FY 2020-21</b>	<b>FY 2021-22</b>
Offenders who qualify for enhanced sentence for whom the State requests enhanced sentence	210	27	28	29	30	31
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%	37%	39%	41%	43%	45%

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

<b>FY 2000-01 BASELINE</b>	<b>FY 2017-18</b>	<b>FY 2018-19</b>	<b>FY 2019-20</b>	<b>FY 2020-21</b>	<b>FY 2021-22</b>
20.5%	17.57%	16%	15%	14%	13%

---

**AGENCY SERVICE OUTCOMES AND  
PERFORMANCE PROJECTION TABLES**

---

**STATE ATTORNEY, THIRTEENTH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT**

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

	<b>FY 2000-01 BASELINE</b>	<b>FY 2017-18</b>	<b>FY 2018-19</b>	<b>FY 2019-20</b>	<b>FY 2020-21</b>	<b>FY 2021-22</b>
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%	97.5%	97.5%	97.5%	97.5%	97.5%

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

<b>FY 2000-01 BASELINE</b>	<b>FY 2017-18</b>	<b>FY 2018-19</b>	<b>FY 2019-20</b>	<b>FY 2020-21</b>	<b>FY 2021-22</b>
27.91%	17.53%	18.00%	18.50%	19.00%	19.50%

**STATE ATTORNEY, FOURTEENTH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT**

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

	<b>FY 2000-01 BASELINE</b>	<b>FY 2017-18</b>	<b>FY 2018-19</b>	<b>FY 2019-20</b>	<b>FY 2020-21</b>	<b>FY 2021-22</b>
Offenders who qualify for enhanced sentence for whom the State requests enhanced sentence	13	55	55	55	55	55
Offenders for whom the Court orders enhanced sentencing	11	44	44	44	44	44
Percentage of offenders sentenced by the Court to an enhanced sentence	87%	80%	80%	80%	80%	80%

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

<b>FY 2000-01 BASELINE</b>	<b>FY 2017-18</b>	<b>FY 2018-19</b>	<b>FY 2019-20</b>	<b>FY 2020-21</b>	<b>FY 2021-22</b>
12.50%	20%	20%	20%	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.

	<b>FY 2000-01 BASELINE</b>	<b>FY 2017-18</b>	<b>FY 2018-19</b>	<b>FY 2019-20</b>	<b>FY 2020-21</b>	<b>FY 2021-22</b>
Offenders who qualify for enhanced sentence for whom the State requests enhanced sentence	313	280	280	285	290	290
Offenders for whom the Court orders enhanced Sentencing	164	220	220	256	261	290
Percentage of offenders sentenced by the Court to an enhanced sentence	52.40%	79%	79%	90%	90%	100%

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

<b>FY 2000-01 BASELINE</b>	<b>FY 2017-18</b>	<b>FY 2018-19</b>	<b>FY 2019-20</b>	<b>FY 2020-21</b>	<b>FY 2021-22</b>
24.15%	12%	12%	12%	11%	11%

**STATE ATTORNEY, SIXTEENTH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT**

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

	<b>FY 2000-01 BASELINE</b>	<b>FY 2017-18</b>	<b>FY 2018-19</b>	<b>FY 2019-20</b>	<b>FY 2020-21</b>	<b>FY 2021-22</b>
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.

<b>FY 2000-01 BASELINE</b>	<b>FY 2017-18</b>	<b>FY 2018-19</b>	<b>FY 2019-20</b>	<b>FY 2020-21</b>	<b>FY 2021-22</b>
77%	25%	20%	20%	20%	20%

---

**AGENCY SERVICE OUTCOMES AND  
PERFORMANCE PROJECTION TABLES**

---

**STATE ATTORNEY, SEVENTEENTH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT**

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

	<b>FY 2001-02 BASELINE</b>	<b>FY 2017-18</b>	<b>FY 2018-19</b>	<b>FY 2019-20</b>	<b>FY 2020-21</b>	<b>FY 2021-22</b>
Offenders who qualify for enhanced sentence for whom the State requests enhanced sentence	849	1086	1086	1086	1086	1086
Offenders for whom the Court orders enhanced sentencing	501	511	511	511	511	511
Percentage of offenders sentenced by the Court to an enhanced sentence	59%	47.1%	47.1%	47.1%	47.1%	47.1%

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

<b>FY 2000-01 BASELINE</b>	<b>FY 2017-18</b>	<b>FY 2018-19</b>	<b>FY 2019-20</b>	<b>FY 2020-21</b>	<b>FY 2021-22</b>
18%	10.40%	10.40%	10.40%	10.40%	10.40%

**STATE ATTORNEY, EIGHTEENTH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT**

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

	<b>FY 2000-01 BASELINE</b>	<b>FY 2017-18</b>	<b>FY 2018-19</b>	<b>FY 2019-20</b>	<b>FY 2020-21</b>	<b>FY 2021-22</b>
Offenders who qualify for enhanced sentence for whom the State requests enhanced sentence	121	128	128	128	128	128
Offenders for whom the Court orders enhanced sentencing	97	128	128	128	128	128
Percentage of offenders sentenced by the Court to an enhanced sentence	80.2%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

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

<b>FY 2000-01 BASELINE</b>	<b>FY 2017-18</b>	<b>FY 2018-19</b>	<b>FY 2019-20</b>	<b>FY 2020-21</b>	<b>FY 2021-22</b>
27.20%	13.28%	13.28%	13.28%	13.28%	13.28%

---

**AGENCY SERVICE OUTCOMES AND  
PERFORMANCE PROJECTION TABLES**

---

**STATE ATTORNEY, NINETEENTH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT**

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

	<b>FY 2000-01 BASELINE</b>	<b>FY 2017-18</b>	<b>FY 2018-19</b>	<b>FY 2019-20</b>	<b>FY 2020-21</b>	<b>FY 2021-22</b>
Offenders who qualify for enhanced sentence for whom the State requests enhanced sentence	69	19	20	21	22	23
Offenders for whom the Court orders enhanced Sentencing	28	19	20	21	22	23
Percentage of offenders sentenced by the Court to an enhanced sentence	41%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

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

<b>FY 2000-01 BASELINE</b>	<b>FY 2017-18</b>	<b>FY 2018-19</b>	<b>FY 2019-20</b>	<b>FY 2020-21</b>	<b>FY 2021-22</b>
17.67%	5.40%	5.40%	5.40%	5.40%	5.40%

**STATE ATTORNEY, TWENTIETH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT**

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

	<b>FY 2000-01 BASELINE</b>	<b>FY 2017-18</b>	<b>FY 2018-19</b>	<b>FY 2019-20</b>	<b>FY 2020-21</b>	<b>FY 2021-22</b>
Offenders who qualify for enhanced sentence for whom the State requests enhanced sentence	257	218	218	218	218	218
Offenders for whom the Court orders enhanced sentencing	105	193	193	193	193	193
Percentage of offenders sentenced by the Court to an enhanced sentence	41.00%	88.53%	88.53%	88.53%	88.53%	88.53%

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

<b>FY 2000-01 BASELINE</b>	<b>FY 2017-18</b>	<b>FY 2018-19</b>	<b>FY 2019-20</b>	<b>FY 2020-21</b>	<b>FY 2021-22</b>
27.00%	8.13%	8.13%	8.13%	8.13%	8.13%

---

**AGENCY SERVICE OUTCOMES AND  
PERFORMANCE PROJECTION TABLES**

---

**PUBLIC DEFENDER**

**PUBLIC DEFENDER, FIRST THROUGH TWENTIETH CIRCUITS**

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

<b>FY 2014-15 BASELINE</b>	<b>FY 2017-18</b>	<b>FY 2018-19</b>	<b>FY 2019-20</b>	<b>FY 2020-21</b>	<b>FY 2021-22</b>
16.53%	14.16%	13.45%	12.78%	12.14%	11.53%

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

<b>FY 2014-15 BASELINE</b>	<b>FY 2017-18</b>	<b>FY 2018-19</b>	<b>FY 2019-20</b>	<b>FY 2020-21</b>	<b>FY 2021-22</b>
475	407	387	368	350	333

**PUBLIC DEFENDER APPELLATE**

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

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

<b>FY 2014-15 BASELINE</b>	<b>FY 2017-18</b>	<b>FY 2018-19</b>	<b>FY 2019-20</b>	<b>FY 2020-21</b>	<b>FY 2021-22</b>
10.22%	8.76%	8.32%	7.9%	7.5%	7.46%

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

<b>FY 2014-15 BASELINE</b>	<b>FY 2017-18</b>	<b>FY 2018-19</b>	<b>FY 2019-20</b>	<b>FY 2020-21</b>	<b>FY 2021-22</b>
101.73%	117.77%	123.66%	129.84%	136.33%	143.15%

---

**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.

<b>BASELINE YEAR Restarted: 2014</b>	<b>FY2017-18</b>	<b>FY2018-19</b>	<b>FY2019-20</b>	<b>FY2020-21</b>	<b>FY2021-22</b>
	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>5</b>

**CAPITAL COLLATERAL REGIONAL COUNSEL, MIDDLE REGION**

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

<b>FY2000-01 BASELINE</b>	<b>FY2017-18</b>	<b>FY2018-19</b>	<b>FY2019-20</b>	<b>FY2020-21</b>	<b>FY2021-22</b>
<b>3</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>5</b>

**CAPITAL COLLATERAL REGIONAL COUNSEL, SOUTH REGION**

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

<b>FY2000-01 BASELINE</b>	<b>FY2017-18</b>	<b>FY2018-19</b>	<b>FY2019-20</b>	<b>FY2020-21</b>	<b>FY2021-22</b>
<b>3</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>5</b>



---

**AGENCY SERVICE OUTCOMES AND  
PERFORMANCE PROJECTION TABLES**

---

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

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

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

<b>FY 2014-15 BASELINE</b>	<b>FY 2017-18</b>	<b>FY 2018-19</b>	<b>FY 2019-20</b>	<b>FY 2020-21</b>	<b>FY 2021-22</b>
20%	3%	8%	13%	18%	23%

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

<b>FY 2014-15 BASELINE</b>	<b>FY 2017-18</b>	<b>FY 2018-19</b>	<b>FY 2019-20</b>	<b>FY 2020-21</b>	<b>FY 2021-22</b>
95%	97%	100%	100%	100%	100%

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

<b>FY 2014-15 BASELINE</b>	<b>FY 2017-18</b>	<b>FY 2018-19</b>	<b>FY 2019-20</b>	<b>FY 2020-21</b>	<b>FY 2021-22</b>
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.

<b>FY 2014-15 BASELINE</b>	<b>FY 2017-18</b>	<b>FY 2018-19</b>	<b>FY 2019-20</b>	<b>FY 2020-21</b>	<b>FY 2021-22</b>
35%	44%	47%	50%	53%	56%

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

<b>FY 2014-15 BASELINE</b>	<b>FY 2017-18</b>	<b>FY 2018-19</b>	<b>FY 2019-20</b>	<b>FY 2020-21</b>	<b>FY 2021-22</b>
76%	82%	83%	84%	85%	86%

---

**AGENCY SERVICE OUTCOMES AND  
PERFORMANCE PROJECTION TABLES**

---

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

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

<b>FY 2014-15 BASELINE</b>	<b>FY 2017-18</b>	<b>FY 2018-19</b>	<b>FY 2019-20</b>	<b>FY 2020-21</b>	<b>FY 2021-22</b>
51%	55%	57%	59%	61%	63%

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

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

<b>FY 2015-16 BASELINE</b>	<b>FY 2017-18</b>	<b>FY 2018-19</b>	<b>FY 2019-20</b>	<b>FY 2020-21</b>	<b>FY 2021-22</b>
N/A	25%	25%	25%	25%	25%

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

<b>FY 2015-16 BASELINE</b>	<b>FY 2017-18</b>	<b>FY 2018-19</b>	<b>FY 2019-20</b>	<b>FY 2020-21</b>	<b>FY 2021-22</b>
80%	75%	75%	75%	75%	75%

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

<b>FY 2015-16 BASELINE</b>	<b>FY 2017-18</b>	<b>FY 2018-19</b>	<b>FY 2019-20</b>	<b>FY 2020-21</b>	<b>FY 2021-22</b>
35%	27%	30%	30%	30%	30%

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

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

<b>FY 2014-15 BASELINE</b>	<b>FY 2017-18</b>	<b>FY 2018-19</b>	<b>FY 2019-20</b>	<b>FY 2020-21</b>	<b>FY 2021-22</b>
33%	41%	33%	33%	33%	33%

---

**AGENCY SERVICE OUTCOMES AND  
PERFORMANCE PROJECTION TABLES**

---

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

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

<b>FY 2014-15 BASELINE</b>	<b>FY 2017-18</b>	<b>FY 2018-19</b>	<b>FY 2019-20</b>	<b>FY 2020-21</b>	<b>FY 2021-22</b>
84%	63%	84%	84%	84%	84%

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

<b>FY 2014-15 BASELINE</b>	<b>FY 2017-18</b>	<b>FY 2018-19</b>	<b>FY 2019-20</b>	<b>FY 2020-21</b>	<b>FY 2021-22</b>
N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

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

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

<b>FY 2015-16 BASELINE</b>	<b>FY 2017-18</b>	<b>FY 2018-19</b>	<b>FY 2019-20</b>	<b>FY 2020-21</b>	<b>FY 2021-22</b>
51%	56%	61%	66%	71%	76%

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

<b>FY 2015-16 BASELINE</b>	<b>FY 2017-18</b>	<b>FY 2018-19</b>	<b>FY 2019-20</b>	<b>FY 2020-21</b>	<b>FY 2021-22</b>
69%	72%	75%	78%	81%	84%

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

<b>FY 2015-16 BASELINE</b>	<b>FY 2017-18</b>	<b>FY 2018-19</b>	<b>FY 2019-20</b>	<b>FY 2020-21</b>	<b>FY 2021-22</b>
77%	79%	81%	83%	85%	87%

---

## LINKAGE TO GOVERNOR'S PRIORITIES

---

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

- World Class Education

#### **STATEWIDE GUARDIAN AD LITEM PROGRAM (GAL)**

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

Since the 2009 passage of legislation allowing the appointment of “surrogate parents” to act in the place of a parent in educational decision making and in safeguarding a child’s rights under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act, volunteer Guardians ad Litem have increasingly volunteered and been trained to serve as “educational advocates” for the children they represent. Between 2012 and 2016, the percentage of GAL volunteers serving as educational advocates has risen from 12% to 41%. This means that almost half of all GAL volunteers across the state represent the best interests of their assigned children not only in the court room and within the child welfare system, but also in the educational setting, where many of these children struggle due to multiple moves, learning or physical disabilities and mental health issues.

Research shows that children with GAL volunteers are more likely to pass all courses, less likely to have poor conduct in school, and less likely to be expelled than those who do not. In addition, these children have better controls against deviant behavior, they value achievement, and work out conflict better with others. [University of Houston and Child Advocates, Inc., “Making a Difference in the Lives of Abused and Neglected Children: Research on the Effectiveness of a Court-Appointed Advocate Program”]

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

- Focus on Job Growth and Retention

#### **STATE ATTORNEYS**

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

#### **PUBLIC DEFENDERS**

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

---

## LINKAGE TO GOVERNOR'S PRIORITIES

---

### **PUBLIC DEFENDERS APPELLATE**

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

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

### **PRIORITY #3 – PUBLIC SAFETY**

- Protect our communities by ensuring the health, welfare and safety of our citizens

### **JUSTICE ADMINISTRATIVE COMMISSION**

**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 PROGRAM (GAL)**

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

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

Children with a GAL volunteer are half as likely to enter foster care, and if they do enter foster care, they spend less time in care. They receive more services and are also more likely to have a positive view of the future. If parental rights are terminated, they are more likely to be adopted. [John Poertner and Allan Press, "Who Represents the Best Interests of Children in Court?" *Child Welfare* 69(6): p.537-549, 1990.] [Gene C. Siegel, et. Al., Arizona CASA effectiveness study. Report to the Arizona Supreme Courts, Administrative Office of the Courts, Dependent Children's Division, by the National Center for Juvenile Justice, 2001] [Susan M. Proffitt, et al., Guardian ad Litem Project. Child Advocates Inc., 1999.]

---

## LINKAGE TO GOVERNOR'S PRIORITIES

---

### STATEWIDE GUARDIAN AD LITEM PROGRAM (GAL)

[Michael Powell and Vernon Speshock, Arizona Court Appointed Special Advocate (CASA Program), Internal Assessment, 1996] [Ohio CASA/GAL Study Committee Report] [University of Houston and Child Advocates, Inc., “Making a Difference in the Lives of Abused and Neglected Children: Research on the Effectiveness of a Court-Appointed Advocate Program”] [Office of the Inspector General, Audit Report 07-04, December 2006]

### STATE ATTORNEYS

**Goal #1:** *To pursue justice through prosecution of all criminal cases presented to the State Attorney over the next five years in an effective, efficient and timely manner.*

### CAPITAL COLLATERAL REGIONAL COUNSELS (CCRC)

Public safety includes protecting Floridian’s Constitutional rights to a fair, equitable and timely judicial process especially when the death penalty is involved. The CCRCs are statutorily created to provide post-conviction legal services to limit the potential for any citizen to be wrongfully convicted and sentenced to death and to meet Supreme Court requirements for competent death penalty reviews. This helps the State of Florida and its judiciary system assure the public that its United States’ and Florida Constitutional protections are safe.

---

## 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 as a county-based program under the jurisdiction of the courts, to represent the best interests of abused, abandoned or neglected children involved in dependency proceedings. 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. There is a single statewide program with local offices in each of Florida's 20 judicial circuits.

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, 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 the GAL's basic mission to represent all dependent children, as defined within Chapter 39 of the Florida Statutes. 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/>

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 dependent children.

---

## TRENDS AND CONDITIONS STATEMENT

---

### STATEWIDE GUARDIAN AD LITEM (continued)

The Guardian ad Litem Program grew significantly between FY 2012/13 and FY 2015/16, 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. Additional funding was appropriated by the Legislature for FY 16/17 to enable the program to represent all children in out of home care and children ages 0 to 3 years in their own homes (in-home care).

The GAL Program has historically sought increasing resources to serve ever larger segments of all dependent children, however, the focus for resource requests for FY 17-18 will be stabilization of the workforce, which has been affected significantly by low salaries and high caseloads leading to high turnover.

The numbers of dependent children in out-of-home care in Florida increased by 31% between June 2013 and June 2016. The increase in the number of children entering care places a strain on resources across all child welfare agencies as well as the courts, and lengthens time to permanency. Dependency court judges exercise sole authority over appointment of children to the Program and on June 30, 2016, the Program was appointed to 25,189 children.

For FY 15-16, People First data indicate turnover in critical classes that have client contact and court responsibility, as well as volunteer recruitment and supervision, as follows:

- Child Advocate Manager – 50.3%
- Sr. Child Advocate Manager – 20.9%
- Volunteer Recruiter – 64.5%
- Program Attorney – 61%
- Sr. Program Attorney – 37.8%

The GAL Program has implemented a variety of no- and low-cost options to improve retention among critical classes, and has submitted a request for funding in FY 17-18 to support salary adjustments in the five key classes of positions listed above. Slowing staff attrition and reducing the lost productivity that results from turnover is essential before additional resources are requested for staff expansion and representation of additional children.

Once the high turnover is addressed, the program will then address a key policy decision with the Office of the Governor and the Legislature; that is, 1) whether the program should request additional resources to pursue representation of all children in the dependency system (out-of-home and all in their own home), or 2) work with the Legislature to limit its statutory mandate to representing only children in out-of-home care and children 0 to 3 years living in their own homes (as current funding levels permit).



---

## **TRENDS AND CONDITIONS STATEMENT**

---

### **STATE ATTORNEYS**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The true test of any agency will be to meet the goals and objectives within the constraints of state and county appropriations and budgetary restrictions. State Attorneys' duties and obligations have not only increased in the criminal justice system but have now extended into the Civil Courts. This has resulted in an increased workload of serious and sophisticated criminal and civil referrals and especially in the demand for public records. We anticipate an even greater increased workload with the introduction of Body Cam Video and Audio recordings that require review and redaction. This will apply to case review and public record demands.

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

---

## TRENDS AND CONDITIONS STATEMENT

---

### STATE ATTORNEYS (continued)

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

### CHANGES THAT REQUIRE LEGISLATIVE ACTION

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

### PUBLIC DEFENDERS

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

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

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

**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.

---

## TRENDS AND CONDITIONS STATEMENT

---

### **PUBLIC DEFENDER APPELLATE**

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

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

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

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

1. Provide quality representation to all appointed clients.
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.

### **Collateral Regional Counsels (CCRCs) Focus Areas, Trends and Conditions and Issues**

#### **2016-17 LONG RANGE PROGRAM PLAN (LRPP) INFORMATION ALERT**

The United States Supreme Court's decision in *Hurst v. Florida* may impact the status of previously decided death penalty decisions in Florida. Ruling clarifications have yet to be received and may have an impact on each of the CCRC's workload / output numbers; especially evidentiary hearings. When ruling details and their impacts are known, output measures could be dramatically affected in 2016-17 and future years.

If there are major changes to this LRPP submission required after details are known, the CCRCs will provide the Legislature and Governor with amendment(s).

#### **CCRC STATUTORY RESPONSIBILITIES:**

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

---

## TRENDS AND CONDITIONS STATEMENT

---

### CAPITAL COLLATERAL REGIONAL COUNSELS (continued)

#### 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 CCRC's LONG RANGE PROGRAM PLAN STORY

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

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

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

**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.**

---

## TRENDS AND CONDITIONS STATEMENT

---

### CAPITAL COLLATERAL REGIONAL COUNSELS (continued)

#### **CCRC FOCUS AREA 1**

#### **Meet State & Federal Court Expectations for Competent Representation in Post-Conviction/Death Penalty Cases**

### **1.0 Trends and Conditions**

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

The Florida Supreme Court initially reviews all death sentences imposed in Florida's Circuit Courts for any indication of an overt mistake during the trial and/or sentencing. In the past, this initial review resulted in a reversal of the trial or death sentence in over 75%

of the cases. Recently, the Florida Supreme Court's reversal rate 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. The Florida Supreme Court trend will likely result in many more cases being assigned to the CCRCs over the next five years.

On January 12, 2016 the United States Supreme Court ruled that Florida's death penalty system is unconstitutional under the Sixth Amendment because it permits a judge-rather than a jury- to find the facts necessary for the imposition of a death sentence. The Hurst case has caused major delays in court activity throughout the state while the Florida Supreme Court determines the implications of the Hurst v. Florida decision.

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

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

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

---

## TRENDS AND CONDITIONS STATEMENT

---

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

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 10% occur in FY 2016-17 (an over \$ 1 million cut for North, Middle and South CCRC regions) , it is likely that 7 lawyers and 5 investigators will be laid off (about 20 % of CCRC case staffing) as well as cutting hundreds of thousands in case support cost spending. The loss of highly experienced and competent lawyers and investigators reduces the ability of the CCRC offices to handle workloads. This would substantially affect particularly the recently recreated CCRC North's ability to accept new cases. Also, a 10% budget cut would severely compromise CCRCs ability to meet stringent Supreme Court post-conviction legal representation standards. Potentially, *Hurst v. Florida* will add significant workloads in 2016-17 after the Florida Supreme Court provides guidance on the U.S. Supreme Court's ruling.

Additionally, the resulting loss of positions would require the CCRCs to reduce their caseload(s) by 10%. The costs per case are unlimited when conducted by Registry lawyers. The Florida Auditor General's Office 2007 report concluded that the CCRCs are more cost effective than Legal Registry lawyers who also are assigned post-conviction cases to represent affected parties in state and federal courts. If the CCRC budgets are cut, cases will be reassigned to the Registry. This is likely to cost more than would have been the case if cuts in CCRC budgets had not occurred allowing the CCRCs to continue the case work.

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

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

CCRCs have made excellent progress in attracting, training and keeping post-conviction law experienced attorneys. Currently, 69% of all CCRC attorneys have more than 5 years' experience in post-conviction litigation. Additionally, over 50% of CCRC lead attorneys have greater than 15 years of post-conviction 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.

---

**TRENDS AND CONDITIONS STATEMENT**

---

**CAPITAL COLLATERAL REGIONAL COUNSELS (continued)**

**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 181. In 2015-16 the CCRC caseload was 195. In 2016-17, the estimated caseload increases to 202.

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.

As of January 2016, the U.S. Supreme Court’s opinion in *Hurst v. Florida* introduces further complications in estimating future CCRC case related workloads. Until the Florida Supreme Court determines the impacts of *Hurst*, new death warrants and evidentiary hearings for cases in the system will be delayed.

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**

	<b>in 2011-12</b>	<b>in 2012-13</b>	<b>in 2013-14</b>	<b>in 2014-15</b>	<b>in 2015-16</b>	<b>in 2016-17</b>
Death warrants:	4	2	3	1	1	4

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

For each warrant, two teams of lawyers and investigators are 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.

---

## TRENDS AND CONDITIONS STATEMENT

---

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

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

The Timely Justice Act, which became effective July 1, 2013, 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. CCRC faces the potential for extensive warrant litigation unprecedented in recent years. Such litigation could occur in concurrently multiple cases, effect many CCRC attorneys and staff, and have broad implications for CCRC resources and capabilities. The number of warrants signed by the Governor has increased dramatically. 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. The trend in the foreseeable future is for warrant signings to increase significantly and 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 post-conviction cases. The re-establishment of CCRC North effective in 2014 resulted in their 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 post-conviction 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 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 post-conviction legal process and CCRCs respond. CCRCs can request delays, but rarely do so as they try to keep the cases progressing to meet Legislative / Gubernatorial expectations. Over the last fiscal years, over 90% of all motions filed by CCRCs were timely filed without requests for extensions. However, the latest Auditor General's Report to the Legislature comparing CCRCs with private Registry indicated that the private registry attorneys only filed 63% of their motions in a timely fashion.



---

## TRENDS AND CONDITIONS STATEMENT

---

### CAPITAL COLLATERAL REGIONAL COUNSELS (continued)

#### **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 the Circuit courts should grant evidentiary hearings on a broad range of factual claims, leading to a significant increase in the number of issues raised by CCRCs that are granted an evidentiary hearing.

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

During the 2013 Session, the Florida Legislature enacted the Timely Justice Act which addressed a variety of substantive changes in capital post-conviction 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 post-conviction process and to make recommendations as to whether Rule 3.851, or any other rule, should be amended to “improve the efficiency of capital post-conviction 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 post-conviction rules which had 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 post-conviction case. These requirements will have the effect of adding additional years of experience before an attorney can handle capital post-conviction matters as a lead attorney despite the fact that most CCRC attorneys have much broader experience in capital post-conviction 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 to post-conviction counsel. The Court further ruled that post-conviction counsel is permitted to view and inspect the files, but any copies provided by the trial counsel to the post-conviction counsel would be at collateral counsel’s expense.

---

## TRENDS AND CONDITIONS STATEMENT

---

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

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.

### **External Issue 2.4 - The Hurst v. Florida ruling details will impact CCRC workloads.**

The impact on past, current and future case proceedings will be better known after the Florida Supreme Court issues an opinion on the implications of Hurst . The workloads have increased since the ruling in January 2016 because more pleadings were filed in both the trial and appellate courts. Due to the need to preserve clients' rights, additional litigation ensued. In light of Hurst, workloads may increase significantly in FY 2016-17.

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

The CCRCs have case teams (1 lead attorney, 1 second attorney, 1 investigator and ½ support position). The number of cases per lead attorney was 12 in FY 2009-10. In FY 2011-12 it was 13. In FY 2014-15 it was 10 and in 2015-16 it was 9. 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.

---

## TRENDS AND CONDITIONS STATEMENT

---

### CAPITAL COLLATERAL REGIONAL COUNSELS (continued)

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

### 3.0 Trends and Conditions

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

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

1. Average cost per case for legal representation: \$ 15,117 (CCRC) vs. \$ 18,579 Registry.
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 (in 2016-17: 202) (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 and 3 in 2013-14 and 1 in 2014-15. With the passage of the Timely Justice Act, many more are possible annually in the future. The average death warrant response costs CCRC between \$20,000 - \$ 30,000.

---

## TRENDS AND CONDITIONS STATEMENT

---

### CAPITAL COLLATERAL REGIONAL COUNSELS (continued)

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

#### 4.0 Trends and Conditions

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

---

## TRENDS AND CONDITIONS STATEMENT

---

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

#### **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.

Additionally, the problem continues of death row cases represented by private attorneys being sent to the CCRCs by Circuit Courts for representation following the signing of a death warrant. A CCRC normally has no familiarization with the case assigned and must devote more staff than average to provide as competent representation as possible in the time allowed.

#### **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 combined, had 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. In 2015-16 as the CCRC North was getting re-established, the three counsels had a combined 40 lawyers, 18 investigators, 8 case processing staff and 8 administrative staff.

CCRCs have become quite efficient in their work efforts as verified by the 2007 Auditor General's Report, and confirmed by the Florida Supreme Court in its written comments to the Florida Legislature praising the CCRC model in 2007 through 2015.

---

## TRENDS AND CONDITIONS STATEMENT

---

### CAPITAL COLLATERAL REGIONAL COUNSELS (continued)

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

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

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

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

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.

#### **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:

---

## TRENDS AND CONDITIONS STATEMENT

---

### CAPITAL COLLATERAL REGIONAL COUNSELS (continued)

#### 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

The CCRCs will continue implementing additional budget management capacities that will allow “unit cost” efficiency analysis and performance evaluations. In FY 2016-17, CCRCs plan to further develop their “unit costing” budget systems to build in automatic management reports that will document cost trends, help identify efficiency improvement candidates and better manage scarce resources needed to perform effectively and meet judicial system standards.

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

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

---

## TRENDS AND CONDITIONS STATEMENT

---

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

#### **Internal Issue 5.3 - Information Technology**

During the 2015-16 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 27-40 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 on-going.

### **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.



---

## TRENDS AND CONDITIONS STATEMENT

---

### OFFICES OF CRIMINAL CONFLICT AND CIVIL REGIONAL COUNSELS

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

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

- Clients subject to the Tuberculosis Control Act pursuant to Chapter 392, Florida Statutes
- Clients subject to the developmental disabilities law pursuant to Chapter 393, Florida Statutes
- Clients subject to the Florida Mental Health Act (“Baker Act”) proceedings regarding involuntary civil commitment pursuant to Chapter 394, Florida Statutes, when the public defender has a conflict
- Clients subject to involuntary commitment under the Jimmy Ryce Act, pursuant to Chapter 394, Part 5, Florida Statutes
- Clients subject to a Hal S. Marchman Alcohol and Other Drug Services Act of 1993 (“Marchman Act”) pursuant to Chapter 397, Florida Statutes
- Clients subject to involuntary civil commitment and removal of civil rights pursuant to the Adjust Protective Services Act, Chapter 415, Florida Statutes
- Clients requiring removal of disabilities of nonage pursuant to Chapter 743, Florida Statutes
- Clients subject to involuntary civil commitment and removal of civil rights pursuant to the Florida Guardianship Law, Chapter 744, Florida Statutes
- Children and families in need of state services pursuant to Chapter 984, Florida Statutes

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

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 2017-18 THROUGH 2021-22***

***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

<b>Approved Performance Measures for FY 2016-17</b>	<b>Approved Prior Year Standard FY 2015-16</b>	<b>Actual Prior Year Standard FY 2015-16</b>	<b>Approved Standards for FY 2016-17</b>	<b>Requested Standards for FY 2017-18</b>
Percent of invoices processed within statutory time frames	95.00%	97.31%	95.00%	95.00%
Number of public records requests	150	465	150	400
Number of cases where registry lawyers request fees above the statutory caps	2,500	1,079	2,500	1,000
Number of cases where the court orders fees above the statutory caps	2,000	969	2,000	1,000
Total amount of excess fees awarded by the court per circuit	\$6,000,000	\$11,579,577	\$6,000,000	\$11,500,000
Number of budget, payroll, disbursement, revenue and financial report transactions processed	375,000	353,381	375,000	360,000
Number of court-appointed attorney and due process vendor invoices processed	65,000	66,366	65,000	65,000

**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

<b>Approved Performance Measures for FY2016-17</b>	<b>Approved Prior Year Standard FY 2015-16</b>	<b>Actual Prior Year Standard FY 2015-16</b>	<b>Approved Standards for FY 2016-17</b>	<b>Requested Standards for FY 2017-18</b>
Average number of children represented	26,500	25,091	26,500	26,500
Average percent of children represented	80%	80.1%	80%	80%
Percent of cases closed with Permanency Goal achieved	70%	64%	70%	70%
Number of new volunteers certified as a GAL	1,464	2,448	1,464	1,464
Average number of active volunteers	5,057	10,945	5,057	5,057

**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 2016-17	Approved Prior Year Standards FY 2015-16	Actual Prior Year Standards FY 2015-16
Percent of offenders who qualify for enhanced sentencing for whom state attorneys requested enhanced sentencing	92.00%	89.74%
Total number of dispositions	1,339,035	1,039,621
Number of dispositions by trial verdicts	14,004	17,407
Number of dispositions by pleas	727,246	516,053
Number of dispositions by non trial	157,990	196,036
Number of dispositions by otherwise	439,795	310,125
Percent of dispositions by trial verdicts	1.05%	1.67%
Percent of dispositions by pleas	54.30%	49.64%
Percent of dispositions by non trial	11.80%	18.86%
Percent of dispositions by otherwise	32.84%	29.83%
Number of substantiated Bar grievances filed annually	0	0
Number of misdemeanor criminal case referrals	1,183,597	715,959
Number of felony criminal case referrals	490,965	370,648
Number of juvenile criminal case referrals	197,338	102,057
Number of misdemeanor filings	792,393	505,708
Number of felony filings	219,752	173,010
Number of juvenile filings	83,616	39,782
Number of post conviction relief responses or Habeas Corpus responses	22,391	8,473
Number of sexual predator civil commitment proceedings	TBD	4,009
Number of Baker Act hearings	27,686	26,089

**EXHIBIT II - PERFORMANCE MEASURES AND STANDARDS**

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

Program: State Attorney, 1 <sup>st</sup> Judicial Circuit	Code: 21.50.01.00	
Service/Budget Entity: State Attorney, 1 <sup>st</sup> Judicial Circuit	Code: 21.50.01.00	

Approved Performance Measures for FY 2016-17	Approved Prior Year Standard FY 2015-16	Actual Prior Year Standard FY 2015-16	Approved Standards for FY 2016-17	Requested Standards for FY 2017-18
Percent of offenders who qualify for enhanced sentencing for whom state attorneys requested enhanced sentencing		100%		100%
Total number of dispositions		42,290		42,290
Number of dispositions by trial verdicts		323		323
Number of dispositions by pleas		26,733		26,733
Number of dispositions by non trial		3,423		3,423
Number of dispositions by otherwise		11,811		11,811
Percent of dispositions by trial verdicts		2%		2%
Percent of dispositions by pleas		62%		62%
Percent of dispositions by non trial		8%		8%
Percent of dispositions by otherwise		28%		28%
Number of substantiated Bar grievances filed annually		0		0
Number of misdemeanor criminal case referrals		29,076		29,076
Number of felony criminal case referrals		17,605		17,605
Number of juvenile criminal case referrals		5,291		5,291
Number of misdemeanor filings		15,274		15,274
Number of felony filings		11,271		11,271
Number of juvenile filings		2,211		2,211
Number of post conviction relief responses or Habeas Corpus responses		418		418
Number of sexual predator civil commitment proceedings		215		215
Number of Baker Act hearings		1,486		1,486

**EXHIBIT II - PERFORMANCE MEASURES AND STANDARDS**

Department: Justice Administration Department No.: 21

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

Approved Performance Measures for FY 2016-17	Approved Prior Year Standard FY 2015-16	Actual Prior Year Standard FY 2015-16	Approved Standards for FY 2016-17	Requested Standards for FY 2017-18
Percent of offenders who qualify for enhanced sentencing for whom state attorneys requested enhanced sentencing		100%		100%
Total number of dispositions		20,500		21,200
Number of dispositions by trial verdicts		334		350
Number of dispositions by pleas		9,403		9,750
Number of dispositions by non trial		1,789		1,600
Number of dispositions by otherwise		8,974		9,500
Percent of dispositions by trial verdicts		1.63%		1.50%
Percent of dispositions by pleas		45.87%		47.00%
Percent of dispositions by non trial		8.73%		7.50%
Percent of dispositions by otherwise		43.78%		44.00%
Number of substantiated Bar grievances filed annually		0		0
Number of misdemeanor criminal case referrals		10,202		11,500
Number of felony criminal case referrals		6,519		6,400
Number of juvenile criminal case referrals		1,267		1,300
Number of misdemeanor filings		7,379		8,000
Number of felony filings		4,582		4,400
Number of juvenile filings		984		960
Number of post conviction relief responses or Habeas Corpus responses		115		75
Number of sexual predator civil commitment proceedings		135		120
Number of Baker Act hearings		43		35

**EXHIBIT II - PERFORMANCE MEASURES AND STANDARDS**

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

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

Approved Performance Measures for FY 2016-17	Approved Prior Year Standard FY 2015-16	Actual Prior Year Standard FY 2015-16	Approved Standards for FY 2016-17	Requested Standards for FY 2017-18
Percent of offenders who qualify for enhanced sentencing for whom state attorneys requested enhanced sentencing		22.4%		22.4%
Total number of dispositions		15,715		15,715
Number of dispositions by trial verdicts		78		78
Number of dispositions by pleas		6,202		6,202
Number of dispositions by non trial		2,333		2,333
Number of dispositions by otherwise		7,102		7,102
Percent of dispositions by trial verdicts		0.5%		0.5%
Percent of dispositions by pleas		39.5%		39.5%
Percent of dispositions by non trial		14.8%		14.8%
Percent of dispositions by otherwise		45.2%		45.2%
Number of substantiated Bar grievances filed annually		0		0
Number of misdemeanor criminal case referrals		7,004		7,004
Number of felony criminal case referrals		3,772		3,772
Number of juvenile criminal case referrals		753		753
Number of misdemeanor filings		5,713		5,713
Number of felony filings		2,816		2,816
Number of juvenile filings		537		537
Number of post conviction relief responses or Habeas Corpus responses		8		8
Number of sexual predator civil commitment proceedings		0		0
Number of Baker Act hearings		490		490



**EXHIBIT II - PERFORMANCE MEASURES AND STANDARDS**

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

Program: State Attorney, 4 <sup>th</sup> Judicial Circuit	Code: 21.50.04.00	
Service/Budget Entity: State Attorney, 4 <sup>th</sup> Judicial Circuit	Code: 21.50.04.00	

Approved Performance Measures for FY 2016-17	Approved Prior Year Standard FY 2015-16	Actual Prior Year Standard FY 2015-16	Approved Standards for FY 2016-17	Requested Standards for FY 2017-18
Percent of offenders who qualify for enhanced sentencing for whom state attorneys requested enhanced sentencing		75.26%		75.26%
Total number of dispositions		12,832		12,832
Number of dispositions by trial verdicts		188		188
Number of dispositions by pleas		8,241		8,241
Number of dispositions by non trial		434		434
Number of dispositions by otherwise		3,969		3,969
Percent of dispositions by trial verdicts		1.47%		1.47%
Percent of dispositions by pleas		64.22%		64.22%
Percent of dispositions by non trial		3.38%		3.38%
Percent of dispositions by otherwise		30.93%		30.93%
Number of substantiated Bar grievances filed annually		0		0
Number of misdemeanor criminal case referrals		42,329		42,329
Number of felony criminal case referrals		17,227		17,227
Number of juvenile criminal case referrals		4,093		4,093
Number of misdemeanor filings		38,047		38,047
Number of felony filings		9,075		9,075
Number of juvenile filings		2,438		2,438
Number of post conviction relief responses or Habeas Corpus responses		223		223
Number of sexual predator civil commitment proceedings		372		372
Number of Baker Act hearings		468		468

**EXHIBIT II - PERFORMANCE MEASURES AND STANDARDS**

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

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

Approved Performance Measures for FY 2016-17	Approved Prior Year Standard FY 2015-16	Actual Prior Year Standard FY 2015-16	Approved Standards for FY 2016-17	Requested Standards for FY 2017-18
Percent of offenders who qualify for enhanced sentencing for whom state attorneys requested enhanced sentencing		98.49%		98.49%
Total number of dispositions		38,599		38,599
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		5,998		5,998
Percent of dispositions by trial verdicts		61%		61%
Percent of dispositions by pleas		62%		62%
Percent of dispositions by non trial		3.41%		3.41%
Percent of dispositions by otherwise		33.98%		33.98%
Number of substantiated Bar grievances filed annually		0		0
Number of misdemeanor criminal case referrals		25,264		25,264
Number of felony criminal case referrals		19,072		19,072
Number of juvenile criminal case referrals		4,124		4,124
Number of misdemeanor filings		12,958		12,958
Number of felony filings		8,965		8,965
Number of juvenile filings		1,803		1,803
Number of post conviction relief responses or Habeas Corpus responses		468		468
Number of sexual predator civil commitment proceedings		214		214
Number of Baker Act hearings		490		490

**EXHIBIT II - PERFORMANCE MEASURES AND STANDARDS**

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

Program: State Attorney, 6 <sup>th</sup> Judicial Circuit	Code: 21.50.06.00	
Service/Budget Entity: State Attorney, 6 <sup>th</sup> Judicial Circuit	Code: 21.50.06.00	

Approved Performance Measures for FY 2016-17	Approved Prior Year Standard FY 2015-16	Actual Prior Year Standard FY 2015-16	Approved Standards for FY 2016-17	Requested Standards for FY 2017-18
Percent of offenders who qualify for enhanced sentencing for whom state attorneys requested enhanced sentencing		100%		100%
Total number of dispositions		73,421		75,000
Number of dispositions by trial verdicts		436		500
Number of dispositions by pleas		47,534		50,000
Number of dispositions by non trial		2,868		3,000
Number of dispositions by otherwise		22,583		21,500
Percent of dispositions by trial verdicts		0.6%		0.7%
Percent of dispositions by pleas		64.7%		66.7%
Percent of dispositions by non trial		3.9%		4.0%
Percent of dispositions by otherwise		30.7%		28.7%
Number of substantiated Bar grievances filed annually		0		0
Number of misdemeanor criminal case referrals		59,032		60,000
Number of felony criminal case referrals		30,994		32,000
Number of juvenile criminal case referrals		8,081		8,200
Number of misdemeanor filings		30,094		35,000
Number of felony filings		15,389		16,000
Number of juvenile filings		3,693		4,000
Number of post conviction relief responses or Habeas Corpus responses		45		50
Number of sexual predator civil commitment proceedings		263		300
Number of Baker Act hearings		1,812		1,900

**EXHIBIT II - PERFORMANCE MEASURES AND STANDARDS**

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

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

Approved Performance Measures for FY 2016-17	Approved Prior Year Standard FY 2015-16	Actual Prior Year Standard FY 2015-16	Approved Standards for FY 2016-17	Requested Standards for FY 2017-18
Percent of offenders who qualify for enhanced sentencing for whom state attorneys requested enhanced sentencing		99.58%		100.00%
Total number of dispositions		48,204		48,000
Number of dispositions by trial verdicts		224		250
Number of dispositions by pleas		24,839		24,000
Number of dispositions by non trial		6,857		6,800
Number of dispositions by otherwise		16,284		16,000
Percent of dispositions by trial verdicts		0.46%		1.00%
Percent of dispositions by pleas		51.52%		50.00%
Percent of dispositions by non trial		14.22%		14.00%
Percent of dispositions by otherwise		33.78%		36.00%
Number of substantiated Bar grievances filed annually		1		0
Number of misdemeanor criminal case referrals		38,994		38,000
Number of felony criminal case referrals		19,353		19,000
Number of juvenile criminal case referrals		3,955		3,500
Number of misdemeanor filings		22,413		22,000
Number of felony filings		8,252		8,000
Number of juvenile filings		1,763		1,750
Number of post conviction relief responses or Habeas Corpus responses		60		260
Number of sexual predator civil commitment proceedings		189		190
Number of Baker Act hearings		1,156		1,150

**EXHIBIT II - PERFORMANCE MEASURES AND STANDARDS**

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

Program: State Attorney, 8 <sup>th</sup> Judicial Circuit	Code: 21.50.08.00	
Service/Budget Entity: State Attorney, 8 <sup>th</sup> Judicial Circuit	Code: 21.50.08.00	

Approved Performance Measures for FY 2016-17	Approved Prior Year Standard FY 2015-16	Actual Prior Year Standard FY 2015-16	Approved Standards for FY 2016-17	Requested Standards for FY 2017-18
Percent of offenders who qualify for enhanced sentencing for whom state attorneys requested enhanced sentencing		100%		100%
Total number of dispositions		21,069		19,582
Number of dispositions by trial verdicts		93		99
Number of dispositions by pleas		9,108		8,406
Number of dispositions by non trial		3,272		3,236
Number of dispositions by otherwise		8,596		7,840
Percent of dispositions by trial verdicts		0.44%		0.53%
Percent of dispositions by pleas		43.23%		42.75%
Percent of dispositions by non trial		15.53%		17.26%
Percent of dispositions by otherwise		40.80%		39.46%
Number of substantiated Bar grievances filed annually		0		0
Number of misdemeanor criminal case referrals		14,027		11,596
Number of felony criminal case referrals		7,890		7,462
Number of juvenile criminal case referrals		1,761		1,530
Number of misdemeanor filings		8,895		7,453
Number of felony filings		4,146		3,979
Number of juvenile filings		795		760
Number of post conviction relief responses or Habeas Corpus responses		336		319
Number of sexual predator civil commitment proceedings		151		122
Number of Baker Act hearings		949		986

**EXHIBIT II - PERFORMANCE MEASURES AND STANDARDS**

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

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

Approved Performance Measures for FY 2016-17	Approved Prior Year Standard FY 2015-16	Actual Prior Year Standard FY 2015-16	Approved Standards for FY 2016-17	Requested Standards for FY 2017-18
Percent of offenders who qualify for enhanced sentencing for whom state attorneys requested enhanced sentencing		100%		100%
Total number of dispositions		78,596		78,596
Number of dispositions by trial verdicts		734		734
Number of dispositions by pleas		38,132		38,132
Number of dispositions by non trial		8,606		8,606
Number of dispositions by otherwise		31,124		31,124
Percent of dispositions by trial verdicts		0.93%		0.93%
Percent of dispositions by pleas		48.52%		48.52%
Percent of dispositions by non trial		10.95%		10.95%
Percent of dispositions by otherwise		39.60%		39.60%
Number of substantiated Bar grievances filed annually		0		0
Number of misdemeanor criminal case referrals		47,050		47,050
Number of felony criminal case referrals		31,402		31,402
Number of juvenile criminal case referrals		10,901		10,901
Number of misdemeanor filings		31,633		31,633
Number of felony filings		12,985		12,985
Number of juvenile filings		4,159		4,159
Number of post conviction relief responses or Habeas Corpus responses		138		138
Number of sexual predator civil commitment proceedings		220		220
Number of Baker Act hearings		2,086		2,086

**EXHIBIT II - PERFORMANCE MEASURES AND STANDARDS**

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

Program: State Attorney, 10 <sup>th</sup> Judicial Circuit	Code: 21.50.10.00
Service/Budget Entity: State Attorney, 10 <sup>th</sup> Judicial Circuit	Code: 21.50.10.00

Approved Performance Measures for FY 2016-17	Approved Prior Year Standard FY 2015-16	Actual Prior Year Standard FY 2015-16	Approved Standards for FY 2016-17	Requested Standards for FY 2017-18
Percent of offenders who qualify for enhanced sentencing for whom state attorneys requested enhanced sentencing		100%		100%
Total number of dispositions		38,998		38,998
Number of dispositions by trial verdicts		493		493
Number of dispositions by pleas		22,608		22,608
Number of dispositions by non trial		2,942		2,942
Number of dispositions by otherwise		12,995		12,995
Percent of dispositions by trial verdicts		1.3%		1.3%
Percent of dispositions by pleas		58.0%		58.0%
Percent of dispositions by non trial		7.5%		7.5%
Percent of dispositions by otherwise		33.2%		33.2%
Number of substantiated Bar grievances filed annually		0		0
Number of misdemeanor criminal case referrals		24,129		24,129
Number of felony criminal case referrals		17,568		17,568
Number of juvenile criminal case referrals		6,162		6,162
Number of misdemeanor filings		13,263		13,263
Number of felony filings		8,243		8,243
Number of juvenile filings		2,571		2,571
Number of post conviction relief responses or Habeas Corpus responses		148		148
Number of sexual predator civil commitment proceedings		348		348
Number of Baker Act hearings		2,577		2,577

**EXHIBIT II - PERFORMANCE MEASURES AND STANDARDS**

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

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

Approved Performance Measures for FY 2016-17	Approved Prior Year Standard FY 2015-16	Actual Prior Year Standard FY 2015-16	Approved Standards for FY 2016-17	Requested Standards for FY 2017-18
Percent of offenders who qualify for enhanced sentencing for whom state attorneys requested enhanced sentencing		100%		100%
Total number of dispositions		192,569		202,197
Number of dispositions by trial verdicts		9,413		9,884
Number of dispositions by pleas		33,014		34,665
Number of dispositions by non trial		117,066		122,919
Number of dispositions by otherwise		33,076		34,730
Percent of dispositions by trial verdicts		5%		5%
Percent of dispositions by pleas		17%		17%
Percent of dispositions by non trial		61%		61%
Percent of dispositions by otherwise		17%		17%
Number of substantiated Bar grievances filed annually		0		0
Number of misdemeanor criminal case referrals		138,372		145,291
Number of felony criminal case referrals		42,875		45,019
Number of juvenile criminal case referrals		15,754		16,542
Number of misdemeanor filings		101,479		106,553
Number of felony filings		14,644		15,376
Number of juvenile filings		2,585		2,714
Number of post conviction relief responses or Habeas Corpus responses		893		938
Number of sexual predator civil commitment proceedings		814		855
Number of Baker Act hearings		0		0



**EXHIBIT II - PERFORMANCE MEASURES AND STANDARDS**

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

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

Approved Performance Measures for FY 2016-17	Approved Prior Year Standard FY 2015-16	Actual Prior Year Standard FY 2015-16	Approved Standards for FY 2016-17	Requested Standards for FY 2017-18
Percent of offenders who qualify for enhanced sentencing for whom state attorneys requested enhanced sentencing		100%		100%
Total number of dispositions		32,960		33,290
Number of dispositions by trial verdicts		258		261
Number of dispositions by pleas		17,993		18,173
Number of dispositions by non trial		1,262		1,275
Number of dispositions by otherwise		13,477		13,581
Percent of dispositions by trial verdicts		1.0%		1.0%
Percent of dispositions by pleas		54.5%		54.5%
Percent of dispositions by non trial		3.8%		3.8%
Percent of dispositions by otherwise		40.7%		40.7%
Number of substantiated Bar grievances filed annually		0		0
Number of misdemeanor criminal case referrals		21,612		21,828
Number of felony criminal case referrals		14,860		15,009
Number of juvenile criminal case referrals		2,439		2,463
Number of misdemeanor filings		15,158		15,310
Number of felony filings		6,497		6,562
Number of juvenile filings		954		964
Number of post conviction relief responses or Habeas Corpus responses		58		59
Number of sexual predator civil commitment proceedings		27		27
Number of Baker Act hearings		568		574

**EXHIBIT II - PERFORMANCE MEASURES AND STANDARDS**

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

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

Approved Performance Measures for FY 2016-17	Approved Prior Year Standard FY 2015-16	Actual Prior Year Standard FY 2015-16	Approved Standards for FY 2016-17	Requested Standards for FY 2017-18
Percent of offenders who qualify for enhanced sentencing for whom state attorneys requested enhanced sentencing		49.24%		49.24%
Total number of dispositions		72,138		72,138
Number of dispositions by trial verdicts		1,210		1,210
Number of dispositions by pleas		38,518		38,518
Number of dispositions by non trial		15,236		15,236
Number of dispositions by otherwise		17,174		17,174
Percent of dispositions by trial verdicts		1.68%		1.68%
Percent of dispositions by pleas		53.39%		53.39%
Percent of dispositions by non trial		21.12%		21.12%
Percent of dispositions by otherwise		23.81%		23.81%
Number of substantiated Bar grievances filed annually		0		0
Number of misdemeanor criminal case referrals		48,491		48,491
Number of felony criminal case referrals		33,652		33,652
Number of juvenile criminal case referrals		7,208		7,208
Number of misdemeanor filings		41,431		41,431
Number of felony filings		13,026		13,026
Number of juvenile filings		3,271		3,271
Number of post conviction relief responses or Habeas Corpus responses		948		948
Number of sexual predator civil commitment proceedings		231		231
Number of Baker Act hearings		5,885		5,885

**EXHIBIT II - PERFORMANCE MEASURES AND STANDARDS**

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

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

Approved Performance Measures for FY 2016-17	Approved Prior Year Standard FY 2015-16	Actual Prior Year Standard FY 2015-16	Approved Standards for FY 2016-17	Requested Standards for FY 2017-18
Percent of offenders who qualify for enhanced sentencing for whom state attorneys requested enhanced sentencing		100%		92%
Total number of dispositions		33,642		33,000
Number of dispositions by trial verdicts		544		350
Number of dispositions by pleas		17,869		16,000
Number of dispositions by non trial		1,952		2,350
Number of dispositions by otherwise		13,277		14,300
Percent of dispositions by trial verdicts		2%		1%
Percent of dispositions by pleas		53%		48%
Percent of dispositions by non trial		6%		7%
Percent of dispositions by otherwise		39%		42%
Number of substantiated Bar grievances filed annually		0		0
Number of misdemeanor criminal case referrals		18,274		19,000
Number of felony criminal case referrals		12,145		10,000
Number of juvenile criminal case referrals		1,831		1,550
Number of misdemeanor filings		15,751		15,000
Number of felony filings		6,145		5,000
Number of juvenile filings		1,078		800
Number of post conviction relief responses or Habeas Corpus responses		696		375
Number of sexual predator civil commitment proceedings		63		50
Number of Baker Act hearings		256		250

**EXHIBIT II - PERFORMANCE MEASURES AND STANDARDS**

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

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

Approved Performance Measures for FY 2016-17	Approved Prior Year Standard FY 2015-16	Actual Prior Year Standard FY 2015-16	Approved Standards for FY 2016-17	Requested Standards for FY 2017-18
Percent of offenders who qualify for enhanced sentencing for whom state attorneys requested enhanced sentencing		72.49%		100.00%
Total number of dispositions		63,112		64,374
Number of dispositions by trial verdicts		611		623
Number of dispositions by pleas		29,826		30,423
Number of dispositions by non trial		1,718		1,752
Number of dispositions by otherwise		30,957		31,576
Percent of dispositions by trial verdicts		0.97%		0.97%
Percent of dispositions by pleas		47.26%		47.26%
Percent of dispositions by non trial		2.72%		2.72%
Percent of dispositions by otherwise		49.05%		49.05%
Number of substantiated Bar grievances filed annually		0		0
Number of misdemeanor criminal case referrals		47,891		48,849
Number of felony criminal case referrals		15,787		16,103
Number of juvenile criminal case referrals		4,764		4,859
Number of misdemeanor filings		39,019		39,799
Number of felony filings		9,409		9,597
Number of juvenile filings		1,913		1,951
Number of post conviction relief responses or Habeas Corpus responses		268		273
Number of sexual predator civil commitment proceedings		144		147
Number of Baker Act hearings		997		1,017

**EXHIBIT II - PERFORMANCE MEASURES AND STANDARDS**

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

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

Approved Performance Measures for FY 2016-17	Approved Prior Year Standard FY 2015-16	Actual Prior Year Standard FY 2015-16	Approved Standards for FY 2016-17	Requested Standards for FY 2017-18
Percent of offenders who qualify for enhanced sentencing for whom state attorneys requested enhanced sentencing		40%		35%
Total number of dispositions		5,576		5,576
Number of dispositions by trial verdicts		40		40
Number of dispositions by pleas		2,798		2,798
Number of dispositions by non trial		1,874		1,874
Number of dispositions by otherwise		864		864
Percent of dispositions by trial verdicts		0.72%		0.72%
Percent of dispositions by pleas		50.18%		50.18%
Percent of dispositions by non trial		33.61%		33.61%
Percent of dispositions by otherwise		15.49%		15.49%
Number of substantiated Bar grievances filed annually		0		1
Number of misdemeanor criminal case referrals		3,781		3,781
Number of felony criminal case referrals		1,663		1,663
Number of juvenile criminal case referrals		186		186
Number of misdemeanor filings		2,518		2,518
Number of felony filings		1,009		1,009
Number of juvenile filings		110		110
Number of post conviction relief responses or Habeas Corpus responses		8		8
Number of sexual predator civil commitment proceedings		0		1
Number of Baker Act hearings		25		25

**EXHIBIT II - PERFORMANCE MEASURES AND STANDARDS**

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

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

Approved Performance Measures for FY 2016-17	Approved Prior Year Standard FY 2015-16	Actual Prior Year Standard FY 2015-16	Approved Standards for FY 2016-17	Requested Standards for FY 2017-18
Percent of offenders who qualify for enhanced sentencing for whom state attorneys requested enhanced sentencing		100%		100%
Total number of dispositions		89,188		89,188
Number of dispositions by trial verdicts		821		821
Number of dispositions by pleas		55,225		55,225
Number of dispositions by non trial		8,828		8,828
Number of dispositions by otherwise		24,314		24,314
Percent of dispositions by trial verdicts		0.92%		0.92%
Percent of dispositions by pleas		61.92%		61.92%
Percent of dispositions by non trial		9.90%		9.90%
Percent of dispositions by otherwise		27.26%		27.26%
Number of substantiated Bar grievances filed annually		0		0
Number of misdemeanor criminal case referrals		44,223		44,223
Number of felony criminal case referrals		23,199		23,199
Number of juvenile criminal case referrals		6,925		6,925
Number of misdemeanor filings		38,190		38,190
Number of felony filings		12,420		12,420
Number of juvenile filings		3,922		3,922
Number of post conviction relief responses or Habeas Corpus responses		901		901
Number of sexual predator civil commitment proceedings		145		145
Number of Baker Act hearings		2,955		2,955

**EXHIBIT II - PERFORMANCE MEASURES AND STANDARDS**

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

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

Approved Performance Measures for FY 2016-17	Approved Prior Year Standard FY 2015-16	Actual Prior Year Standard FY 2015-16	Approved Standards for FY 2016-17	Requested Standards for FY 2017-18
Percent of offenders who qualify for enhanced sentencing for whom state attorneys requested enhanced sentencing		100%		100%
Total number of dispositions		37,125		37,125
Number of dispositions by trial verdicts		266		266
Number of dispositions by pleas		21,988		21,988
Number of dispositions by non trial		3,238		3,238
Number of dispositions by otherwise		11,633		11,633
Percent of dispositions by trial verdicts		0.72%		0.72%
Percent of dispositions by pleas		59.23%		59.23%
Percent of dispositions by non trial		8.72%		8.72%
Percent of dispositions by otherwise		31.33%		31.33%
Number of substantiated Bar grievances filed annually		0		0
Number of misdemeanor criminal case referrals		25,249		25,249
Number of felony criminal case referrals		15,720		15,720
Number of juvenile criminal case referrals		5,731		5,731
Number of misdemeanor filings		17,708		17,708
Number of felony filings		7,415		7,415
Number of juvenile filings		1,804		1,804
Number of post conviction relief responses or Habeas Corpus responses		470		470
Number of sexual predator civil commitment proceedings		69		69
Number of Baker Act hearings		564		564

**EXHIBIT II - PERFORMANCE MEASURES AND STANDARDS**

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

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

Approved Performance Measures for FY 2016-17	Approved Prior Year Standard FY 2015-16	Actual Prior Year Standard FY 2015-16	Approved Standards for FY 2016-17	Requested Standards for FY 2017-18
Percent of offenders who qualify for enhanced sentencing for whom state attorneys requested enhanced sentencing		100%		100%
Total number of dispositions		22,647		24,026
Number of dispositions by trial verdicts		317		336
Number of dispositions by pleas		17,130		18,173
Number of dispositions by non trial		2,168		2,300
Number of dispositions by otherwise		3,032		3,217
Percent of dispositions by trial verdicts		2%		2%
Percent of dispositions by pleas		76%		76%
Percent of dispositions by non trial		9%		9%
Percent of dispositions by otherwise		13%		13%
Number of substantiated Bar grievances filed annually		0		0
Number of misdemeanor criminal case referrals		17,605		18,677
Number of felony criminal case referrals		9,591		10,175
Number of juvenile criminal case referrals		2,609		2,768
Number of misdemeanor filings		13,292		14,101
Number of felony filings		5,691		6,038
Number of juvenile filings		1,404		1,490
Number of post conviction relief responses or Habeas Corpus responses		221		234
Number of sexual predator civil commitment proceedings		135		143
Number of Baker Act hearings		869		921



**EXHIBIT II - PERFORMANCE MEASURES AND STANDARDS**

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

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

Approved Performance Measures for FY 2016-17	Approved Prior Year Standard FY 2015-16	Actual Prior Year Standard FY 2015-16	Approved Standards for FY 2016-17	Requested Standards for FY 2017-18
Percent of offenders who qualify for enhanced sentencing for whom state attorneys requested enhanced sentencing		88.53%		88.53%
Total number of dispositions		54,256		54,799
Number of dispositions by trial verdicts		655		662
Number of dispositions by pleas		28,458		28,743
Number of dispositions by non trial		7,065		7,136
Number of dispositions by otherwise		18,078		18,259
Percent of dispositions by trial verdicts		1.21%		1.21%
Percent of dispositions by pleas		52.45%		52.45%
Percent of dispositions by non trial		13.02%		13.02%
Percent of dispositions by otherwise		33.32%		33.32%
Number of substantiated Bar grievances filed annually		0		0
Number of misdemeanor criminal case referrals		44,935		45,384
Number of felony criminal case referrals		20,348		20,551
Number of juvenile criminal case referrals		4,807		4,855
Number of misdemeanor filings		29,493		29,788
Number of felony filings		11,030		11,140
Number of juvenile filings		1,787		1,805
Number of post conviction relief responses or Habeas Corpus responses		2,120		2,141
Number of sexual predator civil commitment proceedings		191		193
Number of Baker Act hearings		2,506		2,531

**EXHIBIT II - PERFORMANCE MEASURES AND STANDARDS**

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

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

Approved Performance Measures for FY 2016-17	Approved Prior Year Standards FY 2015-16	Actual Prior Year Standards FY 2015-16	Approved Standards for FY 2016-17	Requested Standards for FY 2017-18
Annual attorney turnover rate	18%	16.58%	18%	15.75%
Number of appointed and reappointed cases	875,837	676,471	875,837	710,295
Number of cases closed	784,964	638,631	784,964	670,563
Number of clients represented	705,061	534,838	705,061	561,580
Number of cases per attorney	547	468	547	445

**EXHIBIT II – PERFORMANCE MEASURES AND STANDARDS**

<b>EXHIBIT II PERFORMANCE MEASURES AND STANDARDS – BY CIRCUIT FY 2015-16 – July 2016</b>	<b>1<sup>st</sup></b>	<b>2<sup>nd</sup></b>	<b>3<sup>rd</sup></b>	<b>4<sup>th</sup></b>	<b>5<sup>th</sup></b>	<b>6<sup>th</sup></b>	<b>7<sup>th</sup></b>	<b>8<sup>th</sup></b>	<b>9<sup>th</sup></b>	<b>10<sup>th</sup></b>	<b>11<sup>th</sup></b>	<b>12<sup>th</sup></b>	<b>13<sup>th</sup></b>	<b>14<sup>th</sup></b>	<b>15<sup>th</sup></b>	<b>16<sup>th</sup></b>	<b>17<sup>th</sup></b>	<b>18<sup>th</sup></b>	<b>19<sup>th</sup></b>	<b>20<sup>th</sup></b>	<b>TOTAL</b>
ANNUAL ATTORNEY TURNOVER RATE	14.88%	14.38%	16.22%	10.83%	11.11%	17.54%	19.67%	10.81%	35.99%	14.09%	14.93%	6.81%	19.09%	8.70%	6.97%	30.77%	22.94%	9.60%	8.33%	13.02%	16.58%
NUMBER OF APPOINTED & REAPPOINTED CASES	35,530	16,122	9,561	36,814	30,942	69,002	34,691	15,754	56,520	30,977	64,830	25,037	54,020	20,667	48,047	5,108	37,743	27,097	17,669	40,340	676,471
# CLIENTS	28,266	13,057	8,754	32,729	21,809	59,889	25,787	13,426	40,548	21,909	60,199	15,225	40,893	16,359	31,911	4,049	32,529	23,335	13,663	30,501	534,838
NUMBER OF PLEAS	19,698	7,661	4,244	18,801	16,669	32,148	17,345	5,398	23,704	13,426	13,981	14,685	15,491	9,256	19,594	2,058	15,304	14,767	9,348	17,061	290,639
NUMBER OF TRIALS / CONTESTED HEARINGS	653	775	182	114	118	1,128	569	394	1,812	1,266	792	530	1,406	149	892	25	1,099	693	108	1,483	14,188
NUMBER OF CASES NOLLE PROSSED OR DISMISSED	3,569	944	650	2,462	1,293	2,275	1,473	1,144	6,930	4,149	16,021	2,127	4,998	529	12,390	449	6,804	1,890	1,271	6,707	78,075
TOTAL NUMBER OF CASES CLOSED	34,488	13,463	8,513	34,689	30,291	74,863	34,610	12,495	53,162	26,254	56,204	25,161	50,679	17,525	49,952	3,859	34,338	25,609	15,031	37,445	638,631

**EXHIBIT II - PERFORMANCE MEASURES AND STANDARDS**

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

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

Approved Performance Measures for FY 2016-17	Approved Prior Year Standards <b>FY 2015-16</b>	Actual Prior Year Standards <b>FY 2015-16</b>	Approved Standards for <b>FY 2016-17</b>	Requested Standards for <b>FY 2017-18</b>
Annual attorney turnover rate	8%	13.39%	8%	12.72%
Percent of appeals resolved	99.99%	107.78%	99.99%	113.17%
Number of appointed cases	5,643	4,370	5,643	4,589
Number of clients represented	5,810	4,558	5,810	4,786
Number of briefs filed	5,968	4,934	5,968	5,181
Number of writs filed	106	101	106	106
Number of cases closed	5,612	4,710	5,612	4,946

---

**EXHIBIT II - PERFORMANCE MEASURES AND STANDARDS**

---

**Public Defender Appellate Offices  
PB2 BASELINE DATA COLLECTION FY 2015-2016**

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

	<b>2nd</b>	<b>7th</b>	<b>10th</b>	<b>11th</b>	<b>15th</b>	<b>Total</b>
ANNUAL ATTORNEY TURNOVER RATES *	3.92%	25.21%	23.96%	7.14%	6.67%	13.39%
APPEALS ASSIGNED	1,019	948	1,183	373	847	4,370
NUMBER OF CLIENTS REPRESENTED	1,136	943	1,304	373	802	4,558
PERCENT OF APPEALS RESOLVED	108.64%	92.51%	125.19%	96.25%	104.60%	107.78%
NUMBER OF CASES CLOSED	1,107	877	1,481	359	886	4,710
NUMBER OF BRIEFS FILED	1,190	954	1,633	321	836	4,934
NUMBER OF WRITS FILED	8	14	2	56	21	101

**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, <b>North, Middle &amp; Southern Regions Aggregate</b>	Code: 21.70.00.00	
Approved Performance Measures for FY 2016-17	Approved Prior Year Standards FY 2015-16	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%	93.3%
Number of substantiated Bar grievances filed annually	0	0
Number of appellate actions	35	161
Number of 3.851 filings	13	49
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	3
Number of active cases	180	195
Number of evidentiary hearings	12	6
Number of federal court actions	47	95

**EXHIBIT II - PERFORMANCE MEASURES AND STANDARDS**

Department: Justice Administration Department No.: 21				
Program: Capital Collateral Regional Counsel			Code: 21.70.00.00	
Service/Budget Entity: CCRC, <b>North Region</b>			Code: 21.70.10.01	
Approved Performance Measures for FY 2016-17	Approved Prior Year Standards FY 2015-16	Actual Prior Year Standards FY 2015-16	Approved Standards for FY 2016-17	Requested Standards for FY 2017-18
Percent of cases in which post-conviction motion, post-conviction appeal, federal habeas corpus motion or federal appeal is timely filed, without extension		95%		90%
Number of substantiated Bar grievances filed annually		0		0
Number of appellate actions		10		6
Number of 3.851 filings		7		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		21		26
Number of evidentiary hearings		0		6
Number of federal court actions		3		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, <b>Middle Region</b>			Code: 21.70.20.01	
Approved Performance Measures for FY 2016-17	Approved Prior Year Standards FY 2015-16	Actual Prior Year Standards FY 2015-16	Approved Standards for FY 2016-17	Requested Standards for FY 2017-18
Percent of cases in which post-conviction motion, post-conviction appeal, federal habeas corpus motion or federal appeal is timely filed, without extension		93%		90%
Number of substantiated Bar grievances filed annually		0		0
Number of appellate actions		72		56
Number of 3.851 filings		13		6
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		0		2
Number of active cases		107		95
Number of evidentiary hearings		3		3
Number of federal court actions		37		30



**EXHIBIT II - PERFORMANCE MEASURES AND STANDARDS**

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

Approved Performance Measures for FY 2016-17	Approved Prior Year Standards FY 2015-16	Actual Prior Year Standards FY 2015-16	Approved Standards for FY 2016-17	Requested Standards for FY 2017-18
Percent of cases in which post-conviction motion, post-conviction appeal, federal habeas corpus motion or federal appeal is timely filed, without extension		92%		90%
Number of substantiated Bar grievances filed annually		0		0
Number of appellate actions		79		20
Number of 3.851 filings		29		4
Number of signed death warrants		1		2
Number of court decisions to release a death row inmate, grant a new trial, grant a new sentencing hearing, or grant other appeals		3		2
Number of active cases		67		68
Number of evidentiary hearings		3		4
Number of federal court actions		55		30

**EXHIBIT II – PERFORMANCE MEASURES AND STANDARDS**

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

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

Proposed Performance Measures for FY 2016-17	Approved Prior Year Standards FY 2015-16	Actual Prior Year Standards FY 2015-16	Approved Standards for FY 2016-17	Requested Standards for FY 2017-18
“New Measure” – Annual percentage of appellate briefs filed within 30 days of receipt of record.	N/A	3%	N/A	8%
“New Measure” – Annual percentage of misdemeanor cases closed with 120 days of appointment.	N/A	97%	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	95%	N/A	100%

**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	

<b>Proposed Performance Measures for FY 2016-17</b>	<b>Approved Prior Year Standards FY 2015-16</b>	<b>Actual Prior Year Standards FY 2015-16</b>	<b>Approved Standards for FY 2016-17</b>	<b>Requested Standards for FY 2017-18</b>
“New Measure” – Annual percentage of appellate briefs filed within 30 days of receipt of record.	N/A	38%	N/A	44%
“New Measure” – Annual percentage of misdemeanor cases closed with 120 days of appointment.	N/A	80%	N/A	82%
“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	55%

**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	

<b>Proposed Performance Measures for FY 2016-17</b>	<b>Approved Prior Year Standards FY 2015-16</b>	<b>Actual Prior Year Standards FY 2015-16</b>	<b>Approved Standards for FY 2016-17</b>	<b>Requested Standards for FY 2017-18</b>
“New Measure” – Annual percentage of appellate briefs filed within 30 days of receipt of record	N/A	27%	N/A	30%
“New Measure” – Annual percentage of misdemeanor cases closed with 120 days of appointment.	N/A	73%	N/A	75%
“New Measure” –In cases where there is either an adjudication or a withhold of adjudication, the percentage of case plans approved by the court within 90 days of appointment.	N/A	75%	N/A	75%

**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	

<b>Proposed Performance Measures for FY 2016-17</b>	<b>Approved Prior Year Standards FY 2015-16</b>	<b>Actual Prior Year Standards FY 2015-16</b>	<b>Approved Standards for FY 2016-17</b>	<b>Requested Standards for FY 2017-18</b>
“New Measure” – Annual percentage of appellate briefs filed within 30 days of receipt of record.	N/A	41%	N/A	33%
“New Measure” – Annual percentage of misdemeanor cases closed with 120 days of appointment.	N/A	63%	N/A	84%
“New Measure” –In cases where there is either an adjudication or a withhold of adjudication, the percentage of case plans approved by the court within 90 days of appointment.	N/A	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	

<b>Proposed Performance Measures for FY 2016-17</b>	<b>Approved Prior Year Standards FY 2015-16</b>	<b>Actual Prior Year Standards FY 2015-16</b>	<b>Approved Standards for FY 2016-17</b>	<b>Requested Standards for FY 2017-18</b>
“New Measure” – Annual percentage of appellate briefs filed within 30 days of receipt of record	N/A	51%	N/A	56%
“New Measure” – Annual percentage of misdemeanor cases closed with 120 days of appointment.	N/A	69%	N/A	72%
“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	77%	N/A	79%

***JUSTICE ADMINISTRATION***



***LONG RANGE PROGRAM PLAN  
FISCAL YEARS 2017-18 THROUGH 2021-22***

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





## Exhibit III - ASSESSMENT OF PERFORMANCE MEASURES

<b>Department:</b>	<b>Justice Administration</b>
<b>Program:</b>	<b>Justice Administrative Commission</b>
<b>Service/Budget Entity:</b>	<b>Executive Direction/Support Services</b>
<b>Measure:</b>	<b>Number of public records requests</b>
<b>Action:</b>	
<input type="checkbox"/> Performance Assessment of <u>Outcome</u> Measure	<input checked="" 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
150	465	315	210%

**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 public records requests received fluctuates annually.

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

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

**Recommendations:** Modify the approved standard to reflect the most recent performance results.

## Exhibit III - ASSESSMENT OF PERFORMANCE MEASURES

**Department:** Justice Administration  
**Program:** Justice Administrative Commission  
**Service/Budget Entity:** Executive Direction/Support Services  
**Measure:** Number of 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	1079	-1421	-56.84

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

**Explanation:**

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

**Recommendations:** Modify the approved standard to reflect the most recent performance results.

## Exhibit III - ASSESSMENT OF PERFORMANCE MEASURES

**Department:** Justice Administration  
**Program:** Justice Administrative Commission  
**Service/Budget Entity:** Executive Direction/Support Services  
**Measure:** Number of 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	969	-1,031	-51.55%

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

**Explanation:**

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

**Recommendations:** Modify the approved standard to reflect the most recent performance results.

**Exhibit III - ASSESSMENT OF PERFORMANCE MEASURES**

**Department:** Justice Administration  
**Program:** Justice Administrative Commission  
**Service/Budget Entity:** Executive Direction/Support Services  
**Measure:** 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	\$11,579,577	\$5,579,577	92.99%

**Factors Accounting for the Difference:**

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

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

**Explanation:**

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

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

**Explanation:**

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

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

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

**Recommendations:** Modify the approved standard to reflect the most recent performance results.

## Exhibit III - ASSESSMENT OF PERFORMANCE MEASURES

**Department:** Justice Administration  
**Program:** Justice Administrative Commission  
**Service/Budget Entity:** Executive Direction/Support Services  
**Measure:** Number of budget, payroll, disbursement, revenue, and financial report 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	353,381	-21,619	-5.77%

**Factors Accounting for the Difference:**

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

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

**Explanation:**

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

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

**Explanation:**

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

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

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

**Recommendations:** Modify the approved standard to reflect the most recent performance results.

## Exhibit III - ASSESSMENT OF PERFORMANCE MEASURES

**Department:** Justice Administration  
**Program:** 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	66,366	1,366	2.10%

**Factors Accounting for the Difference:**

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

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

**Explanation:**

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

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

**Explanation:**

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

**Recommendations:** Maintain current approved standard.



## EXHIBIT III – ASSESSMENT OF PERFORMANCE MEASURES

<b>Department:</b> Justice Administration	
<b>Program:</b> Statewide Guardian ad Litem	
<b>Service/Budget Entity:</b> Statewide Guardian ad Litem	
<b>Measure:</b> Average percent of children represented	
<b>Action:</b>	
<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%	80.1%	.1%	.1%

**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:**

**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:**

In addition to ongoing retention efforts, the Program will seek funding for FY 17-18 for salary adjustments for critical classes in which turnover has risen dramatically.





## EXHIBIT III – ASSESSMENT OF PERFORMANCE MEASURES

<b>Department:</b>	<b>Justice Administration</b>
<b>Program:</b>	<b>Statewide Guardian ad Litem</b>
<b>Service/Budget Entity:</b>	<b>Statewide Guardian ad Litem</b>
<b>Measure:</b>	<b>Number of new volunteers certified as a GAL</b>
<b>Action:</b>	
<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	2,448	984	67%

<b>Factors Accounting for the Difference:</b>	<b><u>Not Applicable. Target Exceeded</u></b>
<b>Internal Factors</b> (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)	
<b>Explanation:</b>	
<b>External Factors</b> (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	
<b>Explanation:</b>	
<b>Management Efforts to Address Differences/Problems</b> (check all that apply):	
<input type="checkbox"/> Training	<input type="checkbox"/> Technology
<input type="checkbox"/> Personnel	<input type="checkbox"/> Other (Identify)
<b>Recommendations:</b>	

## EXHIBIT III – ASSESSMENT OF PERFORMANCE MEASURES

<b>Department:</b>	<b>Justice Administration</b>
<b>Program:</b>	<b>Statewide Guardian ad Litem</b>
<b>Service/Budget Entity:</b>	<b>Statewide Guardian ad Litem</b>
<b>Measure:</b>	<b>Average number of Volunteers</b>
<b>Action:</b>	
<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
5,057	10,945	5,888	116%

<b>Factors Accounting for the Difference:</b> <u>Not Applicable. Target Exceeded.</u>	
<b>Internal Factors</b> (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)	
<b>Explanation:</b>	
<b>External Factors</b> (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	
<b>Explanation:</b>	
<b>Management Efforts to Address Differences/Problems</b> (check all that apply):	
<input type="checkbox"/> Training	<input type="checkbox"/> Technology
<input type="checkbox"/> Personnel	<input type="checkbox"/> Other (Identify)
<b>Recommendations:</b>	





**EXHIBIT III - ASSESSMENT OF PERFORMANCE MEASURES**

<b>Department:</b> Justice Administration	
<b>Program:</b> State Attorneys	
<b>Service/Budget Entity:</b> First – Twentieth Judicial Circuits	
<b>Measure:</b> Number of dispositions by trial verdicts	
<b>Action:</b>	
<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	17,407	3,403	24.30%

**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	516,053	(211,193)	(29.04%)

**Factors Accounting for the Difference:**

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

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

**Explanation:**

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

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

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

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

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

**Recommendations:**

**EXHIBIT III - ASSESSMENT OF PERFORMANCE MEASURES**

<b>Department:</b> Justice Administration	
<b>Program:</b> State Attorneys	
<b>Service/Budget Entity:</b> First – Twentieth Judicial Circuits	
<b>Measure:</b> Number of dispositions by non trial	
<b>Action:</b>	
<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	196,036	38,046	24.08%

**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	310,125	(129,670)	(29.48%)

**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%	1.67%	.62	59.05%

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

Approved Standard	Actual Performance Results	Difference (Over/Under)	Percentage Difference
54.30%	49.64%	(4.66)	(8.58%)

**Factors Accounting for the Difference:**

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

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

**Explanation:**

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

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

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

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

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

**Recommendations:**

**EXHIBIT III - ASSESSMENT OF PERFORMANCE MEASURES**

<b>Department:</b> Justice Administration	
<b>Program:</b> State Attorneys	
<b>Service/Budget Entity:</b> First – Twentieth Judicial Circuits	
<b>Measure:</b> Percent of dispositions by non trial	
<b>Action:</b>	
<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
11.80%	18.86%	7.06	59.83%

  

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

Approved Standard	Actual Performance Results	Difference (Over/Under)	Percentage Difference
32.84%	29.83%	(3.01)	(9.17%)

**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	0	0	0

**Factors Accounting for the Difference:**

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

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Personnel Factors                      | <input type="checkbox"/> Staff Capacity    |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Competing Priorities                   | <input 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**

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

Approved Standard	Actual Performance Results	Difference (Over/Under)	Percentage Difference
1,183,597	715,959	(467,638)	(39.51%)

**Factors Accounting for the Difference:**

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

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

**Explanation:**

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

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

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

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

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

**Recommendations:**

**EXHIBIT III - ASSESSMENT OF PERFORMANCE MEASURES**

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

Approved Standard	Actual Performance Results	Difference (Over/Under)	Percentage Difference
490,965	370,648	(120,317)	(24.51%)

**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	102,057	(95,281)	(48.28%)

**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 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	505,708	(286,685)	(36.18%)

**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	173,010	(46,742)	(21.27%)

**Factors Accounting for the Difference:**

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

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

**Explanation:**

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

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

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

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

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

**Recommendations:**

**EXHIBIT III - ASSESSMENT OF PERFORMANCE MEASURES**

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

Approved Standard	Actual Performance Results	Difference (Over/Under)	Percentage Difference
83,616	39,782	(43,834)	(52.42%)

**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	8,473	(13,918)	(62.16%)

**Factors Accounting for the Difference:**

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

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

**Explanation:**

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

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

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

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

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

**Recommendations:**

**EXHIBIT III - ASSESSMENT OF PERFORMANCE MEASURES**

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

Approved Standard	Actual Performance Results	Difference (Over/Under)	Percentage Difference
27,686	26,089	(1,597)	(5.77%)

**Factors Accounting for the Difference:**

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

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

**Explanation:**

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

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

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

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

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

**Recommendations:**



**EXHIBIT III – ASSESSMENT OF PERFORMANCE MEASURES**

<b>Department:</b>	<b>Justice Administration</b>
<b>Program:</b>	<b>Public Defenders</b>
<b>Service/Budget Entity:</b>	<b>Public Defenders, Circuits 1-20</b>
<b>Proposed Revised Measure:</b>	<b>Number of appointed and reappointed cases</b>
<b>Action:</b>	
<input type="checkbox"/> Performance Assessment of <u>Outcome</u> Measure	<input type="checkbox"/> Revision of Measure
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Performance Assessment of <u>Output</u> Measure	<input type="checkbox"/> Deletion of Measure
<input type="checkbox"/> Adjustment of GAA Performance Standards	

Approved Standard	Actual Performance Results	Difference (Over/Under)	Percentage Difference
875,837	676,471	(199,366)	(22.76%)

**Factors Accounting for the Difference:**

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

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

**Explanation:** The number of offenses and arrests reported to the Florida Department of Law Enforcement (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):

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

**Explanation:** The Public Defenders were appointed to fewer cases than projected; however, Public Defenders remain inadequately funded as a result of years of excessive caseloads combined with increased penalties for criminal offenses.

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

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

**Recommendations:**  
Adequate staffing must be provided.



**EXHIBIT III – ASSESSMENT OF PERFORMANCE MEASURES**

<b>Department:</b>	<b>Justice Administration</b>
<b>Program:</b>	<b>Public Defenders</b>
<b>Service/Budget Entity:</b>	<b>Public Defenders, Circuits 1-20</b>
<b>Measure:</b>	<b>Number of cases closed</b>
<b>Action:</b>	
<input type="checkbox"/> Performance Assessment of <u>Outcome</u> Measure	<input type="checkbox"/> Revision of Measure
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Performance Assessment of <u>Output</u> Measure	<input type="checkbox"/> Deletion of Measure
<input type="checkbox"/> Adjustment of GAA Performance Standards	

Approved Standard	Actual Performance Results	Difference (Over/Under)	Percentage Difference
784,964	638,631	(146,333)	(18.64%)

**Factors Accounting for the Difference:**

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

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

**Explanation:** The number of offenses and arrests reported to FDLE are down and fewer cases have been filed by State Attorneys. The Public Defenders handled fewer dispositions than projected due to years of excessive caseloads, combined with increased penalties for criminal offenses.

**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 handled fewer dispositions than projected, offices remain inadequately funded as a result of years of excessive caseloads combined with increased penalties for criminal offenses.

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

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

**Recommendations:**  
Adequate staffing must be provided.

**EXHIBIT III – ASSESSMENT OF PERFORMANCE MEASURES**

<b>Department:</b>	<b>Justice Administration</b>
<b>Program:</b>	<b>Public Defenders</b>
<b>Service/Budget Entity:</b>	<b>Public Defenders, Circuits 1-20</b>
<b>Measure:</b>	<b>Number of clients represented</b>
<b>Action:</b>	
<input type="checkbox"/> Performance Assessment of <u>Outcome</u> Measure	<input type="checkbox"/> Revision of Measure
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Performance Assessment of <u>Output</u> Measure	<input type="checkbox"/> Deletion of Measure
<input type="checkbox"/> Adjustment of GAA Performance Standards	

Approved Standard	Actual Performance Results	Difference (Over/Under)	Percentage Difference
705,061	534,838	(170,223)	(24.14%)

**Factors Accounting for the Difference:**

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

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

**Explanation:** Public Defenders have no control over the number of cases or clients to which we're appointed. The Public Defenders were appointed to fewer clients than projected; however, Public Defenders remain inadequately funded as a result of years of excessive caseloads combined with increased penalties for criminal offenses.

**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:** Public Defenders remain inadequately funded as a result of years of excessive caseloads combined with increased penalties for criminal offenses without corresponding increases in employees.

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

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

**Recommendations:**  
Adequate staffing must be provided.

**EXHIBIT III – ASSESSMENT OF PERFORMANCE MEASURES**

<b>Department:</b>	<b>Justice Administration</b>
<b>Program:</b>	<b>Public Defenders</b>
<b>Service/Budget Entity:</b>	<b>Public Defenders, Circuits 1-20</b>
<b>Measure:</b>	<b>Number of cases per attorney</b>
<b>Action:</b>	
<input type="checkbox"/> Performance Assessment of <u>Outcome</u> Measure	<input type="checkbox"/> Revision of Measure
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Performance Assessment of <u>Output</u> Measure	<input type="checkbox"/> Deletion of Measure
<input type="checkbox"/> Adjustment of GAA Performance Standards	

Approved Standard	Actual Performance Results	Difference (Over/Under)	Percentage Difference
547	468	(79)	(14.44%)

**Factors Accounting for the Difference:**

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

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

**Explanation:** 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):

<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 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):

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

**Recommendations:**  
Adequate staffing must be provided.

**EXHIBIT III – ASSESSMENT OF PERFORMANCE MEASURES**

<b>Department:</b> Justice Administration	
<b>Program:</b> Public Defender, Appellate	
<b>Service/Budget Entity:</b> Public Defender, Appellate	
<b>Measure:</b> Annual attorney turnover rate	
<b>Action:</b>	
<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
8%	13.39%	5.39	67.38%

**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:** There has been little change in the turnover rate; however the slight increase in turnover rates may signal that more appellate attorneys are seeking employment outside the Public Defender’s Office.

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

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

**Recommendations:**

.

---

**EXHIBIT III – ASSESSMENT OF PERFORMANCE MEASURES**

---

<b>Department:</b> <b>Program:</b> <b>Service/Budget Entity:</b> <b>Measure:</b>	<b>Justice Administration</b> <b>Public Defender, Appellate</b> <b>Public Defender, Appellate</b> <b>Percent of appeals resolved</b>								
<b>Action:</b> <input type="checkbox"/> Performance Assessment of <u>Outcome</u> Measure <input type="checkbox"/> Revision of Measure <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Performance Assessment of <u>Output</u> Measure <input type="checkbox"/> Deletion of Measure <input type="checkbox"/> Adjustment of GAA Performance Standards									
<table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <thead> <tr> <th style="width: 25%;">Approved Standard</th> <th style="width: 25%;">Actual Performance Results</th> <th style="width: 25%;">Difference (Over/Under)</th> <th style="width: 25%;">Percentage Difference</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">99.99%</td> <td style="text-align: center;">107.78%</td> <td style="text-align: center;">7.79</td> <td style="text-align: center;">7.79%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		Approved Standard	Actual Performance Results	Difference (Over/Under)	Percentage Difference	99.99%	107.78%	7.79	7.79%
Approved Standard	Actual Performance Results	Difference (Over/Under)	Percentage Difference						
99.99%	107.78%	7.79	7.79%						
<b>Factors Accounting for the Difference:</b> <b>Internal Factors</b> (check all that apply): <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Personnel Factors <input type="checkbox"/> Staff Capacity <input type="checkbox"/> Competing Priorities <input type="checkbox"/> Level of Training <input type="checkbox"/> Previous Estimate Incorrect <input type="checkbox"/> Other (Identify)									
<b>Explanation:</b> While attorneys strive to keep up with assigned caseloads, Public Defenders have little control over the number of appeals resolved by the court.									
<b>External Factors</b> (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									
<b>Explanation:</b> The Courts increased the number of appellate cases decided, and this year's performance potentially indicates there were some actions to address appellate backlog from prior fiscal years' appellate caseload.									
<b>Management Efforts to Address Differences/Problems</b> (check all that apply): <input type="checkbox"/> Training <input type="checkbox"/> Technology <input type="checkbox"/> Personnel <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other (Identify)									
<b>Recommendations:</b> Acquire additional resources to provide adequate staffing.									

**EXHIBIT III – ASSESSMENT OF PERFORMANCE MEASURES**

<b>Department:</b>	<b>Justice Administration</b>		
<b>Program:</b>	<b>Public Defender, Appellate</b>		
<b>Service/Budget Entity:</b>	<b>Public Defender, Appellate</b>		
<b>Measure:</b>	<b>Number of appointed cases</b>		
<b>Action:</b>			
<input type="checkbox"/>	Performance Assessment of <u>Outcome</u> Measure	<input type="checkbox"/>	Revision of Measure
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Performance Assessment of <u>Output</u> Measure	<input type="checkbox"/>	Deletion of Measure
<input type="checkbox"/>	Adjustment of GAA Performance Standards		
<b>Approved Standard</b>	<b>Actual Performance Results</b>	<b>Difference (Over/Under)</b>	<b>Percentage Difference</b>
5,643	4370	(1273)	(22.56%)
<b>Factors Accounting for the Difference:</b>			
<b>Internal Factors</b> (check all that apply):			
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Personnel Factors	<input type="checkbox"/>	Staff Capacity
<input type="checkbox"/>	Competing Priorities	<input type="checkbox"/>	Level of Training
<input type="checkbox"/>	Previous Estimate Incorrect		
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Other (Identify)		
<b>Explanation:</b> 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.			
<b>External Factors</b> (check all that apply):			
<input type="checkbox"/>	Resources Unavailable	<input type="checkbox"/>	Technological Problems
<input type="checkbox"/>	Legal/Legislative Change	<input type="checkbox"/>	Natural Disaster
<input type="checkbox"/>	Target Population Change	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Other (Identify)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	This Program/Service Cannot Fix The Problem		
<input type="checkbox"/>	Current Laws Are Working Against The Agency Mission		
<b>Explanation:</b> 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.			
<b>Management Efforts to Address Differences/Problems</b> (check all that apply):			
<input type="checkbox"/>	Training	<input type="checkbox"/>	Technology
<input type="checkbox"/>	Personnel	<input type="checkbox"/>	Other (Identify)
<b>Recommendations:</b>			

## EXHIBIT III – ASSESSMENT OF PERFORMANCE MEASURES

<b>Department:</b>	<b>Justice Administration</b>		
<b>Program:</b>	<b>Public Defender, Appellate</b>		
<b>Service/Budget Entity:</b>	<b>Public Defender, Appellate</b>		
<b>Measure:</b>	<b>Number of clients represented</b>		
<b>Action:</b>			
<input type="checkbox"/>	Performance Assessment of <u>Outcome</u> Measure	<input type="checkbox"/>	Revision of Measure
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Performance Assessment of <u>Output</u> Measure	<input type="checkbox"/>	Deletion of Measure
<input type="checkbox"/>	Adjustment of GAA Performance Standards		
Approved Standard	Actual Performance Results	Difference (Over/Under)	Percentage Difference
5,810	4558	(1252)	(21.55%)
<b>Factors Accounting for the Difference:</b>			
<b>Internal Factors</b> (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)		
<b>Explanation:</b> 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.			
<b>External Factors</b> (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		
<b>Explanation:</b> Although Public Defenders were appointed to fewer cases and clients than projected, offices remain inadequately funded as a result of years of excessive caseloads.			
<b>Management Efforts to Address Differences/Problems</b> (check all that apply):			
<input type="checkbox"/>	Training	<input type="checkbox"/>	Technology
<input type="checkbox"/>	Personnel	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Other (Identify)
<b>Recommendations:</b>			

## EXHIBIT III – ASSESSMENT OF PERFORMANCE MEASURES

<b>Department:</b>	<b>Justice Administration</b>		
<b>Program:</b>	<b>Public Defender, Appellate</b>		
<b>Service/Budget Entity:</b>	<b>Public Defender, Appellate</b>		
<b>Measure:</b>	<b>Number of briefs filed</b>		
<b>Action:</b>			
<input type="checkbox"/>	Performance Assessment of <u>Outcome</u> Measure	<input type="checkbox"/>	Revision of Measure
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Performance Assessment of <u>Output</u> Measure	<input type="checkbox"/>	Deletion of Measure
<input type="checkbox"/>	Adjustment of GAA Performance Standards		

Approved Standard	Actual Performance Results	Difference (Over/Under)	Percentage Difference
5,968	4934	(1034)	(17.33%)

**Factors Accounting for the Difference:**

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

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

**Explanation:** Due to reduced caseloads at the trial level, fewer appeals were filed than originally expected.

**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:** Although there were fewer briefs filed than the approved standard, the slight increase from last FY may be attributed to the Courts increase in the numbers of decisions made. 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):

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

**Recommendations:**  
Acquire additional resources to provide adequate staffing.



**EXHIBIT III – ASSESSMENT OF PERFORMANCE MEASURES**

---

<b>Department:</b> Justice Administration			
<b>Program:</b> Public Defender, Appellate			
<b>Service/Budget Entity:</b> Public Defender, Appellate			
<b>Measure:</b> Number of writs filed			
<b>Action:</b>			
<input type="checkbox"/> Performance Assessment of <u>Outcome</u> Measure		<input type="checkbox"/> Revision of Measure	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Performance Assessment of <u>Output</u> Measure		<input type="checkbox"/> Deletion of Measure	
<input type="checkbox"/> Adjustment of GAA Performance Standards			
<b>Approved Standard</b>	<b>Actual Performance Results</b>	<b>Difference (Over/Under)</b>	<b>Percentage Difference</b>
106	101	(5)	(4.72%)
<b>Factors Accounting for the Difference:</b>			
<b>Internal Factors</b> (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)			
<b>Explanation:</b> Due to reduced caseloads at the trial level, fewer appeals were filed than originally expected.			
<b>External Factors</b> (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			
<b>Explanation:</b>			
Although there were fewer writs filed than the approved standard, the slight increase from last FY may be attributed to the Courts increase in the numbers of decisions made. Although Public Defenders were appointed to fewer cases and clients than projected, offices remain inadequately funded as a result of years of excessive caseloads.			
<b>Management Efforts to Address Differences/Problems</b> (check all that apply):			
<input type="checkbox"/> Training		<input type="checkbox"/> Technology	
<input type="checkbox"/> Personnel		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other (Identify)	
<b>Recommendations:</b>			
Acquire additional resources to provide adequate staffing.			

**EXHIBIT III – ASSESSMENT OF PERFORMANCE MEASURES**

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

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

Approved Standard	Actual Performance Results	Difference (Over/Under)	Percentage Difference
5,612	4710	(902)	(16.07%)

**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**

<b>Department:</b>	<b>Justice Administration</b>		
<b>Program:</b>	<b>Capital Collateral Regional Counsels</b>		
<b>Service/Budget Entity:</b>	<b>Legal Representation</b>		
<b>Measure:</b>	<b>Number of signed death warrants</b>		
<b>Action:</b>			
<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			
<b>Approved Standard</b>	<b>Actual Performance Results</b>	<b>Difference (Over/Under)</b>	<b>Percentage Difference</b>
5	1	(4)	(80%)
<b>Factors Accounting for the Difference:</b>			
<b>Internal Factors</b> (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)			
<b>Explanation:</b>			
<b>External Factors</b> (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			
<b>Explanation:</b> The outcome of this measure depends on the Governor's decisions.			
<b>Management Efforts to Address Differences/Problems</b> (check all that apply):			
<input type="checkbox"/> Training	<input type="checkbox"/> Technology		
<input type="checkbox"/> Personnel	<input type="checkbox"/> Other (Identify)		
<b>Recommendations:</b>			

**EXHIBIT III - ASSESSMENT OF PERFORMANCE MEASURE**

<b>Department:</b> Justice Administration	
<b>Program:</b> Capital Collateral Regional Counsels	
<b>Service/Budget Entity:</b> Legal Representation	
<b>Measure:</b> Number of court decisions to release a death row inmate, grant a new trial, grant a new sentencing hearing, or grant other appeals	
<b>Action:</b>	
<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
5	3	(2)	(40%)

**Factors Accounting for the Difference:**

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

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

**Explanation:**

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

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

**Explanation:** Since the U.S. Supreme Court Hurst v. Florida decision there have been delays in court decisions.

**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**

<b>Department:</b> Justice Administration			
<b>Program:</b> Capital Collateral Regional Counsels			
<b>Service/Budget Entity:</b> Legal Representation			
<b>Measure:</b> Number of evidentiary hearings			
<b>Action:</b>			
<input type="checkbox"/> Performance Assessment of <u>Outcome</u> Measure	<input type="checkbox"/> Revision of Measure		
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Performance Assessment of <u>Output</u> Measure	<input type="checkbox"/> Deletion of Measure		
<input type="checkbox"/> Adjustment of GAA Performance Standards			
<b>Approved Standard</b>	<b>Actual Performance Results</b>	<b>Difference (Over/Under)</b>	<b>Percentage Difference</b>
12	6	(6)	(50%)
<b>Factors Accounting for the Difference:</b>			
<b>Internal Factors</b> (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)			
<b>Explanation:</b>			
<b>External Factors</b> (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			
<b>Explanation:</b> The Supreme Court Hurst v. Florida decision in January delayed hearings.			
<b>Management Efforts to Address Differences/Problems</b> (check all that apply):			
<input type="checkbox"/> Training	<input type="checkbox"/> Technology		
<input type="checkbox"/> Personnel	<input type="checkbox"/> Other (Identify)		
<b>Recommendations:</b>			

**EXHIBIT III - ASSESSMENT OF PERFORMANCE MEASURES**

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

**Exhibit III is not applicable**

**Action:**

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

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

**Factors Accounting for the Difference:**

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

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

**Explanation:**

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

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

**Explanation:**

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

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

**Recommendations:**

***JUSTICE ADMINISTRATION***



***LONG RANGE PROGRAM PLAN  
FISCAL YEARS 2017-18 THROUGH 2021-22***

***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**

---

<b>Department:</b>	<b>Justice Administration</b>
<b>Program:</b>	<b>Statewide Guardian ad Litem</b>
<b>Service/Budget Entity:</b>	<b>Statewide Guardian ad Litem</b>
<b>Measure:</b>	<b>All Performance Measures <u>X</u></b>

**Action** (check one):

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

**Data Sources and Methodology:**

The data source for these measures are numbers tracked by each of the 20 Guardian ad Litem offices residing in the 20 judicial circuits. Each office records and reports, as of the last day of the month, data needed to assess Program performance and to determine whether standards are met.

**Validity:**

The methodology for collecting and reporting the data supporting all performance measures is an accurate approach to data collection.

**Reliability:**

The methodology is sound and consistent. Although minor issues remain regarding data collection, the Program feels confident that the process is dependable and will result in consistent information from year to year.

---

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

---

**Department:** Justice Administration  
**Program:** State Attorneys, First - Twentieth Judicial Circuits  
**Service/Budget Entity:** State Attorneys, First - Twentieth Judicial Circuits  
**Measure:** 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 – No revisions or new measures requested

**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 – No revisions or new measures requested

**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 – No revisions or new measures requested

**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:** 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 – No revisions or new measures requested

**Data Sources and Methodology:**

**Validity:**

**Reliability:**

---

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

---

**Department:** Justice Administration  
**Program:** Criminal Conflict and Civil Regional Councils  
**Service/Budget Entity:** Regional Conflict Councils, 1<sup>st</sup> – 5<sup>th</sup> Regions  
**Measure:** Annual percentage of briefs filed within 30 days of receipt of record

**Action** (check one):

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

**Data Sources and Methodology:**

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

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

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

---

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

---

<b>Department:</b>	<b>Justice Administration</b>
<b>Program:</b>	<b>Criminal Conflict and Civil Regional Councils</b>
<b>Service/Budget Entity:</b>	<b>Regional Conflict Councils, 1<sup>st</sup> – 5<sup>th</sup> Regions</b>
<b>Measure:</b>	<b>Annual percentage of misdemeanor cases closed within 120 days of appointment</b>

**Action** (check one):

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

**Data Sources and Methodology:**

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

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

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

---

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

---

**Department:** Justice Administration  
**Program:** Criminal Conflict and Civil Regional Councils  
**Service/Budget Entity:** Regional Conflict Councils, 1<sup>st</sup> – 5<sup>th</sup> Regions  
**Measure:** In cases where there is either an adjudication or a withhold of adjudication, a case plan to be approved by the court within 90 days

**Action** (check one):

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

**Data Sources and Methodology:**

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

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

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

***JUSTICE ADMINISTRATION***



***LONG RANGE PROGRAM PLAN  
FISCAL YEARS 2017-18 THROUGH 2021-22***

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

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

Measure Number	Approved Performance Measures for FY 2016-17		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**

<b>Measure Number</b>	<b>Approved Performance Measures for FY 2015-16 (Words)</b>		<b>Associated Activities Title</b>
1	Average number of children represented		Represent children
2	Average percent of children represented		Represent children
3	Percent of cases closed with permanency goal achieved		Represent children
4	Number of new volunteers certified as a GAL		Represent children
5	Number of volunteers on June 30		Represent children

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

<b>Measure Number</b>	<b>Approved Performance Measures for FY 2016-17</b>		<b>Associated Activity Titles (From Exhibit VI)</b>
1	Percent of offenders who qualify for enhanced sentencing for whom state attorneys requested enhanced sentencing		Felony Prosecution Services Misdemeanor Prosecution Services Juvenile Prosecution Services Child Support Enforcement Services Civil Action Services
2	Total number of dispositions		Felony Prosecution Services Misdemeanor Prosecution Services Juvenile Prosecution Services Child Support Enforcement Services Civil Action Services
3	Number of dispositions by trial verdicts		Felony Prosecution Services Misdemeanor Prosecution Services Juvenile Prosecution Services Child Support Enforcement Services Civil Action Services
4	Number of dispositions by pleas		Felony Prosecution Services Misdemeanor Prosecution Services Juvenile Prosecution Services Child Support Enforcement Services Civil Action Services
5	Number of dispositions by non trial		Felony Prosecution Services Misdemeanor Prosecution Services Juvenile Prosecution Services Child Support Enforcement Services Civil Action Services



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

<b>Measure Number</b>	<b>Approved Performance Measures for FY 2016-17</b>		<b>Associated Activity Titles (From Exhibit VI)</b>
6	Number of dispositions by otherwise		Felony Prosecution Services Misdemeanor Prosecution Services Juvenile Prosecution Services Child Support Enforcement Services Civil Action Services
7	Percent of dispositions by trial verdicts		Felony Prosecution Services Misdemeanor Prosecution Services Juvenile Prosecution Services Child Support Enforcement Services Civil Action Services
8	Percent of dispositions by pleas		Felony Prosecution Services Misdemeanor Prosecution Services Juvenile Prosecution Services Child Support Enforcement Services Civil Action Services
9	Percent of dispositions by non trial		Felony Prosecution Services Misdemeanor Prosecution Services Juvenile Prosecution Services Child Support Enforcement Services Civil Action Services
10	Percent of dispositions by otherwise		Felony Prosecution Services Misdemeanor Prosecution Services Juvenile Prosecution Services Child Support Enforcement Services Civil Action Services

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

<b>Measure Number</b>	<b>Approved Performance Measures for FY 2016-17</b>		<b>Associated Activity Titles (From Exhibit VI)</b>
11	Number of substantiated Bar grievances filed annually		Felony Prosecution Services Misdemeanor Prosecution Services Juvenile Prosecution Services Child Support Enforcement Services Civil Action Services
12	Number of misdemeanor criminal case referrals		Misdemeanor Prosecution Services
13	Number of felony criminal case referrals		Felony Prosecution Services
14	Number of juvenile criminal case referrals		Juvenile Prosecution Services
15	Number of misdemeanor filings		Misdemeanor Prosecution Services
16	Number of felony filings		Felony Prosecution Services
17	Number of juvenile filings		Juvenile Prosecution Services
18	Number of post conviction relief responses or Habeas Corpus responses		Felony Prosecution Services Misdemeanor Prosecution Services Juvenile Prosecution Services Child Support Enforcement Services Civil Action Services
19	Number of sexual predator civil commitment proceedings		Civil Action Services
20	Number of Baker Act hearings		Civil Action Services

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

<b>Measure Number</b>	<b>Approved Performance Measures for FY 2016-17</b>		<b>Associated Activity Titles (From Exhibit VI)</b>
1	Annual attorney turnover rate		Civil Trial Indigent Defense Civil Investigative Services Criminal Trial Indigent Defense Criminal Investigative Services
2	Number of appointed & re-opened cases		Civil Trial Indigent Defense Civil Investigative Services Criminal Trial Indigent Defense Criminal Investigative Services
3	Number of cases closed		Civil Trial Indigent Defense Civil Investigative Services Criminal Trial Indigent Defense Criminal Investigative Services
4	Number of clients represented		Civil Trial Indigent Defense Civil Investigative Services Criminal Trial Indigent Defense Criminal Investigative Services
5	Number of cases per attorney		Civil Trial Indigent Defense Civil Investigative Services Criminal Trial Indigent Defense Criminal Investigative Services

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

<b>Measure Number</b>	<b>Approved Performance Measures for FY 2016-17</b>		<b>Associated Activity Titles (From Exhibit VI)</b>
1	Annual attorney turnover rates		Indigent Appellate Defense
2	Percent of appeals resolved		Indigent Appellate Defense
3	Number of appointed cases		Indigent Appellate Defense
4	Number of clients represented		Indigent Appellate Defense
5	Number of briefs filed		Indigent Appellate Defense
6	Number of writs filed		Indigent Appellate Defense
7	Number of cases closed		Indigent Appellate Defense

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

<b>Measure Number</b>	<b>Approved Performance Measures for FY 2016-17</b>		<b>Associated Activities Title (From Exhibit VI)</b>
1	Percent of cases in which post-conviction motion, post-conviction appeal, federal habeas corpus motion or federal appeal is timely filed, without extension		Death Penalty Legal Counsel
			Death Row Case Preparation
2	Number of substantiated Bar grievances filed annually		Death Penalty Legal Counsel
3	Number of appellate actions		Death Penalty Legal Counsel
			Death Row Case Preparation
4	Number of 3.851 filings		Death Penalty Legal Counsel
			Death Row Case Preparation
5	Number of signed death warrants		Death Penalty Legal Counsel
			Death Row Case Preparation
6	Number of court decisions to release a death row inmate, grant a new trial, grant a new sentencing hearing, or grant other appeals		Death Penalty Legal Counsel
			Death Row Case Preparation
7	Number of active cases		Death Penalty Legal Counsel
			Death Row Case Preparation
8	Number of evidentiary hearings		Death Penalty Legal Counsel
			Death Row Case Preparation
9	Number of federal court actions		Death Penalty Legal Counsel
			Death Row Case Preparation

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

<b>Measure Number</b>	<b>Proposed Performance Measures for FY 2016-17</b>		<b>Approved Associated Activity Titles (From Exhibit VI)</b>
1	“New Measure” – Annual percentage of appellate briefs filed within 30 days of receipt of record.		Regional Counsel Workload
2	“New Measure” – Annual percentage of misdemeanor cases closed within 120 days of appointment.		Regional Counsel Workload
3	“New Measure” – In cases where there is an adjudication or a withhold of adjudication, the percentage of case plans approved by the court within 90 days of appointment.		Regional Counsel Workload



---

## 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