



THE STATE OF FLORIDA
JUSTICE ADMINISTRATIVE COMMISSION

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



COMMISSIONERS

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

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

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

LONG RANGE PROGRAM PLAN

***** REVISED *****

www.justiceadmin.org

Justice Administration
Tallahassee, Florida

October 15, 2014

Cynthia Kelly, Director
Office of Policy and Budget
Executive Office of the Governor
1701 Capitol
Tallahassee, Florida-32399-0001

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

Cindy Kynoch, Staff Director
Senate Committee on Appropriations
201 Capitol
Tallahassee, FL 32399-1300

Dear Directors:

Pursuant to Chapter 216, Florida Statutes, the Long Range Program Plan (LRPP) for the Department of Justice Administration was uploaded to the Florida Fiscal Portal on September 30, 2014 in the format prescribed in the LRPP Budget Instructions. Subsequent to the upload, the State Attorney's Office in the 20th Judicial Circuit has requested that a change be made to the reporting of the actual standard achieved for the approved performance measure "Number of substantiated Bar grievances filed annually". The actual standard achieved in Fiscal Year 2013-14 for this measure was 0, not 1 as originally reported. The Department of Justice Administration is therefore submitting Revision #1 to the LRPP that includes an updated Exhibit II - Performance Measures and Standards and Exhibit III - Assessment of Performance Measures for the Fiscal Year 2015-16 through Fiscal Year 2019-20. The internet website address that provides the link to the LRPP located on the Florida Fiscal Portal is www.justiceadmin.com. This revised submission is being provided by me as Executive Director of the Justice Administrative Commission on behalf of all agencies within the Department.

Sincerely,

Alton L. "Rip" Colvin, Jr.



**Justice Administrative Commission
Long-Range Program Plan
FY 2015-2016 through 2019-2020**

**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 2015-2016 through 2019-2020

September 30, 2014

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 2015-16 THROUGH FY 2019-2020

September 30, 2014

**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 2015-2016 THROUGH FY 2019-2020

September 30, 2014

**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 2015-2016 THROUGH FY 2019-2020**

September 30, 2014

**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 2015-16 through 2019-20

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

September 30, 2014



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

**LONG RANGE PROGRAM PLAN
FY 2015-2016 THROUGH FY 2019-2020**

September 30, 2014

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

**Ita Neymotin
Regional Counsel, Second Region**

**Eugene Zenobi
Regional Counsel, Third Region**

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

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

AGENCY MISSION AND GOALS

JUSTICE ADMINISTRATIVE COMMISSION

Mission: *Provide Superior Services*

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

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

Priority #1 Goal:

Provide quality administrative services.

STATEWIDE GUARDIAN AD LITEM

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

Long Range Operational Goals

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

Priority #1 Goal:

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

AGENCY MISSION AND GOALS

STATEWIDE GUARDIAN AD LITEM

Priority #2 Goal:

Advocate for timely permanency for children.

Priority #3 Goal:

Increase number of volunteer advocates for children.

STATE ATTORNEY

Mission: *Seeking Justice for Florida*

"The prosecutor is the representative, not of an ordinary party in a controversy, but of sovereignty whose obligation to govern impartially is as compelling as its obligation to govern at all; and whose interest, therefore, in a criminal prosecution is not that it win a case, but that justice shall be done."

*Justice Southerland
Berger vs U.S. 295 U.S. 78 (1935)*

Priority #1 Goal:

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

Priority #2 Goal:

To recruit and retain qualified and experienced Assistant State Attorneys to handle the increased caseloads and sophisticated prosecutions on behalf of the people of the State of Florida.

PUBLIC DEFENDER

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

Priority #1 Goal:

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

Priority #2 Goal:

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

AGENCY MISSION AND GOALS

PUBLIC DEFENDER APPELLATE

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

Priority #1 Goal:

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

Priority #2 Goal:

Establish reasonable caseloads for appellate attorneys and process appeals in a timely manner.

CAPITAL COLLATERAL REGIONAL COUNSEL

Capital Collateral Regional Counsel (CCRC) Purpose: To provide legal representation for state inmates who have received the death penalty and for whom state laws provide post-conviction reviews of their judgement of conviction and sentence.

Mission: *Assure capital justice*

Chapter 27 Part IV and the Florida Rules of Criminal Procedure 3.851 and 3.852: CCRCs are responsible for collecting and analyzing public records of all assigned post-death penalty conviction cases, investigating each case and providing legal representation within state and federal courts performing post-conviction reviews.

Goal:

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

OFFICES OF CRIMINAL CONFLICT AND CIVIL REGIONAL COUNSELS (OCCRC)

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

Priority #1 Goal:

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

AGENCY OBJECTIVES

JUSTICE ADMINISTRATIVE COMMISSION

Goal 1 Objective 1:

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

Goal 1 Objective 2:

Review court appointed counsel and due process vendor invoices for compliance with contractual and statutory requirements, as well as the Department of Financial Services' rules and regulations.

STATEWIDE GUARDIAN AD LITEM

Goal 1 Objective:

Represent all children under Court supervision as reported by the Department of Children and Families.

Goal 2 Objective:

Provide representation for children until permanency is achieved.

Goal 3 Objective:

Increase number of new volunteers.

STATE ATTORNEY

Goal 1 Objective:

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

Goal 2 Objective:

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

PUBLIC DEFENDER

Goals 1 & 2 Objective:

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

AGENCY OBJECTIVES

PUBLIC DEFENDER APPELLATE

Goals 1 & 2 Objective:

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

CAPITAL COLLATERAL REGIONAL COUNSEL (CCRC)

Goal 1 Objective:

To competently achieve the completion of death penalty post-conviction review by state and federal courts.

OFFICES OF CRIMINAL CONFLICT AND CIVIL REGIONAL COUNSELS (OCCRC)

Goal 1 Objective:

Appeals: File initial appellate briefs within 30 days of receipt of record.

Criminal: Close misdemeanor cases within 120 days of appointment.

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

**AGENCY SERVICE OUTCOMES AND
PERFORMANCE PROJECTION TABLES**

JUSTICE ADMINISTRATIVE COMMISSION

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

Baseline/ Year 2013-14	FY 2015-16	FY 2016-17	FY 2017-18	FY 2018-19	FY 2019-20
369,016	372,706	376,433	380,197	383,999	387,839

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

Baseline/ Year 2013-14	FY 2015-16	FY 2016-17	FY 2017-18	FY 2018-19	FY 2019-20
53,808	54,346	54,889	55,438	55,992	56,552

STATEWIDE GUARDIAN AD LITEM

PRIMARY SERVICE OUTCOMES

Outcome: Average number of children represented.

Baseline					
FY 2013/14	FY2015/16	FY2016/17	FY2017/18	FY2018/19	FY2019/20
22,266	26,352	28,180	28,180	28,180	28,180

Explanation: This is the average of 12 months of data, from July 1 – June 30 of each fiscal year, reflecting the percentage of children served in the dependency system. The proposed incremental increases reflected in the chart above provide for expansion until such time as 100% of all children in the dependency system are represented by June of 2016. **These levels of performance are primarily contingent upon funding of the legislative budget requests submitted by the Guardian ad Litem Program for the years FY15/16 forward and the variable rate of children entering the dependency system. These targets also assume that the average number of children in the dependency system remains constant at a level estimated at 28,180.**

Outcome: Average percent of children represented.

Baseline					
FY 2013/14	FY2015/16	FY2016/17	FY2017/18	FY2018/19	FY2019/20
78.02%	93%	100%	100%	100%	100%

**AGENCY SERVICE OUTCOMES AND
PERFORMANCE PROJECTION TABLES**

STATEWIDE GUARDIAN AD LITEM

Explanation: Showing the average percent of children represented gives the reader an understanding of the proportion of children represented in the dependency system. It is important to show the both the number represented (as in the first outcome shown above) and the percent of children represented (as in the second chart above) in order to give an accurate picture of performance on this measure. It is worth noting that although the GAL Program averaged 78.02% representation in FY 13-14, performance improved from 73.07% in July 2013 to 81.59% in June 2014. The proposed continuing increase reflected in the chart above provides for expansion until such time as 100% of all children in the dependency system are represented by June 2016. **These levels of performance are primarily contingent upon funding of the legislative budget requests submitted by the Guardian ad Litem Program for the years FY 15-16 and forward and the variable rate of children entering the dependency system. These targets also assume that the average number of children in the dependency system remains constant at a level estimated at 28,180.**

Outcome: Percent of cases closed with Permanency Goal achieved.

<u>Baseline</u>					
FY 2013/14	FY2015/16	FY2016/17	FY2017/18	FY2018/19	FY2019/20
74.3%	75.0%	75.0%	75.0%	75.0%	75.0%

Explanation: This measure is an average of 12 months' data on closed cases. 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, supervision by the Department of Children and Families (DCF) is terminated when those goals are achieved. Ideally, a GAL should not discharge off of an assigned case before a child achieves permanency, although that desired result is not always achieved. Improvement in that result over time is highly desired and in the best interest of children. **This performance measure can be impacted by judicial appointment of our Program in areas lacking the local staffing resources required to keep pace with higher rates of children entering the dependency court system. In addition, it has yet to be determined what effect the implementation by the Department of Children and Families (DCF) of the new Florida Safety Methodology will have on the overall number of children entering state care.**

Outcome: Number of new volunteers certified as a GAL.

<u>Baseline</u>					
FY 2013/14	FY2015/16	FY2016/17	FY2017/18	FY2018/19	FY2019/20
2,830	3,225	3,225	3,225	3,225	3,225

**AGENCY SERVICE OUTCOMES AND
PERFORMANCE PROJECTION TABLES**

STATEWIDE GUARDIAN AD LITEM

Explanation: The GAL Program aims to reach a total of 10,000 volunteers by the end of June 2015. **Once the June 30, 2015, objective of 10,000 certified volunteers is achieved, this performance measure will become a replacement activity. It is contingent upon achieving a volunteer retention rate of 72% or higher.**

Outcome: Number of volunteers on June 30, annually.

<u>Baseline</u>					
FY 2013/14	FY2015/16	FY2016/17	FY2017/18	FY2018/19	FY2019/20
9,222	10,000	10,000	10,000	10,000	10,000

Explanation: At the end of June 2014, the number of certified volunteers was 9,222. The GAL Program expects to increase that number to 10,000 by the end of the fiscal year FY 2014/15. Our current volunteer strategy is to reach and maintain 10,000 certified volunteers statewide.

STATE ATTORNEY

STATE ATTORNEY, FIRST JUDICIAL CIRCUIT

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

	FY 2000-01 BASELINE	FY 2015-16	FY 2016-17	FY 2017-18	FY 2018-19	FY 2019-20
Offenders who qualify for enhanced sentence for whom the State requests enhanced sentence	146	185	185	185	185	185
Offenders for whom the Court orders enhanced sentencing	91	185	185	185	185	185
Percentage of offenders sentenced by the Court to an enhanced sentence	62%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

Outcome: Assistant State Attorney turnover rate.

FY 2000-01 BASELINE	FY 2015-16	FY 2016-17	FY 2017-18	FY 2018-19	FY 2019-20
15.6%	10.19%	10.19%	10.19%	10.19%	10.19%

**AGENCY SERVICE OUTCOMES AND
PERFORMANCE PROJECTION TABLES**

STATE ATTORNEY, SECOND JUDICIAL CIRCUIT

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

	FY 2000-01 BASELINE	FY 2015-16	FY 2016-17	FY 2017-18	FY 2018-19	FY 2019-20
Offenders who qualify for enhanced sentence for whom the State requests enhanced sentence	152	160	160	160	160	160
Offenders for whom the Court orders enhanced Sentencing	53	160	160	160	160	160
Percentage of offenders sentenced by the Court to an enhanced sentence	37%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

Outcome: Assistant State Attorney turnover rate.

FY 2000-01 BASELINE	FY 2015-16	FY 2016-17	FY 2017-18	FY 2018-19	FY 2019-20
33.4%	20%	30%	25%	20%	20%

STATE ATTORNEY, THIRD JUDICIAL CIRCUIT

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

	FY 2000-01 BASELINE	FY 2015-16	FY 2016-17	FY 2017-18	FY 2018-19	FY 2019-20
Offenders who qualify for enhanced sentence for whom the State requests enhanced sentence	7	45	48	50	50	50
Offenders for whom the Court orders enhanced sentencing	6	41	44	45	45	45
Percentage of offenders sentenced by the Court to an enhanced sentence	85.7%	91.1%	91.7%	90%	90%	90%

Outcome: Assistant State Attorney turnover rate.

FY 2000-01 BASELINE	FY 2015-16	FY 2016-17	FY 2017-18	FY 2018-19	FY 2019-20
13.6%	14%	15%	15%	15%	15%

**AGENCY SERVICE OUTCOMES AND
PERFORMANCE PROJECTION TABLES**

STATE ATTORNEY, FOURTH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT

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

	FY 2000-01 BASELINE	FY 2015-16	FY 2016-17	FY 2017-18	FY 2018-19	FY 2019-20
Offenders who qualify for enhanced sentence for whom the State requests enhanced Sentence	303	950	950	950	950	950
Offenders for whom the Court orders enhanced Sentencing	300	902	902	902	902	902
Percentage of offenders sentenced by the Court to an enhanced sentence	99%	95%	95%	95%	95%	95%

Outcome: Assistant State Attorney turnover rate.

FY 2000-01 BASELINE	FY 2015-16	FY 2016-17	FY 2017-18	FY 2018-19	FY 2019-20
21%	22%	22%	22%	22%	22%

STATE ATTORNEY, FIFTH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT

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

	FY 2001-02 BASELINE	FY 2015-16	FY 2016-17	FY 2017-18	FY 2018-19	FY 2019-20
Offenders who qualify for enhanced sentence for whom the State requests enhanced sentence	320	312	319	328	335	344
Offenders for whom the Court orders enhanced sentencing	168	308	317	326	335	344
Percentage of offenders sentenced by the Court to an enhanced sentence	52.50%	98%	98%	98%	100%	100%

Outcome: Assistant State Attorney turnover rate.

FY 2000-01 BASELINE	FY 2015-16	FY 2016-17	FY 2017-18	FY 2018-19	FY 2019-20
20.59%	18.63%	18.07%	17.52%	16.99%	16.48%

**AGENCY SERVICE OUTCOMES AND
PERFORMANCE PROJECTION TABLES**

STATE ATTORNEY, SIXTH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT

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

	FY 2000-01 BASELINE	FY 2015-16	FY 2016-17	FY 2017-18	FY 2018-19	FY 2019-20
Offenders who qualify for enhanced sentence for whom the State requests enhanced sentence	508	400	350	350	325	325
Offenders for whom the Court orders enhanced Sentencing	356	300	280	280	276	275
Percentage of offenders sentenced by the Court to an enhanced sentence	38%	40%	41%	41%	42%	42%

Outcome: Assistant State Attorney turnover rate.

FY 2000-01 BASELINE	FY 2015-16	FY 2016-17	FY 2017-18	FY 2018-19	FY 2019-20
15%	15%	15%	15%	15%	15%

STATE ATTORNEY, SEVENTH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT

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

	FY 2000-01 BASELINE	FY 2015-16	FY 2016-17	FY 2017-18	FY 2018-19	FY 2019-20
Offenders who qualify for enhanced sentence for whom the State requests enhanced sentence	223	275	280	285	290	295
Offenders for whom the Court orders enhanced sentencing	90	253	260	265	269	274
Percentage of offenders sentenced by the Court to an enhanced sentence	40.5%	93%	93%	93%	93%	93%

Outcome: Assistant State Attorney turnover rate.

FY 2000-01 BASELINE	FY 2015-16	FY 2016-17	FY 2017-18	FY 2018-19	FY 2019-20
19.8%	25%	28%	30%	32%	32%

**AGENCY SERVICE OUTCOMES AND
PERFORMANCE PROJECTION TABLES**

STATE ATTORNEY, EIGHTH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT

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

	FY 2013-14 BASELINE	FY 2015-16	FY 2016-17	FY 2017-18	FY 2018-19	FY 2019-20
Offenders who qualify for enhanced sentence for whom the State requests enhanced sentence	59	60	61	62	63	64

Outcome: Assistant State Attorney turnover rate.

FY 2013-14 BASELINE	FY 2015-16	FY 2016-17	FY 2017-18	FY 2018-19	FY 2019-20
8.16%	10.00%	10.00%	10.00%	10.00%	10.00%

STATE ATTORNEY, NINTH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT

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

	FY 2000-01 BASELINE	FY 2015-16	FY 2016-17	FY 2017-18	FY 2018-19	FY 2019-20
Offenders who qualify for enhanced sentence for whom the State requests enhanced sentence	634	300	300	300	300	300

Outcome: Assistant State Attorney turnover rate.

FY 2000-01 BASELINE	FY 2015-16	FY 2016-17	FY 2017-18	FY 2018-19	FY 2019-20
28.14%	20%	20%	20%	20%	20%

**AGENCY SERVICE OUTCOMES AND
PERFORMANCE PROJECTION TABLES**

STATE ATTORNEY, TENTH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT

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

	FY 2000-01 BASELINE	FY 2015-16	FY 2016-17	FY 2017-18	FY 2018-19	FY 2019-20
Offenders who qualify for enhanced sentence for whom the State requests enhanced sentence	465	1,900	1,900	1,900	1,900	1,900
Offenders for whom the Court orders enhanced sentencing	220	1,900	1,900	1,900	1,900	1,900
Percentage of offenders sentenced by the Court to an enhanced sentence	47.3%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

Outcome: Assistant State Attorney turnover rate.

FY 2000-01 BASELINE	FY 2015-16	FY 2016-17	FY 2017-18	FY 2018-19	FY 2019-20
16.7%	10%	10%	10%	10%	10%

STATE ATTORNEY, ELEVENTH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT

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

	FY 2000-01 BASELINE	FY 2015-16	FY 2016-17	FY 2017-18	FY 2018-19	FY 2019-20
Offenders who qualify for enhanced sentence for whom the State requests enhanced sentence	3,683	2,595	2,861	3,004	3,154	3,312

Outcome: Assistant State Attorney turnover rate.

FY 2000-01 BASELINE	FY 2015-16	FY 2016-17	FY 2017-18	FY 2018-19	FY 2019-20
21.85%	14%	14%	14%	14%	14%

**AGENCY SERVICE OUTCOMES AND
PERFORMANCE PROJECTION TABLES**

STATE ATTORNEY, TWELFTH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT

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

	FY 2000-01 BASELINE	FY 2015-16	FY 2016-17	FY 2017-18	FY 2018-19	FY 2019-20
Offenders who qualify for enhanced sentence for whom the State requests enhanced sentence	210	55	56	57	58	59
Offenders for whom the Court orders enhanced sentencing	123	55	56	57	58	59
Percentage of offenders sentenced by the Court to an enhanced sentence	58.57%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

Outcome: Assistant State Attorney turnover rate.

FY 2000-01 BASELINE	FY 2015-16	FY 2016-17	FY 2017-18	FY 2018-19	FY 2019-20
20.5%	14.29%	13%	12%	11%	10%

STATE ATTORNEY, THIRTEENTH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT

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

	FY 2000-01 BASELINE	FY 2015-16	FY 2016-17	FY 2017-18	FY 2018-19	FY 2019-20
Offenders who qualify for enhanced sentence for whom the State requests enhanced sentence	210	204	204	204	204	204
Offenders for whom the Court orders enhanced Sentencing	203	200	200	200	200	200
Percentage of offenders sentenced by the Court to an enhanced sentence	96.70%	98.04%	98.04%	98.04%	98.04%	98.04%

Outcome: Assistant State Attorney turnover rate.

FY 2000-01 BASELINE	FY 2015-16	FY 2016-17	FY 2017-18	FY 2018-19	FY 2019-20
27.91%	18.43%	19.00%	19.50%	19.75%	20.00%

**AGENCY SERVICE OUTCOMES AND
PERFORMANCE PROJECTION TABLES**

STATE ATTORNEY, FOURTEENTH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT

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

	FY 2000-01 BASELINE	FY 2015-16	FY 2016-17	FY 2017-18	FY 2018-19	FY 2019-20
Offenders who qualify for enhanced sentence for whom the State requests enhanced sentence	13	50	50	50	50	50
Offenders for whom the Court orders enhanced sentencing	11	40	40	40	40	40
Percentage of offenders sentenced by the Court to an enhanced sentence	87%	80%	80%	80%	80%	80%

Outcome: Assistant State Attorney turnover rate.

FY 2000-01 BASELINE	FY 2015-16	FY 2016-17	FY 2017-18	FY 2018-19	FY 2019-20
12.50%	15%	20%	20%	15%	15%

STATE ATTORNEY, FIFTEENTH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT

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

	FY 2000-01 BASELINE	FY 2015-16	FY 2016-17	FY 2017-18	FY 2018-19	FY 2019-20
Offenders who qualify for enhanced sentence for whom the State requests enhanced sentence	313	200	200	205	210	210
Offenders for whom the Court orders enhanced Sentencing	164	200	200	205	210	210
Percentage of offenders sentenced by the Court to an enhanced sentence	52.40%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

Outcome: Assistant State Attorney turnover rate.

FY 2000-01 BASELINE	FY 2015-16	FY 2016-17	FY 2017-18	FY 2018-19	FY 2019-20
24.15%	14%	14%	13%	13%	12%

**AGENCY SERVICE OUTCOMES AND
PERFORMANCE PROJECTION TABLES**

STATE ATTORNEY, SIXTEENTH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT

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

	FY 2000-01 BASELINE	FY 2015-16	FY 2016-17	FY 2017-18	FY 2018-19	FY 2019-20
Offenders who qualify for enhanced sentence for whom the State requests enhanced sentence	44	36	36	36	36	36
Offenders for whom the Court orders enhanced sentencing	42	36	36	36	36	36
Percentage of offenders sentenced by the Court to an enhanced sentence	95%	100	100	100	100	100

Outcome: Assistant State Attorney turnover rate.

FY 2000-01 BASELINE	FY 2015-16	FY 2016-17	FY 2017-18	FY 2018-19	FY 2019-20
77%	25%	25%	25%	25%	25%

STATE ATTORNEY, SEVENTEENTH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT

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

	FY 2001-02 BASELINE	FY 2015-16	FY 2016-17	FY 2017-18	FY 2018-19	FY 2019-20
Offenders who qualify for enhanced sentence for whom the State requests enhanced sentence	849	1127	1127	1127	1127	1127
Offenders for whom the Court orders enhanced sentencing	501	542	542	542	542	542
Percentage of offenders sentenced by the Court to an enhanced sentence	59%	48%	48%	48%	48%	48%

Outcome: Assistant State Attorney turnover rate.

FY 2000-01 BASELINE	FY 2015-16	FY 2016-17	FY 2017-18	FY 2018-19	FY 2019-20
18%	14.41%	14.41%	14.41%	14.41%	14.41%

**AGENCY SERVICE OUTCOMES AND
PERFORMANCE PROJECTION TABLES**

STATE ATTORNEY, EIGHTEENTH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT

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

	FY 2000-01 BASELINE	FY 2015-16	FY 2016-17	FY 2017-18	FY 2018-19	FY 2019-20
Offenders who qualify for enhanced sentence for whom the State requests enhanced sentence	121	180	180	180	180	180
Offenders for whom the Court orders enhanced sentencing	97	180	180	180	180	180
Percentage of offenders sentenced by the Court to an enhanced sentence	80.2%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

Outcome: Assistant State Attorney turnover rate.

FY 2000-01 BASELINE	FY 2015-16	FY 2016-17	FY 2017-18	FY 2018-19	FY 2019-20
27.20%	13%	13%	13%	13%	13%

STATE ATTORNEY, NINETEENTH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT

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

	FY 2000-01 BASELINE	FY 2015-16	FY 2016-17	FY 2017-18	FY 2018-19	FY 2019-20
Offenders who qualify for enhanced sentence for whom the State requests enhanced sentence	69	43	44	45	46	47
Offenders for whom the Court orders enhanced Sentencing	28	43	44	45	46	47
Percentage of offenders sentenced by the Court to an enhanced sentence	41%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

Outcome: Assistant State Attorney turnover rate.

FY 2000-01 BASELINE	FY 2015-16	FY 2016-17	FY 2017-18	FY 2018-19	FY 2019-20
17.67%	11.11%	11.11%	11.11%	11.11%	11.11%

AGENCY SERVICE OUTCOMES AND PERFORMANCE PROJECTION TABLES

STATE ATTORNEY, TWENTIETH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT

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

	FY 2000-01 BASELINE	FY 2015-16	FY 2016-17	FY 2017-18	FY 2018-19	FY 2019-20
Offenders who qualify for enhanced sentence for whom the State requests enhanced sentence	257	429	429	429	429	429
Offenders for whom the Court orders enhanced sentencing	105	385	385	385	385	385
Percentage of offenders sentenced by the Court to an enhanced sentence	41.00%	89.74%	89.74%	89.74%	89.74%	89.74%

Outcome: Assistant State Attorney turnover rate.

FY 2000-01 BASELINE	FY 2015-16	FY 2016-17	FY 2017-18	FY 2018-19	FY 2019-20
27.00%	9.54%	9.54%	9.54%	9.54%	9.54%

PUBLIC DEFENDER

PUBLIC DEFENDER, FIRST THROUGH TWENTIETH CIRCUITS

Outcome: Percent of attorney turnover rates.

FY 2013-14 BASELINE	FY 2015-16	FY 2016-17	FY 2017-18	FY 2018-19	FY 2019-20
17.81%	16.07%	15.27%	14.51%	13.78%	13.09%

Outcome: Number of cases per attorney.

FY 13-14 BASELINE	FY 2015-16	FY 2016-17	FY 2017-18	FY 2018-19	FY 2019-20
508	459	436	414	393	373

**AGENCY SERVICE OUTCOMES AND
PERFORMANCE PROJECTION TABLES**

PUBLIC DEFENDER APPELLATE

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

Outcome: Percent of attorney turnover rates.

FY 20013-14 BASELINE	FY 2015-16	FY 2016-17	FY 2017-18	FY 2018-19	FY 2019-20
9.98%	9.01%	8.56%	8.13%	7.72%	7.33%

Outcome: Percent of appeals resolved annually.

FY 20013-14 BASELINE	FY 2015-16	FY 2016-17	FY 2017-18	FY 2018-19	FY 2019-20
111.43%	122.85%	129.00%	135.45%	142.22%	149.33%

CAPITAL COLLATERAL REGIONAL COUNSEL, NORTH REGION

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

BASELINE YEAR	FY2015-16	FY2016-17	FY2017-18	FY2018-19	FY2019-20
	0	0	0	0	1

CAPITAL COLLATERAL REGIONAL COUNSEL, MIDDLE REGION

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

FY 2000-01 BASELINE	FY2015-16	FY2016-17	FY2017-18	FY2018-19	FY2019-20
3	5	5	5	5	5

**AGENCY SERVICE OUTCOMES AND
PERFORMANCE PROJECTION TABLES**

CAPITAL COLLATERAL REGIONAL COUNSEL, SOUTH REGION

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

FY 2000-01 BASELINE	FY2015-16	FY2016-17	FY2017-18	FY2018-19	FY2019-20
3	5	5	5	5	5

OFFICES OF CRIMINAL CONFLICT AND CIVIL REGIONAL COUNSELS

CRIMINAL CONFLICT AND CIVIL REGIONAL COUNSEL, FIRST REGION

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

FY 2013-14 BASELINE	FY 2015-16	FY 2016-17	FY 2017-18	FY 2018-19	FY 2019-20
5%	10%	15%	20%	25%	30%

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

FY 2013-14 BASELINE	FY 2015-16	FY 2016-17	FY 2017-18	FY 2018-19	FY 2019-20
87%	92%	97%	100%	100%	100%

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

FY 2013-14 BASELINE	FY 2015-16	FY 2016-17	FY 2017-18	FY 2018-19	FY 2019-20
88%	93%	98%	100%	100%	100%

**AGENCY SERVICE OUTCOMES AND
PERFORMANCE PROJECTION TABLES**

CRIMINAL CONFLICT AND CIVIL REGIONAL COUNSEL, SECOND REGION

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

FY 2013-14 BASELINE	FY 2015-16	FY 2016-17	FY 2017-18	FY 2018-19	FY 2019-20
56%	58%	60%	62%	64%	66%

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

FY 2013-14 BASELINE	FY 2015-16	FY 2016-17	FY 2017-18	FY 2018-19	FY 2019-20
78%	83%	85%	87%	89%	91%

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

FY 2013-14 BASELINE	FY 2015-16	FY 2016-17	FY 2017-18	FY 2018-19	FY 2019-20
48%	52%	56%	60%	64%	68%

CRIMINAL CONFLICT AND CIVIL REGIONAL COUNSEL, THIRD REGION

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

FY 2013-14 BASELINE	FY 2015-16	FY 2016-17	FY 2017-18	FY 2018-19	FY 2019-20
	30%	30%	30%	30%	30%

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

FY 2013-14 BASELINE	FY 2015-16	FY 2016-17	FY 2017-18	FY 2018-19	FY 2019-20
	80%	80%	80%	80%	80%

**AGENCY SERVICE OUTCOMES AND
PERFORMANCE PROJECTION TABLES**

CRIMINAL CONFLICT AND CIVIL REGIONAL COUNSEL, THIRD REGION

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

FY 2013-14 BASELINE	FY 2015-16	FY 2016-17	FY 2017-18	FY 2018-19	FY 2019-20
	40%	40%	40%	40%	40%

CRIMINAL CONFLICT AND CIVIL REGIONAL COUNSEL, FOURTH REGION

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

FY 2013-14 BASELINE	FY 2015-16	FY 2016-17	FY 2017-18	FY 2018-19	FY 2019-20
35%	36.05%	37.13%	38.25%	39.39%	40.58%

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

FY 2013-14 BASELINE	FY 2015-16	FY 2016-17	FY 2017-18	FY 2018-19	FY 2019-20
88%	90.64%	93.36%	96.16%	96.16%	96.16%

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

FY 2013-14 BASELINE	FY 2015-16	FY 2016-17	FY 2017-18	FY 2018-19	FY 2019-20

CRIMINAL CONFLICT AND CIVIL REGIONAL COUNSEL, FIFTH REGION

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

FY 2013-14 BASELINE	FY 2015-16	FY 2016-17	FY 2017-18	FY 2018-19	FY 2019-20
70%	71%	72%	73%	74%	75%

**AGENCY SERVICE OUTCOMES AND
PERFORMANCE PROJECTION TABLES**

CRIMINAL CONFLICT AND CIVIL REGIONAL COUNSEL, FIFTH REGION

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

FY 2013-14 BASELINE	FY 2015-16	FY 2016-17	FY 2017-18	FY 2018-19	FY 2019-20
91.8%	92%	92%	92%	92%	92%

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

FY 2013-14 BASELINE	FY 2015-16	FY 2016-17	FY 2017-18	FY 2018-19	FY 2019-20
79.75%	80%	80%	80%	80%	80%

LINKAGE TO GOVERNOR'S PRIORITIES

PRIORITY #1 – IMPROVING EDUCATION

- World Class Education

PRIORITY #2 – ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT AND JOB CREATION

- Focus on Job Growth and Retention

STATE ATTORNEYS

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

PUBLIC DEFENDERS

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

PUBLIC DEFENDERS APPELLATE

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

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

PRIORITY #3 – MAINTAINING AFFORDABLE COST OF LIVING IN FLORIDA

- Accountability Budgeting

JUSTICE ADMINISTRATIVE COMMISSION (JAC)

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

LINKAGE TO GOVERNOR'S PRIORITIES

JUSTICE ADMINISTRATIVE COMMISSION (JAC)

Objective 2: *Review court appointed counsel and due process vendor invoices for compliance with contractual and statutory requirements, as well as the Department of Financial Services' rules and regulations.*

STATEWIDE GUARDIAN AD LITEM (GAL)

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

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

STATE ATTORNEYS

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

PUBLIC DEFENDERS

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

PUBLIC DEFENDERS APPELLATE

Priority #2 Goal: *Provide quality representation to all appointed clients and thereby protect the constitutional and statutory rights of all citizens. Establish reasonable caseloads for appellate attorneys and process appeals in a timely manner.*

CAPITAL COLLATERAL REGIONAL COUNSELS (CCRC)

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

The CCRC system produces internal budget and performance management oriented metrics during the fiscal year. These metrics help CCRC offices to monitor cost

LINKAGE TO GOVERNOR'S PRIORITIES

CAPITAL COLLATERAL REGIONAL COUNSELS (CCRC)

efficiency, employee productivity and performance results objectives. In addition, CCRCs can use the metrics to provide timely responses to Governor's Office and Legislative staff and member questions related to any aspect of CCRC operations, financial status and performance results.

OFFICE OF CRIMINAL CONFLICT AND CIVIL REGIONAL COUNSELS (OCCRC)

Priority #1 Goal: *To ensure cases are processed in a timely and cost effective manner.*

- Reduce Government Spending

JUSTICE ADMINISTRATIVE COMMISSION (JAC)

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

Objective 2: *Review court appointed counsel and due process vendor invoices for compliance with contractual and statutory requirements, as well as the Department of Financial Services' rules and regulations.*

STATEWIDE GUARDIAN AD LITEM (GAL)

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

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

TRENDS AND CONDITIONS

JUSTICE ADMINISTRATIVE COMMISSION (JAC)

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

Additionally, the JAC is charged with the responsibility of providing compliance and financial review of the court appointed counsel due process costs.

The JAC priorities were determined after consulting with the agencies we administratively serve and related legislative actions. Over the next five years, the JAC will continue to review its priorities with our stakeholders and make modifications as necessary.

The JAC strives to maintain employees who are highly skilled, motivated, productive, and ethical. JAC's core values are teamwork, efficiency, accuracy, and customer service.

STATEWIDE GUARDIAN AD LITEM

The Guardian ad Litem Program was established in Florida in 1980 to represent the best interests of abused, abandoned or neglected children involved in court proceedings. There are 20 local Guardian ad Litem programs in the 20 judicial circuits in Florida. On January 1, 2004, the *Statewide* Guardian ad Litem Office was created to provide the infrastructure to increase functionality and standardization among the existing programs. Section 39.8296, Florida Statutes, created the State Office as an independent entity within the Justice Administrative Commission.

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

Since 2004, an annual report has been filed each year which describes the environment, issues and strategies employed to address our basic mission to represent all dependent children, as defined within Chapter 39 of the Florida Statutes. Past annual reports may be viewed at the Guardian ad Litem Program's website, <http://www.guardianadlitem.org/> under the topic "News."

TRENDS AND CONDITIONS

STATEWIDE GUARDIAN AD LITEM

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

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

- The Guardian ad Litem Program has grown significantly since FY 2012-13, with the injection of new recurring funding to hire additional staff that can, in turn, recruit, manage and oversee the work of additional volunteers. The Guardian ad Litem Program expects that by the end of FY 2015-16, if legislative budget requests are funded and the population of dependent children does not climb, that the program can represent all children in the dependency system in keeping with federal and state mandates.
- The Florida Legislature appropriated new recurring funding in the amount of \$3.8 million for the Guardian ad Litem Program for FY 2013-14. This funding increase brought the Guardian ad Litem Program back to the level of funding that it had before the reductions of FY 2007. It allowed the Program to increase the numbers of children represented and by the end of FY 2013-14, almost 82% of the children in the dependency system were represented by the GAL Program. This exceeded the Program's projections.
- For FY 2014-15, the Florida Legislature appropriated an additional \$6.1 million for continued expansion of the program. The GAL Program projects that it will be able to represent an estimated 88% of the dependent children with the additional of this new funding.
- The GAL Program believes that a volunteer assigned to every child is critical to the protection of a child's best interests and by July 1, 2016, the plan is to ensure that all of our currently assigned children have a voice.
- Additional funding will be necessary to fund volunteer growth and an increase in the percentage of children represented beyond June 30, 2015. The Guardian ad Litem Program is requesting such funding in its Legislative Budget Request for FY 2015-16.

TRENDS AND CONDITIONS

STATEWIDE GUARDIAN AD LITEM

- Growth or contraction in the dependency system is often linked with the economic and political climate in the State of Florida, as well as news coverage of high profile child death cases. Recent focus on the capacity and quality of child protective services has led to increases in the number of children removed from their homes in some urban areas of the state. If this trend were to continue, it is likely that the total number of children served in the dependency system would increase, and therefore lower the GAL ability to serve all children, and the percentage of children represented with existing resources.
- In addition, the impact the DCF's new safety methodology on the rate of removal of children is yet unknown.
- All targets and projections are contingent upon funding of the Guardian ad Litem legislative budget requests, and are based on the assumption that the number of children in the dependency system does not grow beyond its current level. Variations in these factors will result in adjustments in the projections provided herein.

STATE ATTORNEYS

AGENCIES PRIMARY RESPONSIBILITIES AND STATUTORY AUTHORITY

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

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

TRENDS AND CONDITIONS

STATE ATTORNEYS

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 is their effectiveness in meeting the goals and objectives within the constraints of state and county appropriations and budgetary restrictions.

State Attorneys' duties and obligations have not only increased in the criminal justice system but have now extended into the civil courtrooms. This has resulted in an increased workload of serious and sophisticated criminal and civil referrals including the legislatively expanded Civil Commitment Procedures of Sexual Predators.

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 reduce turnover and provide a more stable, efficient and productive staff.

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

CHANGES THAT REQUIRE LEGISLATIVE ACTION

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

TRENDS AND CONDITIONS

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.

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.

TRENDS AND CONDITIONS

PUBLIC DEFENDER APPELLATE

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.

CAPITAL COLLATERAL REGIONAL COUNSEL (CCRC)

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

CCRC Statutory Responsibilities:

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

CCRC GOAL

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

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

THE CCRC'S PROFESSIONAL FOCUS

CCRCs strive to meet professional standards for providing post-conviction legal services by competently working all cases assigned by the Florida Supreme Court in as cost and operationally efficient and timely manner as possible.

TRENDS AND CONDITIONS

CAPITAL COLLATERAL REGIONAL COUNSEL

THE CCRCs LONG RANGE PROGRAM PLAN STORY

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

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

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

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

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

CCRC FOCUS AREA 1

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

1.0 Trends and Conditions

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

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

TRENDS AND CONDITIONS

CAPITAL COLLATERAL REGIONAL COUNSEL

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.

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

Related External Issue 1.2 Budget Reduction Impact

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

If additional budget reductions of 5% occur in FY 2015-16, it is likely that 4 lawyers and 2 investigators will be laid off (about 8% of CCRC case staffing). The loss of highly experienced and competent lawyers and investigators reduces the ability of the CCRC offices to handle workloads by 10%, and would substantially affect the newly recreated CCRC North's ability to accept new cases. A mandate to cut the CCRC budgets by 5% would severely compromise CCRCs ability to meet court standards. Additionally, the resulting loss of positions would require the CCRCs to reduce the number of cases in Middle and South regional offices by 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 may be reassigned to the Registry. This is likely to cost more than would have been the case if cuts in CCRC budgets had not occurred allowing the CCRCs to continue the case work.

TRENDS AND CONDITIONS

CAPITAL COLLATERAL REGIONAL COUNSEL

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, 73% of all CCRC attorneys have more than 5 years experience in post conviction litigation. Additionally, 86% of CCRC lead attorneys have greater than 10 years of postconviction experience. Lowering staff turnover rates has been a priority in order to meet legislatively mandated performance measures as well as state and federal guidelines for timeliness.

CCRC FOCUS AREA 2

Respond to increasing CCRC caseloads, state law and court rulings.

2.0 Trends and Conditions

CCRC caseloads, as assigned by the Florida Supreme Court, typically increase annually. In FY 2010-11, the caseload was 172. In FY 2013-14, the CCRC workload was 181. In FY 2014-15 it is expected to be 181 unless CCRC North caseloads grow more quickly and dramatically than anticipated. In 2015-16 the CCRC caseloads are expected to be 183.

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

The CCRCs perform case trial records research, investigate case backgrounds and issues, produce a filing raising critical issues for state and federal court consideration and provide legal representation in the state and federal courts where issues are heard. When a death warrant is signed by the Governor, the CCRCs have an accelerated requirement to do final state and federal court reviews of the sentence within a short 45-60 day period.

TRENDS AND CONDITIONS

CAPITAL COLLATERAL REGIONAL COUNSEL

External Issue 2.1 Have the capacity to meet increasing workloads

	in 2009-10	in 2010-11	in 2011-12	in 2012-13	in 2013-14	in 2014-15
Death warrants:	1	1	4	2	3	5

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.

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. The Timely Justice Act changed the manager of the Registry attorney's contracts from the Department of Financial Services to the Justice Administration Commission. The Justice Administration Commission changed some of the requirements in the contract between the Registry attorneys and the State of Florida, causing several Registry attorneys to withdraw from their cases, resulting in the CCRC's being appointed to warrant ready cases or other cases further along in the system. 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.

TRENDS AND CONDITIONS

CAPITAL COLLATERAL REGIONAL COUNSEL

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 94% of all motions filed by CCRCs were timely filed without requests for extensions. However, the latest Auditor General's Report to the Legislature comparing CCRCs with private Registry indicated that the private registry attorneys only filed 63% of their motions in a timely fashion.

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

For the past ten (10) years, the Florida Supreme Court has reversed many Circuit courts who have summarily denied post-conviction motions without granting an evidentiary hearing. The court has made it very clear that the Circuit courts should grant evidentiary hearings on a broad range of factual claims, leading to a significant increase in the number of issues raised by CCRCs that are granted an evidentiary hearing.

This has led to a slight increase in the costs of legal representation and case preparation, but it has also decreased delay in the post-conviction process. Cases that were previously reversed and remanded for an evidentiary hearing after a summary denial are now being considered by the Circuit courts in a timely fashion. The 2-3 year delay caused when the Florida Supreme Court reversed the case, simply because the Circuit court failed to consider issues when they were first raised, occurs less often, thereby increasing the 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 postconviction proceedings. Responding to legislative concerns, the Florida Supreme Court created the Capital Postconviction Proceedings Committee to look into possible substantive and procedural changes to the capital post-conviction process.

TRENDS AND CONDITIONS

CAPITAL COLLATERAL REGIONAL COUNSEL

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

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

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

Second, the court ordered that trial counsel in capital cases must retain all the original files, including all work product generated in the representation of the defendant at trial, which is counter to the practice in most jurisdictions where trial counsel routinely provided original files to post-conviction counsel. The Court further ruled that postconviction counsel is permitted to view and inspect the files, but any copies provided by the trial counsel to the post-conviction counsel would be at collateral counsel’s expense.

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

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

TRENDS AND CONDITIONS

CAPITAL COLLATERAL REGIONAL COUNSEL

Internal Issue 2.4 Be able to maintain attorney workloads at reasonable levels to continually provide competent legal representation and keep cases progressing on a timely basis through the court systems.

The CCRCs have case teams (1 lead attorney, 1 second attorney, 1 investigator and ½ support position). The number of cases per lead attorney was 12 in FY 2009-10. In FY 2011-12 it was 13. In FY 2014-15 it is expected to be 12. The Spangenburg Report of 1999 and the American Bar Association recommend a caseload of less than 6 per attorney.

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

CCRC FOCUS AREA 3

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

3.0 Trends and Conditions

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

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

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

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

TRENDS AND CONDITIONS

CAPITAL COLLATERAL REGIONAL COUNSEL

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 are costly. There was one death warrant issued in FY 2007-08, 5 in FY 2008-09 and 3 in 2013-14. Many

more are possible annually in the future. The average death warrant response costs CCRC between \$ 20,000 - \$ 30,000.

CCRC FOCUS AREA 4

The Time It Takes To Complete Capital Cases in the Judicial System

4.0 Trends and Conditions

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

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

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.

TRENDS AND CONDITIONS

CAPITAL COLLATERAL REGIONAL COUNSEL

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

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

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

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

The time it takes for the State and Federal courts to hear cases is a major factor affecting the time it takes for cases to progress through the judicial system. Judges set the timelines for scheduling case hearings. This can be affected by court caseloads and backlog conditions.

Judges must carefully consider case issues and motions before scheduling hearings on those that have merit. It is then the responsibility of the CCRC and a prosecuting attorney to be prepared to participate in the scheduled hearing(s).

At times, the court will grant hearing delays upon a legitimate request by the CCRC or prosecuting attorney. The trend in the increased timeliness of court hearings is due in part to the increased frequency of status conferences by the trial courts required under the new rules promulgated by the Florida Supreme Court.

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

TRENDS AND CONDITIONS

CAPITAL COLLATERAL REGIONAL COUNSEL

CCRCs, combined, had 32 lawyers, 16 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 2013.

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

TRENDS AND CONDITIONS

CAPITAL COLLATERAL REGIONAL COUNSEL

CCRCs also are developing improved and more efficient capacities to monitor and evaluate their planning, budgeting and performance and accountability responsibilities. Administrative systems are being integrated to allow the office to administer more efficiently. The production of Long Range Program Plans, budgets and financial and operating performance measures in a much more time efficient, integrative and accurate manner is also being realized.

CCRCs continue to monitor their public records, investigation and legal counsel process activities and work tasks to isolate areas where efficiencies may be enhanced. The tasks involved in each of these processes are as follow:

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

1.0 Public Records

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

2.0 Investigations

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

3.0 Legal Counsel

- 3.1. Visit client
- 3.2. Analyze witness information
- 3.3. Draft and publish or transmit the 3.851 motion documents
- 3.4. Prepare other motions as appropriate
- 3.5. Participate in evidentiary hearing(s)
- 3.6. Draft post-hearing orders and pleadings
- 3.7. Review court decisions
- 3.8. Prepare for and participate in state court appeals/Habeas Corpus
- 3.9. Prepare and file a Petition for Certiorari to the U.S. Supreme Court
- 3.10. Prepare for and participate in Federal Habeas Corpus proceedings
- 3.11. Conduct or attend evidentiary and/or other hearings
- 3.12. Prepare for and participate in Circuit Court of Appeal
- 3.13. Prepare and file a Petition for Certiorari to the U.S. Supreme Court

The CCRCs will continue implementing additional budget management capacities that will allow “unit cost” efficiency analysis and performance evaluations. In FY 2015-16, CCRCs plan to further develop their “unit costing” budget systems to build in automatic

TRENDS AND CONDITIONS

CAPITAL COLLATERAL REGIONAL COUNSEL

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 postconviction legal representation story due to the availability of valid and reliable data, their ability to be collected and their ability to be integrated with financial data.

Internal Issue 5.3 Information Technology

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

Additionally, the CCRCs have invested in advanced scanning and document systems that allow quicker retrieval of documents and reduce the need for storage space within the home office for paper records necessary for review. Historically, each client represented by the CCRCs generates records averaging between 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.

TRENDS AND CONDITIONS

OFFICES OF CRIMINAL CONFLICT AND CIVIL REGIONAL COUNSELS

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

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

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

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

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

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

TRENDS AND CONDITIONS

OFFICES OF CRIMINAL CONFLICT AND CIVIL REGIONAL COUNSELS

- Clients requiring removal of disabilities of nonage pursuant to Chapter 743, Florida Statutes
- Clients subject to involuntary civil commitment and removal of civil rights pursuant to the Florida Guardianship Law, Chapter 744, Florida Statutes
- Children and families in need of state services pursuant to Chapter 984, Florida Statutes

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

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

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

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

JUSTICE ADMINISTRATION



***LONG RANGE PROGRAM PLAN
FISCAL YEARS 2015-16 THROUGH 2019-20***

PERFORMANCE MEASURES AND STANDARDS – LRPP EXHIBIT II

EXHIBIT II – PERFORMANCE MEASURES AND STANDARDS

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

Program: Justice Administrative Commission	Code: 21300000
--	----------------

Service/Budget Entity: Executive Direction/Support Services	Code: 21308000
---	----------------

Approved Performance Measures for FY 2014-15	Approved Prior Year Standard FY 2013-14	Prior Year Actual FY 2013-14	Approved Standards for FY 2014-15	Requested FY 2015-16 Standard
Percent of invoices processed within statutory time frames	95.00%	96.29%	95.00%	95.00%
Number of public records requests	150	225	150	150
Number of cases where registry lawyers request fees above the statutory caps	2,500	711	2,500	700
Number of cases where the court orders fees above the statutory cap	2,000	691	2,000	700
Total amount of excess fees awarded by the court per circuit	\$6,000,000	\$7,470,854	\$6,000,000	\$6,500,000
Number of budget, payroll, disbursement, revenue and financial report transactions processed	375,000	369,016	375,000	375,000
Number of court-appointed attorney and due process vendor invoices processed	65,000	53,808	65,000	50,000

EXHIBIT II - PERFORMANCE MEASURES AND STANDARDS

Department: Justice Administration	Department No.: 21
Program: Statewide Guardian ad Litem Program	Code: 21.31.00.00
Service/Budget Entity: PGM: Stw/Guardian ad Litem	Code: 21.31.00.00

Approved Performance Measures for FY 2014-15	Approved Prior Year Standards FY 2013-14	Actual Prior Year Standards FY 2013-14	Approved Standards For FY 2014-15	Requested FY 2015-16 Standard
Average number of children represented	26,500	22,991	26,500	27,052
Average percent of children represented	80%	81.59%	80%	92%
Percent of cases closed with Permanency Goal achieved.	70%	77.73%	70%	75%
Number of new volunteers certified as a GAL	1,464	2,830	1,464	3,225
Average number of active volunteers	5,057	8,879	5,057	10,000

EXHIBIT II - PERFORMANCE MEASURES AND STANDARDS

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

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

Approved Performance Measures for FY 2014-15	Approved Prior Year Standards FY 2013-14	Actual Prior Year Standards FY 2013-14
Percent of offenders who qualify for enhanced sentencing for whom state attorneys requested enhanced sentencing	92.00%	94.27%
Total number of dispositions	1,339,035	1,097,656
Number of dispositions by trial verdicts	14,004	22,455
Number of dispositions by pleas	727,246	593,982
Number of dispositions by non trial	157,990	173,364
Number of dispositions by otherwise	439,795	307,855
Percent of dispositions by trial verdicts	1.05%	2.05%
Percent of dispositions by pleas	54.30%	54.11%
Percent of dispositions by non trial	11.80%	15.79%
Percent of dispositions by otherwise	32.84%	28.05%
Number of substantiated Bar grievances filed annually	0	1
Number of misdemeanor criminal case referrals	1,183,597	884,563
Number of felony criminal case referrals	490,965	389,452
Number of juvenile criminal case referrals	197,338	109,064
Number of misdemeanor filings	792,393	624,348
Number of felony filings	219,752	174,932
Number of juvenile filings	83,616	43,649
Number of post conviction relief responses or Habeas Corpus responses	22,391	12,515
Number of sexual predator civil commitment proceedings	TBD	4,665
Number of Baker Act hearings	27,686	22,560

EXHIBIT II - PERFORMANCE MEASURES AND STANDARDS

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

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

Approved Performance Measures for FY 2014-15	Approved Prior Year Standards FY 2013-14	Actual Prior Year Standards FY 2013-14	Approved Standards for FY 2014-15	Requested Standards for FY 2015-16
Percent of offenders who qualify for enhanced sentencing for whom state attorneys requested enhanced sentencing		100%		100%
Total number of dispositions		54,586		54,586
Number of dispositions by trial verdicts		404		404
Number of dispositions by pleas		37,814		37,814
Number of dispositions by non trial		3,494		3,494
Number of dispositions by otherwise		12,874		12,874
Percent of dispositions by trial verdicts		1%		1%
Percent of dispositions by pleas		68%		68%
Percent of dispositions by non trial		7%		7%
Percent of dispositions by otherwise		24%		24%
Number of substantiated Bar grievances filed annually		0		0
Number of misdemeanor criminal case referrals		28,056		28,056
Number of felony criminal case referrals		17,018		17,018
Number of juvenile criminal case referrals		4,898		4,898
Number of misdemeanor filings		15,593		15,593
Number of felony filings		11,361		11,361
Number of juvenile filings		2,667		2,667
Number of post conviction relief responses or Habeas Corpus responses		597		597
Number of sexual predator civil commitment proceedings		242		242
Number of Baker Act hearings		1,741		1,741

EXHIBIT II - PERFORMANCE MEASURES AND STANDARDS

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

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

Approved Performance Measures for FY 2014-15	Approved Prior Year Standards FY 2013-14	Actual Prior Year Standards FY 2013-14	Approved Standards for FY 2014-15	Requested Standards for FY 2015-16
Percent of offenders who qualify for enhanced sentencing for whom state attorneys requested enhanced sentencing		100		100
Total number of dispositions		23,034		23,000
Number of dispositions by trial verdicts		367		375
Number of dispositions by pleas		10,487		10,500
Number of dispositions by non trial		1,905		1,600
Number of dispositions by otherwise		10,275		10,500
Percent of dispositions by trial verdicts		1.59%		1.45%
Percent of dispositions by pleas		45.53%		47.30%
Percent of dispositions by non trial		8.27%		6.50%
Percent of dispositions by otherwise		44.60%		44.70%
Number of substantiated Bar grievances filed annually		0		0
Number of misdemeanor criminal case referrals		12,679		13,000
Number of felony criminal case referrals		6,380		6,400
Number of juvenile criminal case referrals		1,312		1,350
Number of misdemeanor filings		11,404		11,500
Number of felony filings		4,289		4,400
Number of juvenile filings		955		960
Number of post conviction relief responses or Habeas Corpus responses		82		65
Number of sexual predator civil commitment proceedings		150		120
Number of Baker Act hearings		43		35

EXHIBIT II - PERFORMANCE MEASURES AND STANDARDS

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

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

Approved Performance Measures for FY 2014-15	Approved Prior Year Standards FY 2013-14	Actual Prior Year Standards FY 2013-14	Approved Standards for FY 2014-15	Requested Standards for FY 2015-16
Percent of offenders who qualify for enhanced sentencing for whom state attorneys requested enhanced sentencing		60.7%		90%
Total number of dispositions		14,304		14,304
Number of dispositions by trial verdicts		102		102
Number of dispositions by pleas		5,663		5,663
Number of dispositions by non trial		1,288		1,288
Number of dispositions by otherwise		7,251		7,251
Percent of dispositions by trial verdicts		.7%		.7%
Percent of dispositions by pleas		39.6%		39.6%
Percent of dispositions by non trial		9%		9%
Percent of dispositions by otherwise		50.7%		50.7%
Number of substantiated Bar grievances filed annually		1		1
Number of misdemeanor criminal case referrals		6,502		6,502
Number of felony criminal case referrals		3,699		3,699
Number of juvenile criminal case referrals		947		947
Number of misdemeanor filings		5,092		5,092
Number of felony filings		2,574		2,574
Number of juvenile filings		598		598
Number of post conviction relief responses or Habeas Corpus responses		5		5
Number of sexual predator civil commitment proceedings		326		326
Number of Baker Act hearings		97		97

EXHIBIT II - PERFORMANCE MEASURES AND STANDARDS

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

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

Approved Performance Measures for FY 2014-15	Approved Prior Year Standards FY 2013-14	Actual Prior Year Standards FY 2013-14	Approved Standards for FY 2014-15	Requested Standards for FY 2015-16
Percent of offenders who qualify for enhanced sentencing for whom state attorneys requested enhanced sentencing		89.66%		89.66%
Total number of dispositions		61,402		61,402
Number of dispositions by trial verdicts		436		436
Number of dispositions by pleas		45,153		45,153
Number of dispositions by non trial		2,423		2,423
Number of dispositions by otherwise		13,390		13,390
Percent of dispositions by trial verdicts		.70%		.70%
Percent of dispositions by pleas		73.54%		73.54%
Percent of dispositions by non trial		3.95%		3.95%
Percent of dispositions by otherwise		21.81%		21.81%
Number of substantiated Bar grievances filed annually		0		0
Number of misdemeanor criminal case referrals		43,609		43,609
Number of felony criminal case referrals		18,473		18,473
Number of juvenile criminal case referrals		4,131		4,131
Number of misdemeanor filings		41,795		41,795
Number of felony filings		10,452		10,452
Number of juvenile filings		2,671		2,671
Number of post conviction relief responses or Habeas Corpus responses		2,198		2,198
Number of sexual predator civil commitment proceedings		325		325
Number of Baker Act hearings		1,271		1,271

EXHIBIT II - PERFORMANCE MEASURES AND STANDARDS

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

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

Approved Performance Measures for FY 2014-15	Approved Prior Year Standards FY 2013-14	Actual Prior Year Standards FY 2013-14	Approved Standards for FY 2014-15	Requested Standards for FY 2015-16
Percent of offenders who qualify for enhanced sentencing for whom state attorneys requested enhanced sentencing		98%		98%
Total number of dispositions		42,062		42,062
Number of dispositions by trial verdicts		264		264
Number of dispositions by pleas		26,009		26,009
Number of dispositions by non trial		1,607		1,607
Number of dispositions by otherwise		14,182		14,182
Percent of dispositions by trial verdicts		7%		7%
Percent of dispositions by pleas		62%		62%
Percent of dispositions by non trial		4%		4%
Percent of dispositions by otherwise		34%		34%
Number of substantiated Bar grievances filed annually		0		0
Number of misdemeanor criminal case referrals		29,311		29,311
Number of felony criminal case referrals		19,660		19,660
Number of juvenile criminal case referrals		3,795		3,795
Number of misdemeanor filings		14,511		14,511
Number of felony filings		9,644		9,644
Number of juvenile filings		1,623		1,623
Number of post conviction relief responses or Habeas Corpus responses		160		160
Number of sexual predator civil commitment proceedings		263		263
Number of Baker Act hearings		369		369

EXHIBIT II - PERFORMANCE MEASURES AND STANDARDS

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

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

Approved Performance Measures for FY 2014-15	Approved Prior Year Standards FY 2013-14	Actual Prior Year Standards FY 2013-14	Approved Standards for FY 2014-15	Requested Standards for FY 2015-16
Percent of offenders who qualify for enhanced sentencing for whom state attorneys requested enhanced sentencing		100%		100%
Total number of dispositions		89,984		90,000
Number of dispositions by trial verdicts		529		600
Number of dispositions by pleas		63,761		65,000
Number of dispositions by non trial		3,673		3,600
Number of dispositions by otherwise		22,021		20,800
Percent of dispositions by trial verdicts		.60%		.70%
Percent of dispositions by pleas		70.80%		72.20%
Percent of dispositions by non trial		4.10%		4.00%
Percent of dispositions by otherwise		24.50%		23.10%
Number of substantiated Bar grievances filed annually		N/A		N/A
Number of misdemeanor criminal case referrals		59,407		60,000
Number of felony criminal case referrals		31,109		32,000
Number of juvenile criminal case referrals		8,297		8,500
Number of misdemeanor filings		37,524		40,000
Number of felony filings		14,890		15,000
Number of juvenile filings		3,161		3,300
Number of post conviction relief responses or Habeas Corpus responses		95		100
Number of sexual predator civil commitment proceedings		312		350
Number of Baker Act hearings		1,483		1,500

EXHIBIT II - PERFORMANCE MEASURES AND STANDARDS

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

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

Approved Performance Measures for FY 2014-15	Approved Prior Year Standards FY 2013-14	Actual Prior Year Standards FY 2013-14	Approved Standards for FY 2014-15	Requested Standards for FY 2015-16
Percent of offenders who qualify for enhanced sentencing for whom state attorneys requested enhanced sentencing		262		265
Total number of dispositions		54,231		55,250
Number of dispositions by trial verdicts		248		250
Number of dispositions by pleas		23,577		24,000
Number of dispositions by non trial		8,527		8,500
Number of dispositions by otherwise		21,879		22,000
Percent of dispositions by trial verdicts		1%		1.3%
Percent of dispositions by pleas		44%		44%
Percent of dispositions by non trial		14%		14%
Percent of dispositions by otherwise		41%		41%
Number of substantiated Bar grievances filed annually		0		0
Number of misdemeanor criminal case referrals		51,097		51,000
Number of felony criminal case referrals		17,288		17,300
Number of juvenile criminal case referrals		5,202		5,200
Number of misdemeanor filings		27,765		28,000
Number of felony filings		8,140		8,200
Number of juvenile filings		2,194		2,000
Number of post conviction relief responses or Habeas Corpus responses		173		200
Number of sexual predator civil commitment proceedings		169		180
Number of Baker Act hearings		736		750

EXHIBIT II - PERFORMANCE MEASURES AND STANDARDS

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

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

Approved Performance Measures for FY 2014-15	Approved Prior Year Standards FY 2013-14	Actual Prior Year Standards FY 2013-14	Approved Standards for FY 2014-15	Requested Standards for FY 2015-16
Percent of offenders who qualify for enhanced sentencing for whom state attorneys requested enhanced sentencing		100%		100%
Total number of dispositions		24,914		23,413
Number of dispositions by trial verdicts		114		107
Number of dispositions by pleas		11,585		11,105
Number of dispositions by non trial		3,350		3,132
Number of dispositions by otherwise		9,865		9,069
Percent of dispositions by trial verdicts		0.46%		0.46%
Percent of dispositions by pleas		46.50%		47.43%
Percent of dispositions by non trial		13.45%		13.38%
Percent of dispositions by otherwise		39.59%		38.73%
Number of substantiated Bar grievances filed annually		0		0
Number of misdemeanor criminal case referrals		17,265		15,834
Number of felony criminal case referrals		8,705		8,504
Number of juvenile criminal case referrals		2,106		1,981
Number of misdemeanor filings		10,952		10,266
Number of felony filings		4,714		4,722
Number of juvenile filings		1,052		996
Number of post conviction relief responses or Habeas Corpus responses		289		285
Number of sexual predator civil commitment proceedings		199		246
Number of Baker Act hearings		506		486

EXHIBIT II - PERFORMANCE MEASURES AND STANDARDS

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

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

Approved Performance Measures for FY 2014-15	Approved Prior Year Standards FY 2013-14	Actual Prior Year Standards FY 2013-14	Approved Standards for FY 2014-15	Requested Standards for FY 2015-16
Percent of offenders who qualify for enhanced sentencing for whom state attorneys requested enhanced sentencing		100%		100%
Total number of dispositions		71,892		71,892
Number of dispositions by trial verdicts		704		704
Number of dispositions by pleas		37,675		37,675
Number of dispositions by non trial		7,929		7,929
Number of dispositions by otherwise		25,584		25,584
Percent of dispositions by trial verdicts		.98%		.98%
Percent of dispositions by pleas		52.40%		52.40%
Percent of dispositions by non trial		11.03%		11.03%
Percent of dispositions by otherwise		35.59%		35.59%
Number of substantiated Bar grievances filed annually		0		0
Number of misdemeanor criminal case referrals		48,043		48,043
Number of felony criminal case referrals		33,462		33,462
Number of juvenile criminal case referrals		9,449		9,449
Number of misdemeanor filings		32,155		32,155
Number of felony filings		13,516		13,516
Number of juvenile filings		3,922		3,922
Number of post conviction relief responses or Habeas Corpus responses		474		474
Number of sexual predator civil commitment proceedings		231		231
Number of Baker Act hearings		1,479		1,479

EXHIBIT II - PERFORMANCE MEASURES AND STANDARDS

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

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

Approved Performance Measures for FY 2014-15	Approved Prior Year Standards FY 2013-14	Actual Prior Year Standards FY 2013-14	Approved Standards for FY 2014-15	Requested Standards for FY 2015-16
Percent of offenders who qualify for enhanced sentencing for whom state attorneys requested enhanced sentencing		100%		100%
Total number of dispositions		43,085		42,718
Number of dispositions by trial verdicts		537		537
Number of dispositions by pleas		24,894		24,894
Number of dispositions by non trial		3,070		2,703
Number of dispositions by otherwise		14,584		14,584
Percent of dispositions by trial verdicts		1.2%		1.3%
Percent of dispositions by pleas		57.9%		58.3%
Percent of dispositions by non trial		7.1%		6.3%
Percent of dispositions by otherwise		33.8%		34.1%
Number of substantiated Bar grievances filed annually		0		0
Number of misdemeanor criminal case referrals		25,705		25,705
Number of felony criminal case referrals		17,842		17,842
Number of juvenile criminal case referrals		7,420		7,306
Number of misdemeanor filings		13,258		13,258
Number of felony filings		7,683		7,683
Number of juvenile filings		3,477		3,249
Number of post conviction relief responses or Habeas Corpus responses		153		153
Number of sexual predator civil commitment proceedings		299		299
Number of Baker Act hearings		2,508		2,400

EXHIBIT II - PERFORMANCE MEASURES AND STANDARDS

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

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

Approved Performance Measures for FY 2014-15	Approved Prior Year Standards FY 2013-14	Actual Prior Year Standards FY 2013-14	Approved Standards for FY 2014-15	Requested Standards for FY 2015-16
Percent of offenders who qualify for enhanced sentencing for whom state attorneys requested enhanced sentencing		100%		100%
Total number of dispositions		183,466		192,639
Number of dispositions by trial verdicts		14,055		14,758
Number of dispositions by pleas		48,429		50,850
Number of dispositions by non trial		80,487		84,511
Number of dispositions by otherwise		40,495		42,520
Percent of dispositions by trial verdicts		8%		8%
Percent of dispositions by pleas		26%		26%
Percent of dispositions by non trial		44%		44%
Percent of dispositions by otherwise		22%		22%
Number of substantiated Bar grievances filed annually		0		0
Number of misdemeanor criminal case referrals		130,043		136,545
Number of felony criminal case referrals		43,702		45,887
Number of juvenile criminal case referrals		12,661		13,294
Number of misdemeanor filings		132,852		139,495
Number of felony filings		17,034		17,886
Number of juvenile filings		3,075		3,229
Number of post conviction relief responses or Habeas Corpus responses		2,017		2,118
Number of sexual predator civil commitment proceedings		825		866
Number of Baker Act hearings		0		0

EXHIBIT II - PERFORMANCE MEASURES AND STANDARDS

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

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

Approved Performance Measures for FY 2014-15	Approved Prior Year Standards FY 2013-14	Actual Prior Year Standards FY 2013-14	Approved Standards for FY 2014-15	Requested Standards for FY 2015-16
Percent of offenders who qualify for enhanced sentencing for whom state attorneys requested enhanced sentencing		100%		100%
Total number of dispositions		36,723		37,090
Number of dispositions by trial verdicts		322		325
Number of dispositions by pleas		21,248		21,460
Number of dispositions by non trial		1,286		1,299
Number of dispositions by otherwise		13,867		14,006
Percent of dispositions by trial verdicts		1%		1%
Percent of dispositions by pleas		58%		58%
Percent of dispositions by non trial		3%		3%
Percent of dispositions by otherwise		38%		38%
Number of substantiated Bar grievances filed annually		0		0
Number of misdemeanor criminal case referrals		28,569		28,855
Number of felony criminal case referrals		13,978		14,118
Number of juvenile criminal case referrals		2,706		2,733
Number of misdemeanor filings		17,923		18,102
Number of felony filings		6,458		6,523
Number of juvenile filings		926		935
Number of post conviction relief responses or Habeas Corpus responses		66		67
Number of sexual predator civil commitment proceedings		155		157
Number of Baker Act hearings		510		515

EXHIBIT II - PERFORMANCE MEASURES AND STANDARDS

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

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

Approved Performance Measures for FY 2014-15	Approved Prior Year Standards FY 2013-14	Actual Prior Year Standards FY 2013-14	Approved Standards for FY 2014-15	Requested Standards for FY 2015-16
Percent of offenders who qualify for enhanced sentencing for whom state attorneys requested enhanced sentencing		48.23%		48.23%
Total number of dispositions		84,718		84,718
Number of dispositions by trial verdicts		1,416		1,416
Number of dispositions by pleas		49,040		49,040
Number of dispositions by non trial		13,670		13,670
Number of dispositions by otherwise		20,592		20,592
Percent of dispositions by trial verdicts		1.67%		1.67%
Percent of dispositions by pleas		57.89%		57.89%
Percent of dispositions by non trial		16.14%		16.14%
Percent of dispositions by otherwise		24.30%		24.30%
Number of substantiated Bar grievances filed annually		0		0
Number of misdemeanor criminal case referrals		59,052		59,052
Number of felony criminal case referrals		33,857		33,857
Number of juvenile criminal case referrals		7,751		7,751
Number of misdemeanor filings		50,839		50,839
Number of felony filings		13,146		13,146
Number of juvenile filings		3,280		3,280
Number of post conviction relief responses or Habeas Corpus responses		1,357		1,357
Number of sexual predator civil commitment proceedings		235		235
Number of Baker Act hearings		4,669		4,669

EXHIBIT II - PERFORMANCE MEASURES AND STANDARDS

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

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

Approved Performance Measures for FY 2014-15	Approved Prior Year Standards FY 2013-14	Actual Prior Year Standards FY 2013-14	Approved Standards for FY 2014-15	Requested Standards for FY 2015-16
Percent of offenders who qualify for enhanced sentencing for whom state attorneys requested enhanced sentencing		100%		80%
Total number of dispositions		28,794		28,500
Number of dispositions by trial verdicts		220		225
Number of dispositions by pleas		15,781		15,500
Number of dispositions by non trial		1,653		1,600
Number of dispositions by otherwise		11,140		11,000
Percent of dispositions by trial verdicts		1		1
Percent of dispositions by pleas		55		55
Percent of dispositions by non trial		6		6
Percent of dispositions by otherwise		38		38
Number of substantiated Bar grievances filed annually		0		0
Number of misdemeanor criminal case referrals		18,197		18,000
Number of felony criminal case referrals		10,228		9,000
Number of juvenile criminal case referrals		1,772		1,300
Number of misdemeanor filings		16,340		14,750
Number of felony filings		5,266		5,000
Number of juvenile filings		795		775
Number of post conviction relief responses or Habeas Corpus responses		780		500
Number of sexual predator civil commitment proceedings		140		20
Number of Baker Act hearings		451		250

EXHIBIT II - PERFORMANCE MEASURES AND STANDARDS

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

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

Approved Performance Measures for FY 2014-15	Approved Prior Year Standards FY 2013-14	Actual Prior Year Standards FY 2013-14	Approved Standards for FY 2014-15	Requested Standards for FY 2015-16
Percent of offenders who qualify for enhanced sentencing for whom state attorneys requested enhanced sentencing		66.23%		100.00%
Total number of dispositions		75,510		77,020
Number of dispositions by trial verdicts		680		694
Number of dispositions by pleas		47,186		48,130
Number of dispositions by non trial		5,656		5,769
Number of dispositions by otherwise		21,988		22,428
Percent of dispositions by trial verdicts		0.90%		0.90%
Percent of dispositions by pleas		62.49%		62.49%
Percent of dispositions by non trial		7.49%		7.49%
Percent of dispositions by otherwise		29.12%		29.12%
Number of substantiated Bar grievances filed annually		0		0
Number of misdemeanor criminal case referrals		98,808		100,784
Number of felony criminal case referrals		18,243		18,608
Number of juvenile criminal case referrals		5,684		5,798
Number of misdemeanor filings		84,130		85,813
Number of felony filings		9,325		9,512
Number of juvenile filings		2,448		2,497
Number of post conviction relief responses or Habeas Corpus responses		308		314
Number of sexual predator civil commitment proceedings		177		181
Number of Baker Act hearings		1,347		1,374

EXHIBIT II - PERFORMANCE MEASURES AND STANDARDS

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

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

Approved Performance Measures for FY 2014-15	Approved Prior Year Standards FY 2013-14	Actual Prior Year Standards FY 2013-14	Approved Standards for FY 2014-15	Requested Standards for FY 2015-16
Percent of offenders who qualify for enhanced sentencing for whom state attorneys requested enhanced sentencing		36%		36%
Total number of dispositions		6,624		6,624
Number of dispositions by trial verdicts		31		31
Number of dispositions by pleas		3,392		3,392
Number of dispositions by non trial		1,976		1,976
Number of dispositions by otherwise		1,222		1,222
Percent of dispositions by trial verdicts		.6%		.6%
Percent of dispositions by pleas		51.2%		51.2%
Percent of dispositions by non trial		29.8%		29.8%
Percent of dispositions by otherwise		18.4%		18.4%
Number of substantiated Bar grievances filed annually		0		0
Number of misdemeanor criminal case referrals		3,914		3,914
Number of felony criminal case referrals		1,429		1,429
Number of juvenile criminal case referrals		190		190
Number of misdemeanor filings		3,156		3,156
Number of felony filings		1,151		1,151
Number of juvenile filings		162		162
Number of post conviction relief responses or Habeas Corpus responses		37		37
Number of sexual predator civil commitment proceedings		0		0
Number of Baker Act hearings		29		29

EXHIBIT II - PERFORMANCE MEASURES AND STANDARDS

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

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

Approved Performance Measures for FY 2014-15	Approved Prior Year Standards FY 2013-14	Actual Prior Year Standards FY 2013-14	Approved Standards for FY 2014-15	Requested Standards for FY 2015-16
Percent of offenders who qualify for enhanced sentencing for whom state attorneys requested enhanced sentencing		100%		100%
Total number of dispositions		77,834		77,834
Number of dispositions by trial verdicts		792		792
Number of dispositions by pleas		48,818		48,818
Number of dispositions by non trial		12,844		12,844
Number of dispositions by otherwise		15,380		15,380
Percent of dispositions by trial verdicts		1.02%		1.02%
Percent of dispositions by pleas		62.72%		62.72%
Percent of dispositions by non trial		16.50%		16.50%
Percent of dispositions by otherwise		19.76%		19.76%
Number of substantiated Bar grievances filed annually		0		0
Number of misdemeanor criminal case referrals		78,896		78,896
Number of felony criminal case referrals		35,899		35,899
Number of juvenile criminal case referrals		8,753		8,753
Number of misdemeanor filings		43,486		43,486
Number of felony filings		12,543		12,543
Number of juvenile filings		5,200		5,200
Number of post conviction relief responses or Habeas Corpus responses		426		426
Number of sexual predator civil commitment proceedings		188		188
Number of Baker Act hearings		1,838		1,838

EXHIBIT II - PERFORMANCE MEASURES AND STANDARDS

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

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

Approved Performance Measures for FY 2014-15	Approved Prior Year Standards FY 2013-14	Actual Prior Year Standards FY 2013-14	Approved Standards for FY 2014-15	Requested Standards for FY 2015-16
Percent of offenders who qualify for enhanced sentencing for whom state attorneys requested enhanced sentencing		100%		100%
Total number of dispositions		39,254		39,254
Number of dispositions by trial verdicts		335		335
Number of dispositions by pleas		23,336		23,336
Number of dispositions by non trial		3,700		3,700
Number of dispositions by otherwise		11,883		11,883
Percent of dispositions by trial verdicts		0.85%		0.85%
Percent of dispositions by pleas		59.45%		59.45%
Percent of dispositions by non trial		9.43%		9.43%
Percent of dispositions by otherwise		30.27%		30.27%
Number of substantiated Bar grievances filed annually		0		0
Number of misdemeanor criminal case referrals		26,751		26,751
Number of felony criminal case referrals		16,920		16,920
Number of juvenile criminal case referrals		4,499		4,499
Number of misdemeanor filings		19,664		19,664
Number of felony filings		7,943		7,943
Number of juvenile filings		1,899		1,899
Number of post conviction relief responses or Habeas Corpus responses		430		430
Number of sexual predator civil commitment proceedings		63		63
Number of Baker Act hearings		539		539

EXHIBIT II - PERFORMANCE MEASURES AND STANDARDS

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

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

Approved Performance Measures for FY 2014-15	Approved Prior Year Standards FY 2013-14	Actual Prior Year Standards FY 2013-14	Approved Standards for FY 2014-15	Requested Standards for FY 2015-16
Percent of offenders who qualify for enhanced sentencing for whom state attorneys requested enhanced sentencing		100%		100%
Total number of dispositions		24,110		25,578
Number of dispositions by trial verdicts		369		391
Number of dispositions by pleas		17,741		18,821
Number of dispositions by non trial		2,820		2,992
Number of dispositions by otherwise		3,180		3,374
Percent of dispositions by trial verdicts		2%		2%
Percent of dispositions by pleas		74%		74%
Percent of dispositions by non trial		11%		11%
Percent of dispositions by otherwise		13%		13%
Number of substantiated Bar grievances filed annually		0		0
Number of misdemeanor criminal case referrals		18,521		19,649
Number of felony criminal case referrals		9,806		10,403
Number of juvenile criminal case referrals		2,698		2,862
Number of misdemeanor filings		13,725		14,561
Number of felony filings		5,583		5,923
Number of juvenile filings		1,670		1,772
Number of post conviction relief responses or Habeas Corpus responses		221		234
Number of sexual predator civil commitment proceedings		110		117
Number of Baker Act hearings		1,105		1,172

EXHIBIT II - PERFORMANCE MEASURES AND STANDARDS

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

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

Approved Performance Measures for FY 2014-15	Approved Prior Year Standards FY 2013-14	Actual Prior Year Standards FY 2013-14	Approved Standards for FY 2014-15	Requested Standards for FY 2015-16
Percent of offenders who qualify for enhanced sentencing for whom state attorneys requested enhanced sentencing		89.74%		89.74%
Total number of dispositions		61,068		61,679
Number of dispositions by trial verdicts		469		474
Number of dispositions by pleas		32,393		32,717
Number of dispositions by non trial		12,003		12,123
Number of dispositions by otherwise		16,203		16,365
Percent of dispositions by trial verdicts		.768%		.768%
Percent of dispositions by pleas		53.04%		53.04%
Percent of dispositions by non trial		19.66%		19.66%
Percent of dispositions by otherwise		26.53%		26.53%
Number of substantiated Bar grievances filed annually ¹		0		0
Number of misdemeanor criminal case referrals		50,854		51,363
Number of felony criminal case referrals		20,952		21,162
Number of juvenile criminal case referrals		5,865		5,924
Number of misdemeanor filings		32,184		32,506
Number of felony filings		9,220		9,312
Number of juvenile filings		1,874		1,893
Number of post conviction relief responses or Habeas Corpus responses		2,420		2,444
Number of sexual predator civil commitment proceedings		256		259
Number of Baker Act hearings		1,839		1,857

¹ Number of substantiated Bar grievances filed annually – revised October 14, 2014

EXHIBIT II - PERFORMANCE MEASURES AND STANDARDS

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

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

Approved Performance Measures for FY 2014-15	Approved Prior Year Standards FY 2013-14	Actual Prior Year Standards FY 2013-14	Approved Standards for FY 2014-15	Requested Standards for FY 2015-16
Annual attorney turnover rate	18%	17.81%	18%	16.92%
Number of appointed & re-opened cases	875,837	725,988	875,837	762,287
Number of cases closed	784,964	657,879	784,964	690,773
Number of clients represented	705,061	594,823	705,061	624,564
Number of cases per attorney	547	508	547	483

EXHIBIT II - PERFORMANCE MEASURES AND STANDARDS

EXHIBIT II PERFORMANCE MEASURES AND STANDARDS - BY CIRCUIT FY 2013-14 - July 2014	1 st	2 nd	3 rd	4 th	5 th	6 th	7 th	8 th	9 th	10 th	11 th	12 th	13 th	14 th	15 th	16 th	17 th	18 th	19 th	20 th	TOTAL
ANNUAL ATTORNEY TURNOVER RATE	27.99%	18.54%	0%	22.71%	16.19%	9.52%	17.21%	28.57%	21.26%	8.70%	23.84%	6.87%	20.68%	7.41%	10.59%	16.22%	11.76%	13.68%	30.30%	27.16%	17.81%
NUMBER OF APPOINTED & RE-OPENED CASES	33,071	15,360	9,382	37,189	30,345	73,606	34,851	17,796	73,979	31,769	76,427	31,248	55,379	19,413	52,682	6,236	40,258	28,664	20,011	38,322	725,988
# CLIENTS	26,280	12,288	8,567	33,787	25,331	73,606	29,615	14,840	48,089	26,503	71,414	19,584	44,039	15,866	34,701	5,670	33,674	24,728	16,673	29,568	594,823
NUMBER OF PLEAS	19,136	7,684	4,496	18,021	15,851	31,715	17,502	6,612	23,795	11,844	20,459	9,144	16,681	7,940	22,330	2,796	17,710	15,795	9,840	18,551	297,902
NUMBER OF TRIALS / CONTESTED HEARINGS	368	219	22	130	345	1,030	148	124	2,184	582	960	222	1,623	512	1,014	20	472	415	140	428	10,958
NUMBER OF CASES NOLLE PROSSED OR DISMISSED	2,976	1,018	616	3,526	1,315	2,180	1,812	1,418	6,065	2,329	18,764	797	7,469	297	12,806	649	6,165	2,539	1,223	5,348	79,312
TOTAL NUMBER OF CASES CLOSED	31,893	12,550	8,934	34,992	28,761	77,134	35,525	14,079	47,139	29,860	68,507	19,548	55,078	14,225	52,506	5,330	36,081	27,853	19,372	38,512	657,879

EXHIBIT II - PERFORMANCE MEASURES AND STANDARDS

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

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

Approved Performance Measures for FY 2014-15	Approved Prior Year Standards FY 2013-14	Actual Prior Year Standards FY 2013-14	Approved Standards for FY 2014-15	Requested Standards for FY 2015-16
Annual attorney turnover rate	8%	9.98%	8%	9.48%
Percent of appeals resolved	99.99%	111.43%	99.99%	117.00%
Number of appointed cases	5,643	4,732	5,643	4,969
Number of clients represented	5,810	4,734	5,810	4,971
Number of briefs filed	5,968	4,877	5,968	5,121
Number of writs filed	106	98	106	103
Number of cases closed	5,612	5,273	5,612	5,537

EXHIBIT II - PERFORMANCE MEASURES AND STANDARDS

**Public Defender Appellate Offices
PB2 BASELINE DATA COLLECTION FY 2013-2014**

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

	2nd	7th	10th	11th	15th	Total
ANNUAL ATTORNEY TURNOVER RATES *	12.31%	17.90%	0.0%	6.25%	13.48%	9.98%
APPEALS ASSIGNED	1,078	919	1,521	421	793	4,732
NUMBER OF CLIENTS REPRESENTED	1,289	910	1,359	421	755	4,734
PERCENT OF APPEALS RESOLVED	111.50%	114.69%	105.59%	130.40%	108.70%	111.43%
NUMBER OF CASES CLOSED	1,202	1,054	1,606	549	862	5,273
NUMBER OF BRIEFS FILED	1,138	932	1,391	472	944	4,877
NUMBER OF WRITS FILED	5	14	8	54	17	98

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

EXHIBIT II - PERFORMANCE MEASURES AND STANDARDS

Department: Justice Administration Department No.: 21

Program: Capital Collateral Regional Counsel Code: 21.70.00.00

Service/Budget Entity: CCRC, **North, Middle & Southern Regions Aggregate** Code: 21.70.00.00

Approved Performance Measures for FY 2014-15	Approved Prior Year Standards FY 2013-14	Actual Prior Year Standards FY 2013-14
Percent of cases in which post-conviction motion, post-conviction appeal, federal habeas corpus motion or federal appeal is timely filed, without extension	90%	94%
Number of substantiated Bar grievances filed annually	0	0
Number of appellate actions	78	88
Number of 3.851 filings	26	19
Number of signed death warrants	5	3
Number of court decisions to release a death row inmate, grant a new trial, grant a new sentencing hearing or grant other appeals	5	5
Number of active cases	171	175
Number of evidentiary hearings	16	16
Number of federal court actions	42	72

EXHIBIT II - PERFORMANCE MEASURES AND STANDARDS

Department: Justice Administration Department No.: 21

Program: Capital Collateral Regional Counsel

Code: 21.70.00.00

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

Code: 21.70.10.01

Approved Performance Measures for FY 2014-15	Approved Prior Year Standards FY 2013-14	Actual Prior Year Standards FY 2013-14	Approved Standards for FY 2014-15	Requested Standards for 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		0		90%
Number of substantiated Bar grievances filed annually		0		0
Number of appellate actions		0		0
Number of 3.851 filings		0		3
Number of signed death warrants		0		0
Number of court decisions to release a death row inmate, grant a new trial, grant a new sentencing hearing, or grant other appeals		0		0
Number of active cases		4		15
Number of evidentiary hearings		0		4
Number of federal court actions		0		0

EXHIBIT II - PERFORMANCE MEASURES AND STANDARDS

Department: Justice Administration Department No.: 21

Program: Capital Collateral Regional Counsel

Code: 21.70.00.00

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

Code: 21.70.20.01

Approved Performance Measures for FY 2014-15	Approved Prior Year Standards FY 2013-14	Actual Prior Year Standards FY 2013-14	Approved Standards for FY 2014-15	Requested Standards for 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%		90%
Number of substantiated Bar grievances filed annually		0		0
Number of appellate actions		48		39
Number of 3.851 filings		15		6
Number of signed death warrants		3		3
Number of court decisions to release a death row inmate, grant a new trial, grant a new sentencing hearing, or grant other appeals		2		1
Number of active cases		99		95
Number of evidentiary hearings		10		6
Number of federal court actions		40		29

EXHIBIT II - PERFORMANCE MEASURES AND STANDARDS

Department: Justice Administration Department No.: 21

Program: Capital Collateral Regional Counsel

Code: 21.70.00.00

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

Code: 21.70.30.01

Approved Performance Measures for FY 2014-15	Approved Prior Year Standards FY 2013-14	Actual Prior Year Standards FY 2013-14	Approved Standards for FY 2014-15	Requested Standards for 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		91%		90%
Number of substantiated Bar grievances filed annually		0		0
Number of appellate actions		40		30
Number of 3.851 filings		4		4
Number of signed death warrants		0		3
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		72		72
Number of evidentiary hearings		6		4
Number of federal court actions		32		25

EXHIBIT II - PERFORMANCE MEASURES AND STANDARDS

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

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

<u>Proposed</u> Performance Measures for FY 2014-15	Approved Prior Year Standards FY 2013-14	Actual Prior Year Standards FY 2013-14	Approved Standards for FY 2014-15	Requested Standards for FY 2015-16
“New Measure” – Annual percentage of appellate briefs filed within 30 days of receipt of record.	N/A	5%	N/A	5%
“New Measure” – Annual percentage of misdemeanor cases closed within 120 days of appointment.	N/A	87%	N/A	87%
“New Measure” –In cases where there is either an adjudication or a withhold of adjudication, the percentage of case plans approved by the court within 90 days of appointment.	N/A	88%	N/A	88%

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	

<u>Proposed</u> Performance Measures for FY 2014-15	Approved Prior Year Standards FY 2013-14	Actual Prior Year Standards FY 2013-14	Approved Standards for FY 2014-15	Requested Standards for FY 2015-16
“New Measure” – Annual percentage of appellate briefs filed within 30 days of receipt of record.	N/A	56%	N/A	58%
“New Measure” – Annual percentage of misdemeanor cases closed with 120 days of appointment.	N/A	78%	N/A	83%
“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	48%	N/A	52%

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	

<u>Proposed</u> Performance Measures for FY 2014-15	Approved Prior Year Standards FY 2013-14	Actual Prior Year Standards FY 2013-14	Approved Standards for FY 2014-15	Requested Standards for FY 2015-16
“New Measure” – Annual percentage of appellate briefs filed within 30 days of receipt of record.	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
“New Measure” – Annual percentage of misdemeanor cases closed with 120 days of appointment.	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
“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, 4 th Region	Code: 21.80.04.00	

<u>Proposed</u> Performance Measures for FY 2014-15	Approved Prior Year Standards FY 2013-14	Actual Prior Year Standards FY 2013-14	Approved Standards for FY 2014-15	Requested Standards for FY 2015-16
“New Measure” – Annual percentage of appellate briefs filed within 30 days of receipt of record.	N/A	35%	N/A	36.05%
“New Measure” – Annual percentage of misdemeanor cases closed within 120 days of appointment.	N/A	88%	N/A	90.64%
“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	

<u>Proposed</u> Performance Measures for FY 2014-15	Approved Prior Year Standards FY 2013-14	Actual Prior Year Standards FY 2013-14	Approved Standards for FY 2014-15	Requested Standards for FY 2015-16
“New Measure” – Annual percentage of appellate briefs filed within 30 days of receipt of record.	N/A	70%	N/A	70%
“New Measure” – Annual percentage of misdemeanor cases closed within 120 days of appointment.	N/A	91.8%	N/A	91.8%
“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	79.75%	N/A	79.75%

JUSTICE ADMINISTRATION



***LONG RANGE PROGRAM PLAN
FISCAL YEARS 2015-16 THROUGH 2019-20***

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

EXHIBIT III – ASSESSMENT OF PERFORMANCE MEASURES

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

Action:

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

Approved Standard	Actual Performance Results	Difference (Over/Under)	Percentage Difference
2,500	711	(1,789)	(71.6%)

Factors Accounting for the Difference:

Internal Factors (check all that apply):

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

Explanation:

External Factors (check all that apply):

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

Explanation:

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

Modifications made to s. 27.5304, F.S., in 2012 further reduced the number of these orders by establishing limited registries, and requiring that the chief judge or single designee hold hearings for fees above the statutory caps rather than the trial judge.

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

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

Recommendations:

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

EXHIBIT III – ASSESSMENT OF PERFORMANCE MEASURES

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

Action:

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

Approved Standard	Actual Performance Results	Difference (Over/Under)	Percentage Difference
2,000	691	(1,309)	(65.5%)

Factors Accounting for the Difference:

Internal Factors (check all that apply):

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

Explanation:

External Factors (check all that apply):

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

Explanation:

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

Modifications made to s. 27.5304, F.S. in 2012 further reduced the number of these orders by establishing limited registries and requiring that the chief judge or single designee hold hearings for fees above the statutory caps rather than the trial judge.

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

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

Recommendations:

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

EXHIBIT III – ASSESSMENT OF PERFORMANCE MEASURES

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

Action:

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

Approved Standard	Actual Performance Results	Difference (Over/Under)	Percentage Difference
375,000	369,016	(5,984)	(1.6%)

Factors Accounting for the Difference:

Internal Factors (check all that apply):

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

Explanation:

External Factors (check all that apply):

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

Explanation:

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

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

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

Recommendations:

Maintain current approved standard.

EXHIBIT III – ASSESSMENT OF PERFORMANCE MEASURES

Department: Justice Administration
Program: 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	53,808	(11,192)	(17.2%)

Factors Accounting for the Difference:

Internal Factors (check all that apply):

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

Explanation:

External Factors (check all that apply):

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

Explanation:

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

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

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

Recommendations:

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

EXHIBIT III – ASSESSMENT OF PERFORMANCE MEASURES

Department: Justice Administration
Program: Statewide Guardian ad Litem
Service/Budget Entity: Statewide Guardian ad Litem
Measure: Percent of cases closed with permanency goal achieved
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
70%	77.73%	7.73%	11%

Factors Accounting for the Difference: **Not applicable. Target exceeded.**

Internal Factors (check all that apply):

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

Explanation:

External Factors (check all that apply):

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

Explanation:

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

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

Recommendations:

EXHIBIT III – ASSESSMENT OF PERFORMANCE MEASURES

Department: Justice Administration
Program: Statewide Guardian ad Litem
Service/Budget Entity: Statewide Guardian ad Litem
Measure: Number of new volunteers certified as a GAL
Action:
 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
1,464	2,830	1,366	93%

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:

EXHIBIT III - ASSESSMENT OF PERFORMANCE MEASURES

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

Action:

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

Approved Standard	Actual Performance Results	Difference (Over/Under)	Percentage Difference
92.00%	94.27%	2.27%	2%

Factors Accounting for the Difference: Target exceeded.

Internal Factors (check all that apply):

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

Explanation:

External Factors (check all that apply):

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

Explanation:

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

- Training Technology
 Personnel Other (Identify)

Recommendations:

EXHIBIT III - ASSESSMENT OF PERFORMANCE MEASURES

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

Approved Standard	Actual Performance Results	Difference (Over/Under)	Percentage Difference
1,339,035	1,097,656	(241,379)	(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 and/or percentages measure the performance of the criminal justice system that includes the State Attorney, Public Defender, private defense lawyers, Clerk of the Court and Judiciary. The disposition of a case requires the negotiation and agreement of all parties to a crime or specific civil matter.

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

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

Recommendations:

EXHIBIT III - ASSESSMENT OF PERFORMANCE MEASURES

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

Action:
 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
14,004	22,455	8,451	60%

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	593,982	(133,264)	(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 and/or percentages measure the performance of the criminal justice system that includes the State Attorney, Public Defender, private defense lawyers, Clerk of the Court and Judiciary. The disposition of a case requires the negotiation and agreement of all parties to a crime or specific civil matter.

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

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

Recommendations:

EXHIBIT III - ASSESSMENT OF PERFORMANCE MEASURES

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

Action:

- 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
157,990	173,364	15,374	10%

Factors Accounting for the Difference: Target exceeded.

Internal Factors (check all that apply):

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

Explanation:

External Factors (check all that apply):

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

Explanation:

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

- Training Technology
 Personnel Other (Identify)

Recommendations:

EXHIBIT III - ASSESSMENT OF PERFORMANCE MEASURES

Department: Justice Administration
Program: State Attorneys
Service/Budget Entity: First – Twentieth Judicial Circuits
Measure: 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	307,855	(131,940)	(30%)

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%	2.05%	1%	95%

Factors Accounting for the Difference: Target exceeded.

Internal Factors (check all that apply):

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

Explanation:

External Factors (check all that apply):

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

Explanation:

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

- Training Technology
 Personnel Other (Identify)

Recommendations:

EXHIBIT III - ASSESSMENT OF PERFORMANCE MEASURES

Department: Justice Administration
Program: State Attorneys
Service/Budget Entity: First – Twentieth Judicial Circuits
Measure: Percent of 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%	54.11%	(0.19%)	(0.35%)

Factors Accounting for the Difference:

Internal Factors (check all that apply):

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

Explanation:

External Factors (check all that apply):

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

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

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

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

Recommendations:

EXHIBIT III - ASSESSMENT OF PERFORMANCE MEASURES

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

Action:

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

Approved Standard	Actual Performance Results	Difference (Over/Under)	Percentage Difference
11.80%	15.79%	3.99%	34%

Factors Accounting for the Difference: Target exceeded.

Internal Factors (check all that apply):

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

Explanation:

External Factors (check all that apply):

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

Explanation:

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

- Training Technology
 Personnel Other (Identify)

Recommendations:

EXHIBIT III - ASSESSMENT OF PERFORMANCE MEASURES

Department: Justice Administration
Program: State Attorneys
Service/Budget Entity: First – Twentieth Judicial Circuits
Measure: Percent of 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%	28.05%	(4.79%)	(15%)

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:	
<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
0	0	0	N/A

Factors Accounting for the Difference:
Not Applicable – The standard for this performance measure was met.¹

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:

¹ The Number of substantiated Bar grievances filed annually – revised October 14, 2014.

EXHIBIT III - ASSESSMENT OF PERFORMANCE MEASURES

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

Approved Standard	Actual Performance Results	Difference (Over/Under)	Percentage Difference
1,183,597	884,563	(299,034)	(25%)

Factors Accounting for the Difference:

Internal Factors (check all that apply):

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

Explanation:

External Factors (check all that apply):

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

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

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

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

Recommendations:

EXHIBIT III - ASSESSMENT OF PERFORMANCE MEASURES

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

Approved Standard	Actual Performance Results	Difference (Over/Under)	Percentage Difference
490,965	389,452	(101,513)	(21%)

Factors Accounting for the Difference:

Internal Factors (check all that apply):

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

Explanation:

External Factors (check all that apply):

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

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

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

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

Recommendations:

EXHIBIT III - ASSESSMENT OF PERFORMANCE MEASURES

Department: Justice Administration
Program: State Attorneys
Service/Budget Entity: First – Twentieth Judicial Circuits
Measure: Number of 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	109,064	(88,274)	(45%)

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:	
<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
792,393	624,348	(168,045)	(21%)

Factors Accounting for the Difference:

Internal Factors (check all that apply):

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

Explanation:

External Factors (check all that apply):

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

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

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

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

Recommendations:

EXHIBIT III - ASSESSMENT OF PERFORMANCE MEASURES

Department: Justice Administration
Program: State Attorneys
Service/Budget Entity: First – Twentieth Judicial Circuits
Measure: Number of 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	174,932	(44,820)	(20%)

Factors Accounting for the Difference:

Internal Factors (check all that apply):

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

Explanation:

External Factors (check all that apply):

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

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

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

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

Recommendations:

EXHIBIT III - ASSESSMENT OF PERFORMANCE MEASURES

Department: Justice Administration
Program: State Attorneys
Service/Budget Entity: First – Twentieth Judicial Circuits
Measure: Number of 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	43,649	(39,967)	(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 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	12,515	(9,876)	(44%)

Factors Accounting for the Difference:

Internal Factors (check all that apply):

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

Explanation:

External Factors (check all that apply):

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

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

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

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

Recommendations:

EXHIBIT III - ASSESSMENT OF PERFORMANCE MEASURES

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

Approved Standard	Actual Performance Results	Difference (Over/Under)	Percentage Difference
27,686	22,560	(5,126)	(19%)

Factors Accounting for the Difference:

Internal Factors (check all that apply):

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

Explanation:

External Factors (check all that apply):

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

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

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

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

Recommendations:

EXHIBIT III – ASSESSMENT OF PERFORMANCE MEASURES

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

Action:

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

Approved Standard	Actual Performance Results	Difference (Over/Under)	Percentage Difference
18%	17.81%	(.19)	(1.06%)

Factors Accounting for the Difference:

Internal Factors (check all that apply):

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

Explanation:

External Factors (check all that apply):

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

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

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

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

Recommendations:

EXHIBIT III – ASSESSMENT OF PERFORMANCE MEASURES

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

Action:

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

Approved Standard	Actual Performance Results	Difference (Over/Under)	Percentage Difference
8%	9.98%	1.98	24.75%

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

Department: Justice Administration
Program: Public Defender, Appellate
Service/Budget Entity: Public Defender, Appellate
Measure: Percent of appeals resolved

Action:

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

Approved Standard	Actual Performance Results	Difference (Over/Under)	Percentage Difference
99.99%	111.43%	11.44	11.44%

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: While attorneys strive to keep up with assigned caseloads, Public Defenders have little control over the number of appeals resolved by the court.

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 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.

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

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

Recommendations:

Acquire additional resources to provide adequate staffing.

EXHIBIT III – ASSESSMENT OF PERFORMANCE MEASURES

Department: _____ Justice Administration _____
Program: _____ Public Defender, Appellate _____
Service/Budget Entity: _____ Public Defender, Appellate _____
Measure: Number of writs filed

Action:

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

Approved Standard	Actual Performance Results	Difference (Over/Under)	Percentage Difference
106	98	(8)	(7.55%)

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 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 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

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

Action:

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

Approved Standard	Actual Performance Results	Difference (Over/Under)	Percentage Difference
5,612	5,273	(339)	(6.04%)

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 MEASURES

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

Action:

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

Approved Standard	Actual Performance Results	Difference (Over/Under)	Percentage Difference
8%	9.98%	1.98	24.75%

Factors Accounting for the Difference:

Internal Factors (check all that apply):

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

Explanation:

External Factors (check all that apply):

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

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

Recommendations:

.

EXHIBIT III – ASSESSMENT OF PERFORMANCE MEASURES

Department: Justice Administration
Program: Public Defender, Appellate
Service/Budget Entity: Public Defender, Appellate
Measure: Percent of appeals resolved

Action:

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

Approved Standard	Actual Performance Results	Difference (Over/Under)	Percentage Difference
99.99%	111.43%	11.44	11.44%

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: While attorneys strive to keep up with assigned caseloads, Public Defenders have little control over the number of appeals resolved by the court.

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 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.

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

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

Recommendations:

Acquire additional resources to provide adequate staffing.

EXHIBIT III – ASSESSMENT OF PERFORMANCE MEASURES

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

Action:

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

Approved Standard	Actual Performance Results	Difference (Over/Under)	Percentage Difference
5,968	4,877	(1,091)	(18.28%)

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 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 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

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

Action:

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

Approved Standard	Actual Performance Results	Difference (Over/Under)	Percentage Difference
5,612	5,273	(339)	(6.04%)

Factors Accounting for the Difference:

Internal Factors (check all that apply):

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

Explanation:

External Factors (check all that apply):

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

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

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

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

Recommendations:

Adequate staffing is needed.

EXHIBIT III - ASSESSMENT OF PERFORMANCE MEASURE

Department: Justice Administration
Program: Capital Collateral Regional Counsels
Service/Budget Entity: Legal Representation
Measure: Number of signed death warrants

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

Explanation: The Governor signed three Death Warrants to CCRCs in FY 2013-14.

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

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

Recommendations:

EXHIBIT III - ASSESSMENT OF PERFORMANCE MEASURE

Department:	Justice Administration		
Program:	Capital Collateral Regional Counsels		
Service/Budget Entity:	Legal Representation		
Measure:	Number of 3.850/3.851 filings		
Action:			
<input type="checkbox"/> Performance Assessment of <u>Outcome</u> Measure	<input type="checkbox"/> Revision of Measure		
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Performance Assessment of <u>Output</u> Measure	<input type="checkbox"/> Deletion of Measure		
<input type="checkbox"/> Adjustment of GAA Performance Standards			
Approved Standard	Actual Performance Results	Difference (Over/Under)	Percentage Difference
26	19	(7)	(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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Legal/Legislative Change	<input type="checkbox"/> Natural Disaster		
<input type="checkbox"/> Target Population Change	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other (Identify)		
<input type="checkbox"/> This Program/Service Cannot Fix The Problem?			
<input type="checkbox"/> Current Laws Are Working Against The Agency Mission			
Explanation: The Supreme Court Assigned fewer cases to the CCRCs than estimated.			
Management Efforts to Address Differences/Problems (check all that apply):			
<input type="checkbox"/> Training	<input type="checkbox"/> Technology		
<input type="checkbox"/> Personnel	<input type="checkbox"/> Other (Identify)		
Recommendations:			

EXHIBIT III - ASSESSMENT OF PERFORMANCE MEASURES

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

Exhibit III is not applicable

Action:

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

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

Factors Accounting for the Difference:

Internal Factors (check all that apply):

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

Explanation:

External Factors (check all that apply):

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

Explanation:

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

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

Recommendations:

JUSTICE ADMINISTRATION



***LONG RANGE PROGRAM PLAN
FISCAL YEARS 2015-16 THROUGH 2019-20***

PERFORMANCE MEASURE VALIDITY AND RELIABILITY – LRPP EXHIBIT IV

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

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

Action (check one):

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

Data Sources and Methodology:

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 cap

Action (check one):

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

Data Sources and Methodology:

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: Number of court appointed attorney and due process
vendor invoices processed

Action (check one):

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

Data Sources and Methodology:

Court appointed invoices are tracked in the Justice Administrative Commission's Court Appointed Attorney Tracking System (CAATS).

Validity:

Court appointed attorney and due process vendor invoices are processed in CAATS.

Reliability:

The number of invoices processed in CAATS can be queried each year.

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

Department: Justice Administration
Program: 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: _____ **Statewide Guardian ad Litem** _____
Service/Budget Entity: _____ **Statewide Guardian ad Litem** _____
Measure: _____ **All Performance Measures** _____

Action (check one):

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

Data Sources and Methodology:

Validity:

Reliability:

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

Department: Justice Administration
Program: State Attorneys, First - Twentieth Judicial Circuits
Service/Budget Entity: State Attorneys, First - Twentieth Judicial Circuits
Measure: All Performance Measures

Action (check one):

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

Data Sources and Methodology:

Validity:

Reliability:

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

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

Action (check one):

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

Data Sources and Methodology:

Validity:

Reliability:

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

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

Action (check one):

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

Data Sources and Methodology:

Validity:

Reliability:

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

Department: Justice Administration
Program: Capital Collateral Regional Counsels
Service/Budget Entity: Capital Collateral Regional Counsels
Measure: All Performance Measures

Action (check one):

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

Data Sources and Methodology:

Validity:

Reliability:

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

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

Action (check one):

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

Data Sources and Methodology:

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

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

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

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

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

Action (check one):

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

Data Sources and Methodology:

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

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

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

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

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

Action (check one):

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

Data Sources and Methodology:

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

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

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

JUSTICE ADMINISTRATION



***LONG RANGE PROGRAM PLAN
FISCAL YEARS 2015-16 THROUGH 2019-20***

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

EXHIBIT V – ASSOCIATED ACTIVITIES CONTRIBUTING TO PERFORMANCE MEASURES

Measure Number	Approved Performance Measures for FY 2014-15		Associated Activities Title
1	Percent of invoices processed within statutory time frames		Executive Direction
			Pass Through - Due Process and Court Appointed Costs
			Pass Through - to DMS and DFS
2	Number of public records requests		Executive Direction
			Pass Through - Due Process and Court Appointed Costs
3	Number of cases where registry lawyers request fees above statutory caps		Pass Through - Due Process and Court Appointed Costs
4	Number of cases where the court orders fees above the statutory caps		Pass Through - Due Process and Court Appointed Costs
5	Total amount of excess fees awarded by the courts per circuit		Pass Through - Due Process and Court Appointed Costs
6	Number of budget, payroll, disbursement, revenue, and financial reporting transactions		Executive Direction
			Pass Through - Due Process and Court Appointed Costs
			Pass Through – to DMS and DFS
7	Number of court appointed attorney and due process vendor invoices		Pass Through – Due Process and Court Appointed Costs

EXHIBIT V - ASSOCIATED ACTIVITIES CONTRIBUTING TO PERFORMANCE MEASURES

Measure Number	Approved Performance Measures for FY 2014-15		Associated Activities Title (From Exhibit VI)
1	Average number of children represented		Represent children
2	Average percent of children represented		Represent children
3	Percent of cases closed with permanency goal achieved		Represent children
4	Number of new volunteers certified as a GAL		Represent children
5	Average number of active volunteers		Represent children

EXHIBIT V - ASSOCIATED ACTIVITIES CONTRIBUTING TO PERFORMANCE MEASURES

Measure Number	Approved Performance Measures for FY 2014-15		Associated Activity Titles (From Exhibit VI)
1	Percent of offenders who qualify for enhanced sentencing for whom state attorneys requested enhanced sentencing		Felony Prosecution Services Misdemeanor Prosecution Services Juvenile Prosecution Services Child Support Enforcement Services Civil Action Services
2	Total number of dispositions		Felony Prosecution Services Misdemeanor Prosecution Services Juvenile Prosecution Services Child Support Enforcement Services Civil Action Services
3	Number of dispositions by trial verdicts		Felony Prosecution Services Misdemeanor Prosecution Services Juvenile Prosecution Services Child Support Enforcement Services Civil Action Services
4	Number of dispositions by pleas		Felony Prosecution Services Misdemeanor Prosecution Services Juvenile Prosecution Services Child Support Enforcement Services Civil Action Services
5	Number of dispositions by non trial		Felony Prosecution Services Misdemeanor Prosecution Services Juvenile Prosecution Services Child Support Enforcement Services Civil Action Services

EXHIBIT V - ASSOCIATED ACTIVITIES CONTRIBUTING TO PERFORMANCE MEASURES

Measure Number	Approved Performance Measures for FY 2014-15		Associated Activity Titles (From Exhibit VI)
6	Number of dispositions by otherwise		Felony Prosecution Services Misdemeanor Prosecution Services Juvenile Prosecution Services Child Support Enforcement Services Civil Action Services
7	Percent of dispositions by trial verdicts		Felony Prosecution Services Misdemeanor Prosecution Services Juvenile Prosecution Services Child Support Enforcement Services Civil Action Services
8	Percent of dispositions by pleas		Felony Prosecution Services Misdemeanor Prosecution Services Juvenile Prosecution Services Child Support Enforcement Services Civil Action Services
9	Percent of dispositions by non trial		Felony Prosecution Services Misdemeanor Prosecution Services Juvenile Prosecution Services Child Support Enforcement Services Civil Action Services
10	Percent of dispositions by otherwise		Felony Prosecution Services Misdemeanor Prosecution Services Juvenile Prosecution Services Child Support Enforcement Services Civil Action Services

EXHIBIT V - ASSOCIATED ACTIVITIES CONTRIBUTING TO PERFORMANCE MEASURES

Measure Number	Approved Performance Measures for FY 2014-15		Associated Activity Titles (From Exhibit VI)
11	Number of substantiated Bar grievances filed annually		Felony Prosecution Services Misdemeanor Prosecution Services Juvenile Prosecution Services Child Support Enforcement Services Civil Action Services
12	Number of misdemeanor criminal case referrals		Misdemeanor Prosecution Services
13	Number of felony criminal case referrals		Felony Prosecution Services
14	Number of juvenile criminal case referrals		Juvenile Prosecution Services
15	Number of misdemeanor filings		Misdemeanor Prosecution Services
16	Number of felony filings		Felony Prosecution Services
17	Number of juvenile filings		Juvenile Prosecution Services
18	Number of post conviction relief responses or Habeas Corpus responses		Felony Prosecution Services Misdemeanor Prosecution Services Juvenile Prosecution Services Child Support Enforcement Services Civil Action Services
19	Number of sexual predator civil commitment proceedings		Civil Action Services
20	Number of Baker Act hearings		Civil Action Services

EXHIBIT V - ASSOCIATED ACTIVITIES CONTRIBUTING TO PERFORMANCE MEASURES

Measure Number	Approved Performance Measures for FY 2014-15		Associated Activity Titles (From Exhibit VI)
1	Annual attorney turnover rate		Civil Trial Indigent Defense Civil Investigative Services Criminal Trial Indigent Defense Criminal Investigative Services
2	Number of appointed & re-opened cases		Civil Trial Indigent Defense Civil Investigative Services Criminal Trial Indigent Defense Criminal Investigative Services
3	Number of cases closed		Civil Trial Indigent Defense Civil Investigative Services Criminal Trial Indigent Defense Criminal Investigative Services
4	Number of clients represented		Civil Trial Indigent Defense Civil Investigative Services Criminal Trial Indigent Defense Criminal Investigative Services
5	Number of cases per attorney		Civil Trial Indigent Defense Civil Investigative Services Criminal Trial Indigent Defense Criminal Investigative Services

EXHIBIT V - ASSOCIATED ACTIVITIES CONTRIBUTING TO PERFORMANCE MEASURES

Measure Number	Approved Performance Measures for FY 2014-15		Associated Activity Titles (From Exhibit VI)
1	Annual attorney turnover rates		Indigent Appellate Defense
2	Percent of appeals resolved		Indigent Appellate Defense
3	Number of appointed cases		Indigent Appellate Defense
4	Number of clients represented		Indigent Appellate Defense
5	Number of briefs filed		Indigent Appellate Defense
6	Number of writs filed		Indigent Appellate Defense
7	Number of cases closed		Indigent Appellate Defense

EXHIBIT V - ASSOCIATED ACTIVITIES CONTRIBUTING TO PERFORMANCE MEASURES

Measure Number	Approved Performance Measures for FY 2014-15		Associated Activities Title (From Exhibit VI)
1	Percent of cases in which post-conviction motion, post-conviction appeal, federal habeas corpus motion or federal appeal is timely filed, without extension		Death Penalty Legal Counsel
			Death Row Case Preparation
2	Number of substantiated Bar grievances filed annually		Death Penalty Legal Counsel
3	Number of appellate actions		Death Penalty Legal Counsel
			Death Row Case Preparation
4	Number of 3.850/3.851 filings		Death Penalty Legal Counsel
			Death Row Case Preparation
5	Number of signed death warrants		Death Penalty Legal Counsel
			Death Row Case Preparation
6	Number of court decisions to release a death row inmate, grant a new trial, grant a new sentencing hearing, or grant other appeals		Death Penalty Legal Counsel
			Death Row Case Preparation
7	Number of active cases		Death Penalty Legal Counsel
			Death Row Case Preparation
8	Number of evidentiary hearings		Death Penalty Legal Counsel
			Death Row Case Preparation
9	Number of federal court actions		Death Penalty Legal Counsel
			Death Row Case Preparation

EXHIBIT V ASSOCIATED ACTIVITIES CONTRIBUTING TO PERFORMANCE MEASURES

Measure Number	Proposed Performance Measures for FY 2014-15		Approved Associated Activity Titles (From Exhibit VI)
1	“New Measure” – Annual percentage of appellate briefs filed within 30 days of receipt of record.		Regional Counsel Workload
2	“New Measure” – Annual percentage of misdemeanor cases closed within 120 days of appointment.		Regional Counsel Workload
3	“New Measure” – In cases where there is an adjudication or a withhold of adjudication, the percentage of case plans approved by the court within 90 days of appointment.		Regional Counsel Workload

NUCSSP03 LAS/PBS SYSTEM
BUDGET PERIOD: 2005-2016
STATE OF FLORIDA

SP 09/26/2014 12:31
SCHED XI: AGENCY-LEVEL UNIT COST SUMMARY
AUDIT REPORT JUSTICE ADMINISTRATION

ACTIVITY ISSUE CODES SELECTED:

TRANSFER-STATE AGENCIES ACTIVITY ISSUE CODES SELECTED:

1-8: ACT5000 ACT5100 ACT5200 ACT5300 ACT5400

AID TO LOCAL GOVERNMENTS ACTIVITY ISSUE CODES SELECTED:

1-8:

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

*** NO ACTIVITIES FOUND ***

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

*** NO OPERATING CATEGORIES FOUND ***

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

*** NO ACTIVITIES FOUND ***

TOTALS FROM SECTION I AND SECTIONS II + III:

DEPARTMENT: 21	EXPENDITURES	FCO
FINAL BUDGET FOR AGENCY (SECTION I):	810,503,454	
TOTAL BUDGET FOR AGENCY (SECTION III):	810,503,610	
	-----	-----
DIFFERENCE:	156-	
(MAY NOT EQUAL DUE TO ROUNDING)	=====	=====

GLOSSARY OF TERMS AND ACRONYMS

Activity: A set of transactions within a budget entity that translates inputs into outputs using resources in response to a business requirement. Sequences of activities in logical combinations form services. Unit cost information is determined using the outputs of activities.

Actual Expenditures: Includes prior year actual disbursements, payables and encumbrances. The payables and encumbrances are certified forward at the end of the fiscal year. They may be disbursed between July 1 and December 31 of the subsequent fiscal year. Certified forward amounts are included in the year in which the funds are committed and not shown in the year the funds are disbursed.

Appropriation Category: The lowest level line item of funding in the General Appropriations Act which represents a major expenditure classification of the budget entity. Within budget entities, these categories may include: salaries and benefits, other personal services (OPS), expenses, operating capital outlay, data processing services, fixed capital outlay, etc. These categories are defined within this glossary under individual listings. For a complete listing of all appropriation categories, please refer to the ACTR section in the LAS/PBS User's Manual for instructions on ordering a report.

Baseline Data: Indicators of a state agency's current performance level, pursuant to guidelines established by the Executive Office of the Governor in consultation with legislative appropriations and appropriate substantive committees.

Budget Entity: A unit or function at the lowest level to which funds are specifically appropriated in the appropriations act. "Budget entity" and "service" have the same meaning.

D3-A: A legislative budget request (LBR) exhibit which presents a narrative explanation and justification for each issue for the requested years.

Demand: The number of output units which are eligible to benefit from a service or activity.

Estimated Expenditures: Includes the amount estimated to be expended during the current fiscal year. These amounts will be computer generated based on the current year appropriations adjusted for vetoes and special appropriations bills.

Fixed Capital Outlay: Real property (land, buildings including appurtenances, fixtures and fixed equipment, structures, etc.), including additions, replacements, major repairs, and renovations to real property which materially extend its useful life or materially improve or change its functional use, and including furniture and equipment necessary to furnish and operate a new or improved facility.

Indicator: A single quantitative or qualitative statement that reports information about the nature of a condition, entity or activity. This term is used commonly as a synonym for the word "measure."

Information Technology Resources: Includes data processing-related hardware, software, services, telecommunications, supplies, personnel, facility resources, maintenance, and training.

Input: See Performance Measure.

Judicial Branch: All officers, employees, and offices of the Supreme Court, district courts of appeal, circuit courts, county courts, and the Judicial Qualifications Commission.

LAS/PBS: Legislative Appropriation System/Planning and Budgeting Subsystem. The statewide appropriations and budgeting system owned and maintained by the Executive Office of the Governor.

Legislative Budget Commission: A standing joint committee of the Legislature. The Commission was created to: review and approve/disapprove agency requests to amend original approved budgets; review agency spending plans; issue instructions and reports concerning zero-based budgeting; and take other actions related to the fiscal matters of the state, as authorized in statute. It is composed of 14 members appointed by the President of the Senate and by the Speaker of the House of Representatives

GLOSSARY OF TERMS AND ACRONYMS

Legislative Budget Commission (cont.) to two-year terms, running from the organization of one Legislature to the organization of the next Legislature.

Legislative Budget Request: A request to the Legislature, filed pursuant to s. 216.023, Florida Statutes, or supplemental detailed requests filed with the Legislature, for the amounts of money an agency or branch of government believes will be needed to perform the functions that it is authorized, or which it is requesting authorization by law, to perform.

Long-Range Program Plan: A plan developed on an annual basis by each state agency that is policy-based, priority-driven, accountable, and developed through careful examination and justification of all programs and their associated costs. Each plan is developed by examining the needs of agency customers and clients and proposing programs and associated costs to address those needs based on state priorities as established by law, the agency mission, and legislative authorization. The plan provides the framework and context for preparing the legislative budget request and includes performance indicators for evaluating the impact of programs and agency performance.

Narrative: Justification for each service and activity is required at the program component detail level. Explanation, in many instances, will be required to provide a full understanding of how the dollar requirements were computed.

Nonrecurring: Expenditure or revenue which is not expected to be needed or available after the current fiscal year.

Outcome: See Performance Measure.

Output: See Performance Measure.

Outsourcing: Describes situations where the state retains responsibility for the service, but contracts outside of state government for its delivery. Outsourcing includes everything from contracting for minor administration tasks to contracting for major portions of activities or services which support the agency mission.

Pass Through: Funds the state distributes directly to other entities, e.g., local governments, without being managed by the agency distributing the funds. These funds flow through the agency's budget; however, the agency has no discretion regarding how the funds are spent, and the activities (outputs) associated with the expenditure of funds are not measured at the state level. ***NOTE: This definition of "pass through" applies ONLY for the purposes of long-range program planning.***

Performance Ledger: The official compilation of information about state agency performance-based programs and measures, including approved programs, approved outputs and outcomes, baseline data, approved standards for each performance measure and any approved adjustments thereto, as well as actual agency performance for each measure

Performance Measure: A quantitative or qualitative indicator used to assess state agency performance.

Input means the quantities of resources used to produce goods or services and the demand for those goods and services.

Outcome means an indicator of the actual impact or public benefit of a service.

Output means the actual service or product delivered by a state agency.

GLOSSARY OF TERMS AND ACRONYMS

Policy Area: A grouping of related activities to meet the needs of customers or clients which reflects major statewide priorities. Policy areas summarize data at a statewide level by using the first two digits of the ten-digit LAS/PBS program component code. Data collection will sum across state agencies when using this statewide code.

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

Privatization: Occurs when the state relinquishes its responsibility or maintains some partnership type of role in the delivery of an activity or service.

Program: A set of activities undertaken in accordance with a plan of action organized to realize identifiable goals based on legislative authorization (a program can consist of single or multiple services). For purposes of budget development, programs are identified in the General Appropriations Act for FY 2001-2002 by a title that begins with the word "Program." In some instances a program consists of several services, and in other cases the program has no services delineated within it; the service is the program in these cases. The LAS/PBS code is used for purposes of both program identification and service identification. "Service" is a "budget entity" for purposes of the LRPP.

Program Purpose Statement: A brief description of approved program responsibility and policy goals. The purpose statement relates directly to the agency mission and reflects essential services of the program needed to accomplish the agency's mission.

Program Component: An aggregation of generally related objectives which, because of their special character, related workload and interrelated output, can logically be considered an entity for purposes of organization, management, accounting, reporting, and budgeting.

Reliability: The extent to which the measuring procedure yields the same results on repeated trials and data are complete and sufficiently error free for the intended use.

Service: See Budget Entity.

Standard: The level of performance of an outcome or output.

Validity: The appropriateness of the measuring instrument in relation to the purpose for which it is being used.

Unit Cost: The average total cost of producing a single unit of output - goods and services for a specific agency activity.

GLOSSARY OF TERMS AND ACRONYMS

CIO - Chief Information Officer

CIP - Capital Improvements Program Plan

EOG - Executive Office of the Governor

FCO - Fixed Capital Outlay

FFMIS - Florida Financial Management Information System

FLAIR - Florida Accounting Information Resource Subsystem

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

GAA - General Appropriations Act

GR - General Revenue Fund

IOE - Itemization of Expenditure

IT - Information Technology

LAN - Local Area Network

LAS/PBS - Legislative Appropriations System/Planning and Budgeting Subsystem

LBC - Legislative Budget Commission **LBR** - Legislative Budget Request

LBR - Legislative Budget Request

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

LRPP - Long Range Program Plan

MAN - metropolitan area network (information technology)

NASBO - National Association of State Budget Officers

OPB - Office of Policy and Budget, Executive Office of the Governor

PBPB/PB2 - Performance-Based Program Budgeting

SWOT - Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities and Threats

TCS - Trends and Conditions Statement

TF - Trust Fund

WAN - wide area network (information technology)

ZBB - Zero-Based Budgeting