LOUISIANA DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

STRATEGIC PLAN SUPPORTING DOCUMENTATION

FY 2023-2024 THROUGH FY 2027-2028

July 1, 2022

STRATEGIC PLANNING CHECKLIST

Planning Process
- [x] General description of process implementation included in plan process documentation
- [ ] Consultant used
  - If so, identify: _____
- [x] Department/agency explanation of how duplication of program operations will be avoided included in plan process documentation
- [x] Incorporated statewide strategic initiatives
- [ ] Incorporated organization internal workforce plans and information technology plans

Analysis Tools Used
- [ ] SWOT analysis
- [ ] Cost/benefit analysis
- [x] Financial audit(s)
- [x] Performance audit(s)
- [ ] Program evaluation(s)
- [ ] Benchmarking for best management practices
- [ ] Benchmarking for best measurement practices
- [ ] Stakeholder or customer surveys
- [x] Undersecretary management report (Act 160 Report) used
- [ ] Other analysis or evaluation tools used
  - If so, identify: _____

Attach analysis projects, reports, studies, evaluations, and other analysis tools.

Stakeholders (Customers, Compliers, Expectation Groups, Others) identified
- [ ] Involved in planning process
- [ ] Discussion of stakeholders included in plan process documentation

Authorization for goals
- [x] Authorization exists
- [ ] Authorization needed
- [x] Authorization included in plan process documentation

External Operating Environment
- [ ] Factors identified and assessed
- [ ] Description of how external factors may affect plan included in plan process documentation

Formulation of Objectives
- [ ] Variables (target group; program & policy variables; and external variables) assessed
- [x] Objectives are SMART

Building Strategies
- [ ] Organizational capacity analyzed
- [ ] Needed organizational structural or procedural changes identified
- [ ] Resource needs identified
- [x] Strategies developed to implement needed changes or address resource needs
- [x] Action plans developed; timelines confirmed; and responsibilities assigned

Building in Accountability
- [x] Balanced sets of performance indicators developed for each objective
- [x] Documentation Sheets completed for each performance indicator
- [x] Internal accountability process or system implemented to measure progress
- [x] Data preservation and maintenance plan developed and implemented

Fiscal Impact of Plan
- [x] Impact on operating budget
- [ ] Impact on capital outlay budget
- [ ] Means of finance identified for budget change
- [x] Return on investment determined to be favorable

SITUATION INVENTORY

Program customers/clients, stakeholders, and expectations groups:

<u>Customers</u>: citizens, department employees, local, state, and federal elected officials, constituents, legislature, professional service contractors, students.

<u>Stakeholders</u>: Division of Administration, state agencies, legislative auditor, state retirement system, deferred compensation.

<u>Expectation groups:</u> Division of Administration, Citizens, department employees, legislative auditor, constituents, grantors, department employees, legislature.

Where has the program been?

The MIS section has been successful in automating most functions in the department. They have developed and maintained an intranet site for employees. Over 20 Customized databases are in place throughout the department. Departmental performance measures are tracked and reports are generated on a regular basis.

The HR department continues experiencing a rebirth and is planning many changes and improvement over the next four years. There have been some staff changes recently and an internal HR database will be established to automate the HR process in the future.

The Finance, Accounting and Budget Section is responsible for maintaining and tracking the budget of the Attorney General's Office and for creating and implementing methods of accountability for all five programs. The conversion of the financial system to the LaGov module will also produce greater transparency to the citizens of Louisiana.

Where is the program now?

The Department of Justice, Administrative Program converted the financial system to the LaGov module and using DocuSign creating an electronic approval processes increasing efficiency and accountability. Numerous hours devoted to training and preparation of financial information for a successful crosswalk was essential. This is significant and beneficial as the agency is now utilizing the latest platform offered by the State. Accuracy and timeliness of reports, vendor information, and expenses are readily available from reports created in LaGov. In addition, the Purchasing Section processes purchases and contracts utilizing the LaGov platform improving the transparency of the agency.

The Department has made a significant investment in updating technology and IT infrastructure. Support, maintenance and security of these systems is a priority. The DOJ improved and is still progressing toward replacing existing IT infrastructure (server/network), hardware and software that is 10-15 years old. Upgrades to the existing PoE (power of Ethernet), switches, servers,

security, as well as updates to Microsoft Office, and hardware has been made. This benefits the State as the LA Department of Justice, Legal Officer of the State, must have the tools it needs to meet the many challenges placed on an aging infrastructure.

The technological advances made and being made are instrumental. Progress has been made which touches all of the Administrative sections. From property to purchasing to fleet, advancements have been made. This is invaluable as the retention of historical information is one of the many goals of this Department. These improvements accomplish this goal.

MIS is responsible for all telecommunications, including phone lines, cell phones and data circuits. Departmental computer equipment is replaced on a rotational basis.

The Collections Section is under the Administrative Program. It represents the following educational institutions/agencies: Louisiana Office of Student Financial Assistance formerly the Governor's Special Commission on Education Services, Louisiana Department of Education, Board of Regents, Louisianan State University (Baton Rouge, Shreveport, Eunice and New Orleans), Louisiana State University Medical Center, Southern University (Baton Rouge, New Orleans, Shreveport), Grambling University, University of Southwestern Louisiana, McNeese State University, Northwestern University, Louisiana Tech University, Northeast University, Southeastern University, University of New Orleans, Nicholls State University, and Charity Hospital School of Nursing. In some instances we collect a variety of types of debts for each institution. The Collections Section not only collects debts for these entities but occasionally advises and directs them in order to avoid the possibility/potential for incurring future uncollectible debts.

What opportunities for positive change exist?

The opportunities for improved communication and transparency exist and will continue to improve as a result of the move to update old technology. These improvements will continue to assist in the preserving and retention of information/knowledge as Department employees retire.

What are the program's strengths and weaknesses?

Strengths: professional, educated, and trained staff; advanced technology available to staff; leadership from new administration; has allowed for higher level of efficiency.

Challenges: employees to embrace change and transfers, remote work management, and expanding the program are difficult even though workloads significantly increase every year.

STRATEGY ANALYSIS CHECKLIST

Program: ADMINISTRATIVE

Objective I.1:   Ensure the 95% of new full-time employees shall attend an administrative orientation within 60 days after hire each fiscal year by June 30, 2028.

Strategy I.1.a:

Update the administrative orientation program as office policies, procedures, and employee programs change.

Analysis
    __x__ Cost/benefit analysis conducted
    _____ Other analysis used
    _____ Impact on other strategies considered

Authorization
    __x__ Authorization exists
    _____ Authorization needed

Organization Capacity
    _____ Needed structural or procedural changes identified
    __x__ Resource needs identified

Time Frame
    _____ Already ongoing
    _____ New, startup date estimated
    _____ Lifetime of strategy identified

Fiscal Impact
    __x__ Impact on operating budget
    _____ Impact on capital outlay budget
    _____ Means of finance identified

STRATEGY ANALYSIS CHECKLIST

Program: ADMINISTRATIVE

Objective I.1:   Ensure the 95% of new full-time employees shall attend an administrative orientation within 60 days after hire each fiscal year by June 30, 2028.

Strategy I.1.b: Orientation programs shall be scheduled on a monthly basis by Human Resources. New employees shall be notified during in-processing of their scheduled orientation date. Reminders will be sent by Human Resources to new employee and supervisor.

Analysis
- __x__ Cost/benefit analysis conducted
- _____ Other analysis used
- _____ Impact on other strategies considered

Authorization
- __x__ Authorization exists
- _____ Authorization needed

Organization Capacity
- _____ Needed structural or procedural changes identified
- __x__ Resource needs identified

Time Frame
- __x__ Already ongoing
- _____ New, startup date estimated
- _____ Lifetime of strategy identified

Fiscal Impact
- __x__ Impact on operating budget
- _____ Impact on capital outlay budget
- _____ Means of finance identified

STRATEGY ANALYSIS CHECKLIST

Program: ADMINISTRATIVE

Objective I.2:   Respond to Management Information System Section Help Desk requests within an average of two hours from the time the requests were made each fiscal year by June 30, 2028.

Strategy I.2.a: Management Information System Section shall ensure the help desk is manned during all business hours.

Analysis
_____ Cost/benefit analysis conducted
_____ Other analysis used
__x__ Impact on other strategies considered

Authorization
__x__ Authorization exists
_____ Authorization needed

Organization Capacity
_____ Needed structural or procedural changes identified
__x__ Resource needs identified

Time Frame
__x__ Already ongoing
_____ New, startup date estimated
_____ Lifetime of strategy identified

Fiscal Impact
__x__ Impact on operating budget
_____ Impact on capital outlay budget
_____ Means of finance identified

STRATEGY ANALYSIS CHECKLIST

Program: ADMINISTRATIVE

Objective I.2:   Respond to Management Information System Section Help Desk requests within an average of two hours from the time the requests were made each fiscal year by June 30, 2028.

Strategy I.2.b: Management Information System Section shall use an automated task management system to manage help desk response.

Analysis
_____ Cost/benefit analysis conducted
_____ Other analysis used
__x__ Impact on other strategies considered

Authorization
__x__ Authorization exists
_____ Authorization needed

Organization Capacity
_____ Needed structural or procedural changes identified
__x__ Resource needs identified

Time Frame
__x__ Already ongoing
_____ New, startup date estimated
_____ Lifetime of strategy identified

Fiscal Impact
__x__ Impact on operating budget
_____ Impact on capital outlay budget
_____ Means of finance identified

STRATEGY ANALYSIS CHECKLIST

Program: ADMINISTRATIVE

Objective II.1:   Collect at least $4,000,000 in outstanding student loans and $5,000,000 total collections each fiscal year by June 30, 2028.

Strategy II.1.a: Improve the collector vs. account ratio in order for all accounts to be worked more effectively by increasing the number of collectors.

Analysis
  __x__ Cost/benefit analysis conducted
  _____ Other analysis used
  _____ Impact on other strategies considered

Authorization
  __x__ Authorization exists
  _____ Authorization needed

Organization Capacity
  _____ Needed structural or procedural changes identified
  __x__ Resource needs identified

Time Frame
  __x__ Already ongoing
  _____ New, startup date estimated
  _____ Lifetime of strategy identified

Fiscal Impact
  __x__ Impact on operating budget
  _____ Impact on capital outlay budget
  _____ Means of finance identified

STRATEGY ANALYSIS CHECKLIST

Program: ADMINISTRATIVE

Objective II.1:   Collect at least $4,000,000 in outstanding student loans and $5,000,000 total collections each fiscal year by June 30, 2028.

Strategy II.1.b: Work with the Management Information System Section to convert current collections software to 1) automate manual processes where possible, 2) develop account tracking mechanism to prioritize work based on success probability, and 3) develop tracking mechanisms to identify strengths and weaknesses in collectors.

Analysis
          _____ Cost/benefit analysis conducted
          __x__ Other analysis used
          _____ Impact on other strategies considered

Authorization
          __x__ Authorization exists
          _____ Authorization needed

Organization Capacity
          _____ Needed structural or procedural changes identified
          __x__ Resource needs identified

Time Frame
          __x__ Already ongoing
          _____ New, startup date estimated
          _____ Lifetime of strategy identified

Fiscal Impact
          __x__ Impact on operating budget
          _____ Impact on capital outlay budget
          _____ Means of finance identified

STRATEGY ANALYSIS CHECKLIST

Program: ADMINISTRATIVE

Objective II.1:   Collect at least $4,000,000 in outstanding student loans and $5,000,000 total collections each fiscal year by June 30, 2028.

Strategy II.1.c: Identify training opportunities for collectors and collection attorneys and incorporate these into employee training plans.

Analysis
     __x__ Cost/benefit analysis conducted
     _____ Other analysis used
     _____ Impact on other strategies considered

Authorization
     __x__ Authorization exists
     _____ Authorization needed

Organization Capacity
     _____ Needed structural or procedural changes identified
     __x__ Resource needs identified

Time Frame
     __x__ Already ongoing
     _____ New, startup date estimated
     _____ Lifetime of strategy identified

Fiscal Impact
     __x__ Impact on operating budget
     _____ Impact on capital outlay budget
     _____ Means of finance identified

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

Program: **ADMINISTRATIVE**

Objective: **I.1**

Indicator Name: **Number of new full-time employees hired**

1. **Type and Level**: Input - General

2. **Rationale:** It is necessary to track to support the outcome measures.

3. **Use:** It will be used for internal management purposes and performance-based budgeting as an indicator of workload.

4. **Clarity:** Clearly identified.

5. **Validity, Reliability and Accuracy:** No, the indicator is valid.

6. **Data Source, Collection and Reporting:** Tracked and gathered monthly.

7. **Calculation Methodology:** The administrative orientation will be performed every month.

8. **Scope:** Indicator is aggregated.

9. **Caveats:** No weaknesses; indicator is not a surrogate; the source of the date does not have a bias; there is not a caveat.

10.   **Responsible Person:** Administrative Director and Human Resource Deputy Director.

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

Program: **ADMINISTRATIVE**

Objective: **I.1**

Indicator Name: **Number of new full-time employees that have attended an Administrative orientation**

1. **Type and Level**: Output - General

2. **Rationale:** It is necessary to track to support the outcome measures.

3. **Use:** It will be used for internal management purposes and performance-based budgeting as an indicator of workload.

4. **Clarity:** Clearly identified.

5. **Validity, Reliability and Accuracy:** No, the indicator is valid.

6. **Data Source, Collection and Reporting:** Tracked and gathered monthly.

7. **Calculation Methodology:** The administrative orientation will be performed every month. Add up all new employees that have attended an administrative orientation.

8. **Scope:** Indicator is aggregated.

9. **Caveats:** No weaknesses; indicator is not a surrogate; the source of the date does not have a bias; there is not a caveat.

10. **Responsible Person:** Administrative Director and Human Resource Deputy Director.

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

Program: **ADMINISTRATIVE**

Objective: **I.1**

Indicator Name: **Percentage of new full-time employees hired that received orientation within 60 days of hire**

Indicator LaPAS PI Code: 21831

1. **Type and Level**: Outcome - Key

2. **Rationale:** It is necessary to track key indicators.

3. **Use:** It will be used for internal management purposes and performance-based budgeting as an indicator of workload.

4. **Clarity:** Clearly identified.

5. **Validity, Reliability and Accuracy:** No, the indicator is valid.

6. **Data Source, Collection and Reporting:** Tracked and gathered monthly.

7. **Calculation Methodology:** The administrative orientation will be performed every month. Add up all new employees that have attended an administrative orientation within two months (60 days) after their first day of work divided by number of new employees who have attended an administrative orientation.

8. **Scope:** Indicator is aggregated.

9. **Caveats:** No weaknesses; indicator is not a surrogate; the source of the date does not have a bias; there is not a caveat.

10. **Responsible Person:** Administrative Director and Human Resource Deputy Director

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

Program: **ADMINISTRATIVE**

Objective: **I.2**

Indicator Name: **Number of help desk requests received**

Indicator LaPAS PI Code: 10384

1. **Type and Level**: Input - General

2. **Rationale:** It is necessary to track to support the outcome measures.

3. **Use:** It will be used for internal management purposes and performance-based budgeting as an indicator of workload.

4. **Clarity:** Clearly identified.

5. **Validity, Reliability and Accuracy:** No, the indicator is valid.

6. **Data Source, Collection and Reporting:** Procedure is already automated in counting the number of help desk requests received.

7. **Calculation Methodology:** Indicator is tracked automatically by a computer

8. **Scope:** Indicator is aggregated.

9. **Caveats:** No weaknesses; indicator is not a surrogate; the source of the date does not have a bias; there is not a caveat.

10.   **Responsible Person:** Management Information System Supervisor

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

Program: **ADMINISTRATIVE**

Objective: **I.2**

Indicator Name: **Number of hours help desk is manned**

1. **Type and Level**: Output - General

2. **Rationale:** It is necessary to track to support the outcome measures.

3. **Use:** It will be used for internal management purposes and performance-based budgeting as an indicator of workload.

4. **Clarity:** Clearly identified.

5. **Validity, Reliability and Accuracy:** No, the indicator is valid.

6. **Data Source, Collection and Reporting:** Tracking employee work schedules

7. **Calculation Methodology:** Add up all hours that the help desk is manned

8. **Scope:** Indicator is aggregated.

9. **Caveats:** No weaknesses; indicator is not a surrogate; the source of the date does not have a bias; there is not a caveat.

10.   **Responsible Person:** Management Information System Supervisor

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

Program: **ADMINISTRATIVE**

Objective: **I.2**

Indicator Name: **Average time to respond to help desk requests (in hours)**

Indicator LaPAS PI Code: 452

1. **Type and Level**: Outcome - Supporting

2. **Rationale:** It is necessary to track key indicators

3. **Use:** It will be used for internal management purposes and performance-based budgeting as an indicator of workload.

4. **Clarity:** Clearly identified.

5. **Validity, Reliability and Accuracy:** No, the indicator is valid.

6. **Data Source, Collection and Reporting:** Data is in the MIS call tracking system. Reported and Collected on a quarterly basis

7. **Calculation Methodology:** System calculates time frame between help call and MIS response.

8. **Scope:** Indicator is aggregated.

9. **Caveats:** No weaknesses; indicator is not a surrogate; the source of the date does not have a bias; there is not a caveat.

10.   **Responsible Person:** Management Information System Supervisor

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

Program: **ADMINISTRATIVE**

Objective: **II.1**

Indicator Name: **Average number of accounts issued per year to number of collectors**

1. **Type and Level**: Input - General

2. **Rationale:** It is necessary to track to support the outcome measures.

3. **Use:** It will be used for internal management purposes and performance-based budgeting as an indicator of workload.

4. **Clarity:** Clearly identified.

5. **Validity, Reliability and Accuracy:** No, the indicator is valid.

6. **Data Source, Collection and Reporting:** Tracked and gathered quarterly.

7. **Calculation Methodology:** Total number of collections divided by number of accounts issued

8. **Scope:** Indicator is aggregated.

9. **Caveats:** No weaknesses; indicator is not a surrogate; the source of the date does not have a bias; there is not a caveat.

10. **Responsible Person:** Collections Section Chief

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

Program: **ADMINISTRATIVE**

Objective: **II.1**

Indicator Name: **Number of collectors**

1. **Type and Level**: Input - General

2. **Rationale:** It is necessary to track to support the outcome measures.

3. **Use:** It will be used for internal management purposes and performance-based budgeting as an indicator of workload.

4. **Clarity:** Clearly identified.

5. **Validity, Reliability and Accuracy:** No, the indicator is valid.

6. **Data Source, Collection and Reporting:** The source of the data will be the Table of Organization. The indicator will be reported on monthly.

7. **Calculation Methodology:** Review the Table of Organization and count filled collector positions

8. **Scope:** Indicator is aggregated.

9. **Caveats:** No weaknesses; indicator is not a surrogate; the source of the date does not have a bias; there is not a caveat.

10.   **Responsible Person:** Collections Section Chief

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

Program: **ADMINISTRATIVE**

Objective: **II.1**

Indicator Name: **Amount collected per collector**

Indicator LaPAS PI Code: 21832

1. **Type and Level**: Efficiency - General

2. **Rationale:** It is necessary to track to support the outcome measures.

3. **Use:** It will be used for internal management purposes and performance-based budgeting as an indicator of workload.

4. **Clarity:** Clearly identified.

5. **Validity, Reliability and Accuracy:** No, the indicator is valid.

6. **Data Source, Collection and Reporting:** Information gathered and tracked quarterly.

7. **Calculation Methodology:** Total collections divided by number of collectors

8. **Scope:** Indicator is aggregated.

9. **Caveats:** No weaknesses; indicator is not a surrogate; the source of the date does not have a bias; there is not a caveat.

10.   **Responsible Person:** Collections Section Chief

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

Program: **ADMINISTRATIVE**

Objective: **II.1**

Indicator Name: **Monetary total collections from outstanding student loan cases**

Indicator LaPAS PI Code: 476

1. **Type and Level**: Outcome - Key

2. **Rationale:** It is necessary to track key indicators

3. **Use:** It will be used for internal management purposes and performance-based budgeting as an indicator of workload.

4. **Clarity:** Clearly identified.

5. **Validity, Reliability and Accuracy:** No, the indicator is valid.

6. **Data Source, Collection and Reporting:** Tracked and gathered monthly..

7. **Calculation Methodology:** Sum up all collections produce from student loan accounts

8. **Scope:** Indicator is aggregated.

9. **Caveats:** No weaknesses; indicator is not a surrogate; the source of the date does not have a bias; there is not a caveat.

10.   **Responsible Person:** Collections Section Chief

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

Program: **ADMINISTRATIVE**

Objective: **II.1**

Indicator Name: **Monetary total of all collections**

Indicator LaPAS PI Code: 12270

1. **Type and Level**: Outcome - Key

2. **Rationale:** It is necessary to track key indicators

3. **Use:** It will be used for internal management purposes and performance-based budgeting as an indicator of workload.

4. **Clarity:** Clearly identified.

5. **Validity, Reliability and Accuracy:** No, the indicator is valid.

6. **Data Source, Collection and Reporting:** Tracked and gathered monthly.

7. **Calculation Methodology:** Adding up all collections made from all sources

8. **Scope:** Indicator is aggregated.

9. **Caveats:** No weaknesses; indicator is not a surrogate; the source of the date does not have a bias; there is not a caveat.

10.   **Responsible Person:** Collections Section Chief

2024-2028 STRATEGIC PLAN
SUPPORTING INTERNAL/EXTERNAL DOCUMENTATION

The Civil Program is a compilation of highly specialized attorneys who are responsible for work that directly impacts state government. The Civil Division defends the State of Louisiana by providing competent and superior professional legal services while defending the State's constitution and its duly enacted laws, as well as to provide legal representation, counsel and assistance to fulfill the needs of the State of Louisiana.

Governmental Litigation Section

The Governmental Section defends the State of Louisiana in constitutional challenges to state laws brought in both state and federal courts. This section also defends state agencies and elected officials in injunctive proceedings, declaratory judgment actions, mandamus actions, and petitions for judicial review.

This section generally performs legal services for state and local officials in the form of rendering advisory opinions, and/or serving as statutory legal counsel to the state's justices of the peace, constables, parish board of election supervisors, and registrars of voters.
Attorney general opinions rendered by this section cover a broad spectrum of questions from open meetings, public records, dual office holding, elections and general governmental law.

This Section represents and/or assists a number of state boards and commissions, including but are not limited to the following: Chiropractor Examiners Board, Social Work Board, Psychology Board, Professional Counselor's Board, Private Investigator's Board, Massage Therapy Board, and Auctioneer's Board.

This Section handles reapportionment and election cases both independently and in conjunction with other state officials

This Section also provides legal representation, renders advice, and prepares educational publications and training for the state's 775 elected Justices of the Peace and Constables.

This Section approves forms used by the Secretary of State.

Internal/External Assessment

(1) Who are the Clients/customers of our section?

The people served by the Governmental Litigation Section include the citizens; justices of the peace and constables; the State of Louisiana; legislators and their staff; public officials, local and state (including sheriffs, and police departments); judiciary and their staff; other sections of the Department of Justice; the press; court reporters; private attorneys; ministers/church organizations; all of the registrars of voters; and private associations.

(2) What are the clients/customers expectations of our section?

The Governmental Litigation Section believes that the people served by our Section expect legal representation (sometimes a "false" expectation for private legal representation); an ear to listen to their complaint; for us to be advised of litigation; for our office to conduct investigations; to have their call routed properly with no voice mail or hang ups; for off-the-cuff legal advice; for private legal work as an Assistant Attorney General; to be able to request anything legal to be done by our office; for our office to enforce the law, including private matters; for free legal aid; for our office to do the work that the district attorney or sheriff won't do; to investigate federal civil rights violations; for private opinions to be issued; and for us to return their calls.

(3) What are our section's strengths?

The Governmental Litigation Section is good at writing legal opinions. We have a lot of legal knowledge, experience, and talent. Attorneys have knowledge in special areas of the law. We have a clerk who gets the mail out timely. Our secretarial staffs are efficient and fast typists. We have good computer knowledge and skills. We have an attorney specializing in writing opinions. We are diverse. We get interesting and important cases. We shoulder the load of other divisions without complaint. We can assist other divisions in litigation. We have patient attorneys and secretaries who handle and return duty calls. We are requested to speak and give presentations on specialty areas of the law. We provide excellent legal representation to boards and commissions, justices of the peace, registrars of voters, and other specialty groups.

(4) What are our section's weaknesses?

In the Governmental Litigation Section, since we are on "duty" each and every day of the working hours of the office, many people complain of phone run-around, where they are transferred too many times.

(5) What opportunities exist for our section?

We have the ability to garner special relationships with government figures and departments. We have the ability to generate income in some areas of our practice, such as charging for copies of opinions (which we do not presently do), charging our present clients a higher rate to represent them (boards & comm.), and acquiring more business, such as representation of other boards and commissions. We have the opportunity to act as general counsel, prosecutor and hearing officer for numerous state boards and commissions and in doing so gain valuable litigation and judicial experience. We have the opportunity to take computer training classes and general department training classes, which are beneficial, and which help us to know what other sections and divisions. We have the opportunity to further our legal experience in handling the cases in our section, as well as assisting other divisions in their cases. We have the opportunity to take professional classes from CPT.

(6) What are the threats to our section?

The Governmental Litigation Section, just as the whole department, is threatened by our personnel and legal staff leaving for the private sector, for more pay and other benefits. The assignment of numerous constitutional challenges from Risk Litigation not handling this aspect of the case, has threatened our section with bigger case loads. The factor of working under an elected official is threatening as each new elected official could shift the focus, direction, and purpose of our section. The Legislature not appropriating funds for expert witnesses to properly defend our cases is also a threat to our section.

Lands and Natural Resources Section

This section advises and renders legal support to state agencies, levee boards, commissions, and other political subdivisions pertaining to lands, water bottoms, boundaries, accretion and erosion, oil and gas, public rights of use and access, sale and acquisition of lands, expenditure of public funds, and related activities. In addition, this section administers the Department of Justice's responsibilities for disaster response matters related to cemeteries as well as representing the state on matters such as grave desecration and human remains theft.

This section represents numerous state agencies on bankruptcy matters related to oil and gas, state lands, and wildlife matters. Large components of the section's litigation are consumed by takings claims against the State arising from public works and coastal protection projects, including levee servitudes, flowage easements, and large-scale constructions.

In addition, this section represents the State in numerous licensing proceedings throughout the year to ensure that the cemeteries of this State are being operated pursuant to law. Part of this work also includes the recovery of, often, hundreds of thousands of dollars a year in cemetery trust fund underpayments or mismanagement that directly benefit consumers.

This section defends the title of the state and its political subdivisions to land and water bottoms, and safeguards the interests of the state in lands and mineral transactions involving publicly-owned lands and water bottoms. Increasingly, this section has led efforts to recover funds from various entities for the plugging and abandonment of oil and gas wells.
The section brings actions against mineral companies that owe the state for royalty underpayments.

The Lands & Natural Resources Section defends the constitutionality of statutes within its sphere of expertise.

The Lands & Natural Resources Section also authors Attorney General opinions on topics including lands, natural resources, cemeteries, coroners, and water bottoms.

The agencies and political subdivisions served by this Section include several state departments, such as the Division of Administration, the State Mineral & Energy Board, the Department of Culture, Recreation and Tourism, Louisiana Coastal Protection and Restoration Agency, the Department of Natural Resources, the Louisiana Department of Transportation and Development, the Louisiana Department of Wildlife and Fisheries, the Board of Trustees for state Colleges and Universities, the Louisiana Military Department, the Governor's Office of Homeland Security and Emergency Preparedness, the Department of Health, the Louisiana Cemetery Board, the Louisiana Division of Archaeology, as well as numerous school boards, police juries, all state universities, assessors, district attorneys, and levee boards.

In addition to its legal representation, the section's personnel serve as members of the Louisiana Geographic Information Systems Council, the Statewide Cemetery Response Task Force, and the Slavery Ancestral Burial Grounds Preservation Commission.

Internal/External Assessment

(1) Who are the program clients and program users of our section?

PROGRAM CLIENTS – PROGRAM USERS
Division of Administration
Office of Coastal Protection and Restoration
Department of Natural Resources
Louisiana Cemetery Board
Public-at-Large
State Land Office
Parishes & Governmental Entities
Department of Culture, Recreation
U.S. Minerals Management Service and Tourism
U.S. Fish & Wildlife
Division of State Parks
National Marine Fisheries Services
Louisiana State Museum
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
Department of Revenue & Taxation
Gulf & South Atlantic Fisheries
Department of Transportation & Commission Development
U.S. Geological Service
Department of Wildlife & Fisheries
U.S. Soil Conservation Service (Natural Resources Conservation Agency)
Board of Trustees for Colleges & Universities
Other States
Louisiana Military Department
National Association of Attorneys General
School Board
Police Jurors
All State Universities
Levee Boards
Louisiana Offshore Oil Port

(2) What are the expectations of the program clients and program users of our section?

The expectation of the program clients and program users is that the section staff will render quality legal advice, consultation and legal support to the various agencies, boards, commissions, and other political subdivisions for which representation and consultation is provided, regarding matters and issues pertaining to lands, water-bottoms, boundaries, accretion and erosion, oil and gas, public rights of use and access, expenditure of public funds and related activities. Additionally, the public-at-large has the same general expectations with regard to their own questions of public right of use and access to public resources.

(3) What are our section's strengths?

The section has experienced attorneys in the general practice of civil law, mineral law, governmental law, and lands and natural resources law, including wildlife management, fisheries resources, boundaries, accretion, erosion, public rights of use and access, expenditure of public funds and all related areas. The attorneys are experienced in writing legal opinions, dealing with the public-at-large, public officials, and persons from all walks of life. Our secretarial staffs, co-shared with the Governmental Litigation Section, are also quite skilled at their work and fully support the section activities. This section is called upon for a wide array of legal advice involving everything from offshore boundaries to historic and archaeological matters, making the work dynamic, interesting, and rewarding. We assist with the work of other sections within the Civil Division, as well as other divisions, when necessary. As a general matter, we provide excellent legal representation to all program clients and program users, as well as the public-at-large.

(4) What are our section's weaknesses?

Attorney duty calls dilute the ability of the section's staff to respond to specific official legal work, opinions, and litigation. The time of the secretarial staff is also diluted with any attorney duty calls, J.P., and Constable calls, sharing receptionist duties, and participating in public interest projects unrelated to the work of the section. Secretarial support is limited because of the above factors.

(5) What opportunities exist for our section?

The section has an opportunity to enhance recruitment and retention, and to continue to gain specialized legal expertise in the areas of interest, as well as the general civil practice of law. The staff can also enhance special program client relationships and continue to recover funds from legal representation of program clients, as well as funds which may be made available through program users. The section staff also has the opportunity to avail itself of computer training classes, and to participate in professional classes from CPT.

(6) What are the threats to our section?

The section has experienced retention and attrition losses in the past several years ago.

Public Finance and Contracts Section

This section provides competent and professional representation to statewide elected officials such as the Treasurer, as well as other state boards and commissions, including the State Bond Commission, the Tobacco Settlement Financing Corporation, the Architects Selection Board, the Engineers Selection Board, the Office of State Procurement, and the Office Facilities Corporation.

This section has the responsibility for the preparation or review of all legal documents required for issuance of state general obligation bonds and state revenue anticipation notes.

This section reviews revenue bond issues of the state including issues of the Transportation Trust Fund and the Office Facilities Corporation.

This section provides counsel to the State Bond Commission which entails reviewing all items brought before the Bond Commission and responding to questions and concerns of the members and staff on all areas of finance law.

This section initiates legal proceedings necessary for appointment of a fiscal administrator for political subdivisions.

This section provides an attorney general representative to the procurement support team.

This section reviews and approves hospital acquisitions.

Opinions rendered by this Section center around areas of taxation, violations of La Const. art. VII, §14, public finance, public bid law, and contracts.

Internal/External Assessment

(1) Who are the clients/customers of our section?

The clients of the Public Finance and Contracts Section are the public - the citizens and taxpayers of Louisiana who contact us through duty calls and correspondence for advice, information and guidance. State agencies are also our clients, especially the State Bond Commission, the Tobacco Settlement Financing Corporation, Deferred Compensation Commission, and the Division of Administration, with which we are in daily contact. We also serve as counsel to several boards and commissions, and provide frequent in depth services to other state agencies and to political subdivisions of the state, which request the majority of the opinions written by this section.

(2) What are the clients'/customers' expectations of our section?

Clients and customers of this section expect competent, specialized knowledge and advice delivered promptly and courteously. Contracts, opinions, and garnishments assigned to us are expected to be completed expeditiously and professionally.

(3) What are our section's strengths?

We process **s**pecialized knowledge in the fields of public finance and public contracts based on years of experience and team work among our professional and support staff. Our staff has a thorough understanding of the working of state government based on years of experience as participants. We share our knowledge with others through speeches, workshops, and panel presentations around the state.

(4) What are our section's weaknesses?

Better communication and cooperation among both professional and support staff are needed to improve team work and cohesion.

(5) What opportunities exist for our section?

We can improve service by cross training our staff so that we will have back-up support to meet our clients' needs.

(6) What are the threats to our section?

Further loss of staff to the private sector.

Environmental Section

The Environmental Section assists the Attorney General in the discharge of his duties under the Environmental Quality Act and in connection with the constitutional responsibility and power of the Attorney General as chief legal officer of the state to institute, prosecute, or intervene in any civil action in order to assert or protect a state natural resource interest.

The Environmental Section represents the Coastal Protection and Restoration Authority, State Land Office, Department of Natural Resources, the Department of Environmental Quality, the Department of Public Safety, the Department of Wildlife and Fisheries, the Department of Culture, Recreation and Tourism, the Office of Public Works, the Department of Agriculture, the Capital Area Groundwater Conservation District, the Louisiana Professional Engineering and Land Surveying Board, Louisiana State Board of Embalmers and Funeral Directors, and other interested state agencies or subdivisions. Representation not only includes litigation counsel, but also includes general counsel, regulatory counsel (i.e. drafting and promulgating regulations), and service as hearing officer for professional regulatory boards. Further, this Section prepares opinions, analyzes legislation, and advises officials and employees of these same State agencies and other governmental entities.

The Environmental Section includes members of the Public Access Task Force and the Surface Water Sales Study Group. Staff personnel also assist the Solicitor General in preparing comments to draft federal rules and regulations and defend the interests of the State and its residents relating to federal overreach in the environmental or natural resources realm. Examples include comments or letters relating to the Clean Water Act, Clean Air Act, Endangered Species Act, and fisheries management.

This Environmental Section prepares opinions, analyzes legislation, and advises officials and employees of the Department of Natural Resources, the Department of Environmental Quality, the Department of Public Safety, the Department of Wildlife and Fisheries, the Department of Culture, Recreation and Tourism, the Office of Public Works, the Department of Agriculture, the United States Corps of Engineers and other interested federal and state agencies or subdivisions. The Environmental Section plays an important role in the administration of the Red River Compact and Sabine River Compact and protection of the State's water by providing legal counsel to the State's delegates

The Environmental Section attends hearings throughout the state and visit problem sites and meet with representatives of both government and industry to seek resolution of environmental problems. Staff personnel also respond to inquiries and complaints from city-state coastal zone regulations in connection with offshore leasing by the U.S. Department of the Interior, and numerous administrative enforcement actions involving hundreds of thousands of dollars of assessed penalties against environmental violators in Louisiana.

Internal/External Assessment

(1) Who are the clients/customers of our section?

The Department of Environmental Quality, Department of Natural Resources, Groundwater Resources Commission, and Louisiana Flood Protection Authority.

(2) What are the clients/customers expectations of our section?

The expectation of the program clients and program users is that the section staff will render quality legal advice, consultation and legal support to the various agencies, boards, commissions, and other political subdivisions for which representation and consultation is provided, regarding matters and issues pertaining to environmental issues, and protection of the states natural resources, expenditure of public funds and related activities. Additionally, the public-at-large has the same general expectations with regard to their own questions of public right of use and access to public resources.

(3) What are our section's strengths?

The experience and training of our staff allows us to perform all the duties we are called upon to perform in a competent and professional manner.

(4) What are our section's weaknesses?

Attorneys are faced with limited resources and continuing funding challenges in the performance of the legal duties required.

(5) What opportunities exist for our section?

Additional training in Microsoft Word, Westlaw, computer use, CPTP, and local Bar Association CLE.

(6) What are the threats to our section?

Personnel leaving for the private sector. Uncertainty of legislative appropriation and salary adjustments.

Education/Interagency Transfer Section

This section represents the Board of Elementary and Secondary Education, the Board of Regents, the Department of Education, and various other public agencies on education related litigation. This section represents public officials in various litigation involving education law. The Education Section responds to requests for attorney general opinions from the various State and local education boards on issues related to elementary, secondary and higher education.

The Interagency Transfer Section includes administration of attorneys in other state departments, including Work Force Commission. The attorneys in this Section represent these agencies in a variety of capacities, including confidential assistant, general counsel, litigation defense, and the defense of statutory law alleged to be unconstitutional.

Internal/External Assessment

(1) Who are the clients/customers of our section?

The Executive Director of the BESE Board; the BESE Board; the Superintendent of the Department of Education; the Commissioner of Higher Education; the Board of Regents; local school boards; the Secretary of Labor, Commissioner of Insurance; the Second Injury Board; the Inspector General; the Louisiana School Board Association; students attending public elementary, secondary, post secondary, and higher education institutions; students attending nonpublic schools as provided by law; legislators and their staff; licensed boards; the Board of Trustees.

(2) What are the clients/customers expectations of our section?

The Education/IAT Section believes that the people served by our section expect superior legal representation. They expect our section to represent them in litigation or advise them of the law. They expect their requests for opinions to be accomplished in a timely manner. The citizens expect their duty calls to be handled with concern.

(3) What are our section's strengths?

The experience and training of our staff allows us to perform all the duties we are called upon to perform in a competent and professional manner.

(4) What are our section's weaknesses?

Limited resources in dealing with complex education law matters.

(5) What opportunities exist for our section?

Additional training in Microsoft Word, Westlaw, computer use, CPTP, and local Bar Association CLE. Representation of additional boards for compensation. Expansions of the number of IAT attorneys, as positions are requested and available.

(6) What are the threats to our section?

Personnel leaving for the private sector. Uncertainty of legislative appropriation and salary adjustments.

Program: CIVIL

Objective I.1:   Maintain an average of 60-day response time for research and writing opinions by June 30, 2028.

Strategy I.1.a: Use opinion tracking system to manage opinion timelines.

Analysis
_____ Cost/benefit analysis conducted
_____ Other analysis used
__X _ Impact on other strategies considered

Authorization
__X_ Authorization exists
_____ Authorization needed

Organization Capacity
_____ Needed structural or procedural changes identified
__X_ Resource needs identified

Time Frame
__X_ Already ongoing
_____ New, startup date estimated
_____ Lifetime of strategy identified

Fiscal Impact
__X _ Impact on operating budget
_____ Impact on capital outlay budget
_____ Means of finance identified

Program: CIVIL

Objective I.2:   Through the Civil Division, to retain in-house 98% of the litigation
                      cases received each fiscal year by June 30, 2028.

Strategy I.2.a: Ensure sufficient range of knowledge and expertise to justify
                      assignment of DOJ attorneys.

Analysis
          __X_ Cost/benefit analysis conducted
          _____ Other analysis used
          _____ Impact on other strategies considered

Authorization
          __X_ Authorization exists
          _____ Authorization needed

Organization Capacity
          _____ Needed structural or procedural changes identified
          __X_ Resource needs identified

Time Frame
          __X_ Already ongoing
          _____ New, startup date estimated
          _____ Lifetime of strategy identified

Fiscal Impact
          __X_ Impact on operating budget
          _____ Impact on capital outlay budget
          _____ Means of finance identified

STRATEGY ANALYSIS CHECKLIST

Program: CIVIL

Objective I.3: Provide legal services to at least 50 state boards and commissions.

Strategy I.3.a: Prioritize a list of boards and commissions for which we want to provide representation based on the appropriateness of skills and the ability of the boards and commissions to pay.

Analysis
__X_ Cost/benefit analysis conducted
_____ Other analysis used
_____ Impact on other strategies considered

Authorization
__X_ Authorization exists
_____ Authorization needed

Organization Capacity
_____ Needed structural or procedural changes identified
__X_ Resource needs identified

Time Frame
_____ Already ongoing
__X_ New, startup date estimated
_____ Lifetime of strategy identified

Fiscal Impact
__X_ Impact on operating budget
_____ Impact on capital outlay budget
_____ Means of finance identified

STRATEGY ANALYSIS CHECKLIST

Program: CIVIL

Objective I.3: Provide legal services to at least 50 state boards and commissions.

Strategy I.3.b: Develop a brief proposal that outlines the functions and capabilities of the Civil Division and a section chief will present a proposal to whoever makes decisions for the boards and commissions.

Analysis
_____ Cost/benefit analysis conducted
_____ Other analysis used
__X_ Impact on other strategies considered

Authorization
__X_ Authorization exists
_____ Authorization needed

Organization Capacity
_____ Needed structural or procedural changes identified
__X_ Resource needs identified

Time Frame
_____ Already ongoing
__X_ New, startup date estimated
_____ Lifetime of strategy identified

Fiscal Impact
__X_ Impact on operating budget
_____ Impact on capital outlay budget
_____ Means of finance identified

STRATEGY ANALYSIS CHECKLIST

Program: CIVIL

Objective I.3: Provide legal services to at least 50 state boards and commissions.

Strategy I.3.c: After consultation with the First Assistant, the appropriate section chief shall approach selected boards and commission decision makers about possible representation.

Analysis
_____ Cost/benefit analysis conducted
_____ Other analysis used
__X_ Impact on other strategies considered

Authorization
__X_ Authorization exists
_____ Authorization needed

Organization Capacity
_____ Needed structural or procedural changes identified
__X_ Resource needs identified

Time Frame
_____ Already ongoing
__X_ New, startup date estimated
_____ Lifetime of strategy identified

Fiscal Impact
__X_ Impact on operating budget
_____ Impact on capital outlay budget
_____ Means of finance identified

STRATEGY ANALYSIS CHECKLIST

Program: CIVIL

Objective I.4:   Through the Public Finance and Contracts Section of the Civil Division, to continue to process contracts within an average of 10 days; resolutions within an average of 6 days, public bond approvals within an average of 6 days; and garnishments within an average of 6 days by June 30, 2028.

Strategy I.4.a: Use tracking system to manage timelines.

Analysis
        __X_ Cost/benefit analysis conducted
        _____ Other analysis used
        _____ Impact on other strategies considered

Authorization
        __X_ Authorization exists
        _____ Authorization needed

Organization Capacity
        _____ Needed structural or procedural changes identified
        __X_ Resource needs identified

Time Frame
        __X_ Already ongoing
        _____ New, startup date estimated
        _____ Lifetime of strategy identified

Fiscal Impact
        __X_ Impact on operating budget
        _____ Impact on capital outlay budget
        _____ Means of finance identified

STRATEGY ANALYSIS CHECKLIST

Program: CIVIL

Objective I.5: Provide and maintain a strong outreach program by providing public presentations on civil law programs and responding to constituent calls and inquiries.

Strategy I.5.a: Use constituent calls tracking system to determine the number of constituent calls received and answered.

Analysis
_____Cost/benefit analysis conducted
__X__Other analysis used
_____ Impact on other strategies considered

Authorization
__X__Authorization exists
_____ Authorization needed

Organization Capacity
__X__Needed structural or procedural changes identified
_____Resource needs identified

Time Frame
__X__Already ongoing
_____New, startup date estimated
_____ Lifetime of strategy identified

Fiscal Impact
__X__Impact on operating budget
_____ Impact on capital outlay budget
_____ Means of finance identified

STRATEGY ANALYSIS CHECKLIST

Program: CIVIL

Objective I.6:   To review for approval of 100% of DEQ penalty settlements strictly in compliance with time limits each fiscal year by June 30, 2028.

Strategy I.6.a: Use tracking system to manage settlement timelines.

Analysis
_____Cost/benefit analysis conducted
__X__Other analysis used
_____ Impact on other strategies considered

Authorization
__X__Authorization exists
_____ Authorization needed

Organization Capacity
__X__Needed structural or procedural changes identified
_____Resource needs identified

Time Frame
__X__Already ongoing
_____New, startup date estimated
_____ Lifetime of strategy identified

Fiscal Impact
__X__Impact on operating budget
_____ Impact on capital outlay budget
_____ Means of finance identified

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

Program: **CIVIL**

Objective: **I.1**

Indicator Name: **Number of opinions requested**

Indicator LaPAS PI Code: 12252

1. **Type and Level**: Input - General

2. **Rationale:** It is necessary to support the outcome measures**.**

3. **Use:** It will be used for internal management purposes and performance-based budgeting as an indicator of workload.

4. **Clarity:** Clearly identified

5. **Validity, Reliability and Accuracy:** No, the indicator is valid.

6. **Data Source, Collection and Reporting:** Information shall be gathered monthly; Internal Opinion Database is maintained.

7. **Calculation Methodology:** Add together all opinions requested.

8. **Scope:** Indicator is aggregated.

9. **Caveats:** No weaknesses; indicator is not a surrogate; the source of the date does not have a bias; there is not a caveat.

10.   **Responsible Person:** Civil Division Deputy Director

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

Program: **CIVIL**

Objective: **I.1**

Indicator Name: **Number of opinions withdrawn**

Indicator LaPAS PI Code: 12254

1. **Type and Level**: Input - General

2. **Rationale:** It is necessary to support the outcome measures**.**

3. **Use:** It will be used for internal management purposes and performance-based budgeting as an indicator of workload.

4. **Clarity:** Clearly identified

5. **Validity, Reliability and Accuracy:** No, the indicator is valid.

6. **Data Source, Collection and Reporting:** Information shall be gathered monthly; Internal Opinion Database is maintained.

7. **Calculation Methodology:** Add together all opinions that are withdrawn.

8. **Scope:** Indicator is aggregated.

9. **Caveats:** No weaknesses; indicator is not a surrogate; the source of the date does not have a bias; there is not a caveat.

10.   **Responsible Person:** Civil Division Deputy Director

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

Program: **CIVIL**

Objective: **I.1**

Indicator Name: **Number of hours devoted to opinions**

Indicator LaPAS PI Code: 12265

1. **Type and Level**: Input - General

2. **Rationale:** It is necessary to support the outcome measures**.**

3. **Use:** It will be used for internal management purposes and performance-based budgeting as an indicator of workload.

4. **Clarity:** Clearly identified

5. **Validity, Reliability and Accuracy:** No, the indicator is valid.

6. **Data Source, Collection and Reporting:** Information shall be gathered monthly; Internal Opinion Database is maintained.

7. **Calculation Methodology:** Add together all opinions released.

8. **Scope:** Indicator is aggregated.

9. **Caveats:** No weaknesses; indicator is not a surrogate; the source of the date does not have a bias; there is not a caveat.

10.   **Responsible Person:** Civil Division Deputy Director

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

Program: **CIVIL**

Objective: **I.1**

Indicator Name: **Number of opinions released**

Indicator LaPAS PI Code: 12256

1. **Type and Level**: Output - General

2. **Rationale:** It is necessary to support the outcome measures**.**

3. **Use:** It will be used for internal management purposes and performance-based budgeting as an indicator of workload.

4. **Clarity:** Clearly identified

5. **Validity, Reliability and Accuracy:** No, the indicator is valid.

6. **Data Source, Collection and Reporting:** Information shall be gathered monthly; Internal Opinion Database is maintained.

7. **Calculation Methodology:** Add together all opinions released.

8. **Scope:** Indicator is aggregated.

9. **Caveats:** No weaknesses; indicator is not a surrogate; the source of the date does not have a bias; there is not a caveat.

10.   **Responsible Person:** Civil Division Deputy Director

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

Program: **CIVIL**

Objective: **I.1**

Indicator Name: **Average response time for attorney to research and write an opinion (in days) (Count only opinions released)**

Indicator LaPAS PI Code: 464

1. **Type and Level**: Outcome - Key

2. **Rationale:** It is necessary to track key indicators**.**

3. **Use:** It will be used for internal management purposes and performance-based budgeting as an indicator of workload.

4. **Clarity:** Clearly identified

5. **Validity, Reliability and Accuracy:** No, the indicator is valid.

6. **Data Source, Collection and Reporting:** Information shall be gathered monthly; Internal Opinion Database is maintained.

7. **Calculation Methodology:** Add together the total number of days to research and write opinions that were released. That number will be divided by the number of opinions released.

8. **Scope:** Indicator is aggregated.

9. **Caveats:** No weaknesses; indicator is not a surrogate; the source of the date does not have a bias; there is not a caveat.

10.   **Responsible Person:** Civil Division Deputy Director

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

Program: **CIVIL**

Objective: **I.1**

Indicator Name: **Average total time from receipt to release of an opinion (in days) (Count only opinions released)**

Indicator LaPAS PI Code: 6213

1. **Type and Level**: Outcome - General

2. **Rationale:** It is necessary to support outcome indicators**.**

3. **Use:** It will be used for internal management purposes and performance-based budgeting as an indicator of workload.

4. **Clarity:** Clearly identified

5. **Validity, Reliability and Accuracy:** No, the indicator is valid.

6. **Data Source, Collection and Reporting:** Information shall be gathered monthly; Internal Opinion Database is maintained.

7. **Calculation Methodology:** Add together the total number of days from receipt to release of opinions. That number will be divided by the number of opinions released.

8. **Scope:** Indicator is aggregated.

9. **Caveats:** No weaknesses; indicator is not a surrogate; the source of the date does not have a bias; there is not a caveat.

10.   **Responsible Person:** Civil Division Deputy Director

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

Program: CIVIL

Objective: I.2

Indicator Name: Number of cases received

Indicator LaPAS PI Code: 471

1. **Type and Level**: Input - General

2. **Rationale:** It is necessary to support the outcome measures**.**

3. **Use:** It will be used for internal management purposes and performance-based budgeting as an indicator of workload.

4. **Clarity:** Clearly identified

5. **Validity, Reliability and Accuracy:** No, the indicator is valid.

6. **Data Source, Collection and Reporting:** Information shall be gathered monthly from an Internal Case Tracking Database System.

7. **Calculation Methodology:** Add together all cases received per month.

8. **Scope:** Indicator is aggregated.

9. **Caveats:** No weaknesses; indicator is not a surrogate; the source of the date does not have a bias; there is not a caveat.

10.   **Responsible Person:** Civil Division Deputy Director

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

Program: **CIVIL**

Objective: **I2**

Indicator Name: **Number of cases being handled in-house**

Indicator LaPAS PI Code: 470

1. **Type and Level**: Input - General

2. **Rationale:** It is necessary to support the outcome measures**.**

3. **Use:** It will be used for internal management purposes and performance-based budgeting as an indicator of workload.

4. **Clarity:** Clearly identified

5. **Validity, Reliability and Accuracy:** No, the indicator is valid.

6. **Data Source, Collection and Reporting:** Information shall be gathered monthly from an Internal Case Tracking Database System.

7. **Calculation Methodology:** Add together all cases received per month.

8. **Scope:** Indicator is aggregated.

9. **Caveats:** No weaknesses; indicator is not a surrogate; the source of the date does not have a bias; there is not a caveat

10.   Responsible Person: Civil Division Deputy Director

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

Program: **CIVIL**

Objective: **I.2**

Indicator Name   **Number of hours devoted to litigation**

LaPAS PI Code: 24996

1. **Type and Level**: Input - General

2. **Rationale:** It is necessary to support the outcome measures**.**

3. **Use:** It will be used for internal management purposes and performance-based budgeting as an indicator of workload.

4. **Clarity:** Clearly identified

5. **Validity, Reliability and Accuracy:** No, the indicator is valid.

6. **Data Source, Collection and Reporting:** Information shall be gathered monthly from an Internal Case Tracking Database System.

7. **Calculation Methodology:** Add together all cases received per month.

8. **Scope:** Indicator is aggregated.

9. **Caveats:** No weaknesses; indicator is not a surrogate; the source of the date does not have a bias; there is not a caveat.

10.   **Responsible Person:** Civil Division Deputy Director

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

Program: **CIVIL**

Objective: **I.2**

Indicator Name: **Number of cases contracted to outside firms**

LaPAS PI Code: 473

1. **Type and Level**: Output - General

2. **Rationale:** It is necessary to support the outcome measures**.**

3. **Use:** It will be used for internal management purposes and performance-based budgeting as an indicator of workload.

4. **Clarity:** Clearly identified

5. **Validity, Reliability and Accuracy:** No, the indicator is valid.

6. **Data Source, Collection and Reporting:** Information shall be gathered monthly from an Internal Case Tracking Database System.

7. **Calculation Methodology:** Add together all cases contracted to outside firms each fiscal year.

8. **Scope:** Indicator is aggregated.

9. **Caveats:** No weaknesses; indicator is not a surrogate; the source of the date does not have a bias; there is not a caveat.

10.   **Responsible Person:** Civil Division Deputy Director

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

Program: **CIVIL**

Objective: **I.2**

Indicator Name: **Percentage of cases handled in-house each fiscal year**

LaPAS PI Code: 470

1. **Type and Level**: Outcome - Key

2. **Rationale:** It is necessary to track key indicators**.**

3. **Use:** It will be used for internal management purposes and performance-based budgeting as an indicator of workload.

4. **Clarity:** Clearly identified

5. **Validity, Reliability and Accuracy:** No, the indicator is valid.

6. **Data Source, Collection and Reporting:** Information shall be gathered monthly from an Internal Case Tracking Database System.

7. **Calculation Methodology:** The number of cases handled in-house will be divided by the total number of cases to obtain the percentage.

8. **Scope:** Indicator is aggregated.

9. **Caveats:** No weaknesses; indicator is not a surrogate; the source of the date does not have a bias; there is not a caveat.

10.   **Responsible Person:** Civil Division Deputy Director

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

Program: **CIVIL**

Objective: **I.3**

Indicator Name: **Number of hours devoted to current Boards and**

                          Commissions

LaPAS PI Code: **24999**

1. **Type and Level**: Input - General

2. **Rationale:** It is necessary to support the outcome measures**.**

3. **Use:** It will be used for internal management purposes and performance-based budgeting as an indicator of workload.

4. **Clarity:** Clearly identified

5. **Validity, Reliability and Accuracy:** No, the indicator is valid.

6. **Data Source, Collection and Reporting:** Information shall be gathered monthly from an Internal Case Tracking Database System.

7. **Calculation Methodology:** Attorneys will input all hours into the case tracking system and they will be added together monthly to obtain the total number of hours.

8. **Scope:** Indicator is aggregated.

9. **Caveats:** No weaknesses; indicator is not a surrogate; the source of the date does not have a bias; there is not a caveat.

10. **Responsible Person:** Civil Division Deputy Director

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

Program:	**CIVIL**
Objective:	**I.3**
Indicator Name:	**Number of hours devoted to boards and commissions last fiscal year**
LaPAS PI Code:	**25000**

1. **Type and Level**: Input - General

2. **Rationale:** It is necessary to support the outcome measures**.**

3. **Use:** It will be used for internal management purposes and performance-based budgeting as an indicator of workload.

4. **Clarity:** Clearly identified

5. **Validity, Reliability and Accuracy:** No, the indicator is valid.

6. **Data Source, Collection and Reporting:** Retrieved from last fiscal year monthly reports

7. **Calculation Methodology:** A list will be compiled of all boards and commissions. That list will be separated into those that are represented by the AG's Office and those that are not. A running total for the number not represented will be kept.

8. **Scope:** Indicator is aggregated.

9. **Caveats:** No weaknesses; indicator is not a surrogate; the source of the date does not have a bias; there is not a caveat.

10. **Responsible Person**: Civil Division Deputy Director

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

Program: **CIVIL**

Objective: **I.3**

Indicator Name: **Number of Boards and Commissions currently**
                          represented

1. **Type and Level**: Input - General

2. **Rationale:** It is necessary to support the outcome measures**.**

3. **Use:** It will be used for internal management purposes and performance-based budgeting as an indicator of workload.

4. **Clarity:** Clearly identified

5. **Validity, Reliability and Accuracy:** No, the indicator is valid.

6. **Data Source, Collection and Reporting:** Information shall be gathered monthly from Tracking Program.

7. **Calculation Methodology:** A list will be compiled of all boards and commissions.

8. **Scope:** Indicator is aggregated.

9. **Caveats:** No weaknesses; indicator is not a surrogate; the source of the date does not have a bias; there is not a caveat.

10.   **Responsible Person:** Civil Division Deputy Director

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

Program: **CIVIL**

Objective: **I.3**

Indicator Name: **Number of new Boards and Commissions represented**
LaPAS PI Code: **24998**

1. **Type and Level**: Output - General

2. **Rationale:** It is necessary to support the outcome measures**.**

3. **Use:** It will be used for internal management purposes and performance-based budgeting as an indicator of workload.

4. **Clarity:** Clearly identified

5. **Validity, Reliability and Accuracy:** No, the indicator is valid.

6. **Data Source, Collection and Reporting:** Information shall be gathered monthly from Tracking Program.

7. **Calculation Methodology:** Add together all new boards and commissions represented per month.

8. **Scope:** Indicator is aggregated.

9. **Caveats:** No weaknesses; indicator is not a surrogate; the source of the date does not have a bias; there is not a caveat.

10.   **Responsible Person:** Civil Division Deputy Director

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

Program: **CIVIL**

Objective: **I.4**

Indicator Name: **Number of contracts processed**

 LaPAS PI Code: **25001**

1. **Type and Level**: Input – General

2. **Rationale:** It is necessary to support the outcome measures**.**

3. **Use:** It will be used for internal management purposes and performance-based budgeting as an indicator of workload.

4. **Clarity:** Clearly identified

5. **Validity, Reliability and Accuracy:** No, the indicator is valid.

6. **Data Source, Collection and Reporting:** Information shall be gathered monthly from an Internal Tracking Database System.

7. **Calculation Methodology:** Add together all contracts processed.

8. **Scope:** Indicator is aggregated.

9. **Caveats:** No weaknesses; indicator is not a surrogate; the source of the date does not have a bias; there is not a caveat.

10.   **Responsible Person:** Civil Division Deputy Director

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

Program: **CIVIL**

Objective: **I.4**

Indicator Name: **Number of resolutions processed**

Indicator LaPAS PI Code: 25002

1. **Type and Level**: Input – General

2. **Rationale:** It is necessary to support the outcome measures**.**

3. **Use:** It will be used for internal management purposes and performance-based budgeting as an indicator of workload.

4. **Clarity:** Clearly identified

5. **Validity, Reliability and Accuracy:** No, the indicator is valid.

6. **Data Source, Collection and Reporting:** Information shall be gathered monthly from an Internal Tracking Database System.

7. **Calculation Methodology:** Add together all resolutions processed.

8. **Scope:** Indicator is aggregated.

9. **Caveats:** No weaknesses; indicator is not a surrogate; the source of the date does not have a bias; there is not a caveat.

10.   **Responsible Person:** Civil Division Deputy Director

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

Program: **CIVIL**

Objective: **I.4**

Indicator Name: **Number of public bond approvals (TEFRAs) processed**

Indicator LaPAS PI Code: 25003

1. **Type and Level**: Input – General

2. **Rationale:** It is necessary to support the outcome measures**.**

3. **Use:** It will be used for internal management purposes and performance-based budgeting as an indicator of workload.

4. **Clarity:** Clearly identified

5. **Validity, Reliability and Accuracy:** No, the indicator is valid.

6. **Data Source, Collection and Reporting:** Information shall be gathered monthly from an Internal Tracking Database System.

7. **Calculation Methodology:** Add together all public bond approvals (TEFRAs) processed.

8. **Scope:** Indicator is aggregated.

9. **Caveats:** No weaknesses; indicator is not a surrogate; the source of the date does not have a bias; there is not a caveat.

10.   **Responsible Person:** Civil Division Deputy Director

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

Program: **CIVIL**

Objective: **I.4**

Indicator Name: **Average processing time for completed contracts**

Indicator LaPAS PI Code: 477

1. **Type and Level**: Outcome - Supporting

2. **Rationale:** It is necessary to track supporting indicators**.**

3. **Use:** It will be used for internal management purposes and performance-based budgeting as an indicator of workload.

4. **Clarity:** Clearly identified

5. **Validity, Reliability and Accuracy:** No, the indicator is valid.

6. **Data Source, Collection and Reporting:** Information shall be gathered monthly from an Internal Tracking Database System.

7. **Calculation Methodology:** For all contracts completed each month, the total number of days will be added together and divided by the number of contracts completed per month.

8. **Scope:** Indicator is aggregated.

9. **Caveats:** No weaknesses; indicator is not a surrogate; the source of the date does not have a bias; there is not a caveat.

10.   **Responsible Person:** Civil Division Deputy Director

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

Program: **CIVIL**

Objective: **I.4**

Indicator Name: **Average processing time for resolutions**

Indicator LaPAS PI Code: 478

1. **Type and Level**: Outcome - Supporting

2. **Rationale:** It is necessary to track supporting indicators**.**

3. **Use:** It will be used for internal management purposes and performance-based budgeting as an indicator of workload.

4. **Clarity:** Clearly identified

5. **Validity, Reliability and Accuracy:** No, the indicator is valid.

6. **Data Source, Collection and Reporting:** Information shall be gathered monthly from an Internal Tracking Database System.

7. **Calculation Methodology:** For all resolutions completed each month, the total number of days will be added together and divided by the number of resolutions completed per month.

8. **Scope:** Indicator is aggregated.

9. **Caveats:** No weaknesses; indicator is not a surrogate; the source of the date does not have a bias; there is not a caveat.

10.   **Responsible Person:** Civil Division Deputy Director

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

Program: **CIVIL**

Objective: **I.4**

Indicator Name: **Average processing time for completed public**

                       bond approvals (TEFRA's)

Indicator LaPAS PI Code: 6218

1. **Type and Level**: Outcome - Supporting

2. **Rationale:** It is necessary to track supporting indicators**.**

3. **Use:** It will be used for internal management purposes and performance-based budgeting as an indicator of workload.

4. **Clarity:** Clearly identified

5. **Validity, Reliability and Accuracy:** No, the indicator is valid.

6. **Data Source, Collection and Reporting:** Information shall be gathered monthly from an Internal Tracking Database System.

7. **Calculation Methodology:** For all public bond approvals completed each month, the total number of days will be added together and divided by the number of public bond approvals completed per month.

8. **Scope:** Indicator is aggregated.

9. **Caveats:** No weaknesses; indicator is not a surrogate; the source of the date does not have a bias; there is not a caveat.

10.   **Responsible Person:** Civil Division Deputy Director

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

Program: **CIVIL**

Objective: **I.4**

Indicator Name: **Average processing time for completed garnishment**

Indicator LaPAS PI Code: 6219

1. **Type and Level**: Outcome - Supporting

2. **Rationale:** It is necessary to track supporting indicators**.**

3. **Use:** It will be used for internal management purposes and performance-based budgeting as an indicator of workload.

4. **Clarity:** Clearly identified

5. **Validity, Reliability and Accuracy:** No, the indicator is valid.

6. **Data Source, Collection and Reporting:** Information shall be gathered monthly from an Internal Tracking Database System.

7. **Calculation Methodology:** For all garnishments completed each month, the total number of days will be added together and divided by the number of garnishments completed per month.

8. **Scope:** Indicator is aggregated.

9. **Caveats:** No weaknesses; indicator is not a surrogate; the source of the date does not have a bias; there is not a caveat.

10.   **Responsible Person:** Civil Division Deputy Director

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

Program: **CIVIL**

Objective: **I.5**

Indicator Name: **Number of specialized inquiries received from state, local or private entities**

Indicator LaPAS PI Code: 25012

1. **Type and Level**: Input – General

2. **Rationale:** It is necessary to support the outcome measures**.**

3. **Use:** It will be used for internal management purposes and performance-based budgeting as an indicator of workload.

4. **Clarity:** Clearly identified

5. **Validity, Reliability and Accuracy:** No, the indicator is valid.

6. **Data Source, Collection and Reporting:** Information shall be gathered monthly.

7. **Calculation Methodology:** Add together the number of specialized inquiries received from public and private entities.

8. **Scope:** Indicator is aggregated.

9. **Caveats:** No weaknesses; indicator is not a surrogate; the source of the date does not have a bias; there is not a caveat.

10.   **Responsible Person:** Civil Division Deputy Director

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

Program: CIVIL

Objective: I.5

Indicator Name: **Total number of presentations made to public and private entities**

1. **Type and Level**: Output - General

2. **Rationale:** It is necessary to track key indicators.

3. **Use:** It will be used for internal management purposes and performance-based budgeting as an indicator of workload.

4. **Clarity:** Clearly identified

5. **Validity, Reliability and Accuracy:** No, the indicator is valid.

6. **Data Source, Collection and Reporting:** Information shall be gathered monthly in the Database Tracking System.

7. **Calculation Methodology:** Add together the number of presentations made to public and private entities.

8. **Scope:** Indicator is aggregated.

9. **Caveats:** No weaknesses; indicator is not a surrogate; the source of the date does not have a bias; there is not a caveat.

10. **Responsible Person:** Civil Division Deputy Director

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

Program: **CIVIL**

Objective: **I.5**

Indicator Name: **Total number of attendees at presentations made to public and private entities**

Indicator LaPAS PI Code: 25006

1. **Type and Level**: Output – Key

2. **Rationale:** It is necessary to track supporting indicators**.**

3. **Use:** It will be used for internal management purposes and performance-based budgeting as an indicator of workload.

4. **Clarity:** Clearly identified

5. **Validity, Reliability and Accuracy:** No, the indicator is valid.

6. **Data Source, Collection and Reporting:** Information shall be gathered monthly.

7. **Calculation Methodology:** Add together the number of attendees at presentations made to public and private entities.

8. **Scope:** Indicator is aggregated.

9. **Caveats:** No weaknesses; indicator is not a surrogate; the source of the date does not have a bias; there is not a caveat.

10.   **Responsible Person:** Civil Division Deputy Director

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

Program: **CIVIL**

Objective: **I.5**

Indicator Name: **Total number of constituent services tickets**

Indicator LaPAS PI Code: 25007

1. **Type and Level**: Output - Key

2. **Rationale:** It is necessary to track key indicators**.**

3. **Use:** It will be used for internal management purposes and performance-based budgeting as an indicator of workload.

4. **Clarity:** Clearly identified

5. **Validity, Reliability and Accuracy:** No, the indicator is valid.

6. **Data Source, Collection and Reporting:** Information shall be gathered monthly.

7. **Calculation Methodology:** Add together the number of constituent services tickets.

8. **Scope:** Indicator is aggregated.

9. **Caveats:** No weaknesses; indicator is not a surrogate; the source of the date does not have a bias; there is not a caveat.

10.   **Responsible Person:** Civil Division Deputy Director

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

Program: **CIVIL**

Objective: **I.5**

Indicator Name: **Number of non-duty attorney tickets resolved**

Indicator LaPAS PI Code: 25008

1. **Type and Level**: Output - Key

2. **Rationale:** It is necessary to track key indicators**.**

3. **Use:** It will be used for internal management purposes and performance-based budgeting as an indicator of workload.

4. **Clarity:** Clearly identified

5. **Validity, Reliability and Accuracy:** No, the indicator is valid.

6. **Data Source, Collection and Reporting:** Information shall be gathered monthly.

7. **Calculation Methodology:** Add together the number of non-duty attorney tickets resolved.

8. **Scope:** Indicator is aggregated.

9. **Caveats:** No weaknesses; indicator is not a surrogate; the source of the date does not have a bias; there is not a caveat.

10.   **Responsible Person:** Civil Division Deputy Director

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

Program: **CIVIL**

Objective: **I.5**

Indicator Name: **Number of duty attorney tickets resolved**

Indicator LaPAS PI Code: 25009

1. **Type and Level**: Output - Key

2. **Rationale:** It is necessary to track key indicators**.**

3. **Use:** It will be used for internal management purposes and performance-based budgeting as an indicator of workload.

4. **Clarity:** Clearly identified

5. **Validity, Reliability and Accuracy:** No, the indicator is valid.

6. **Data Source, Collection and Reporting:** Information shall be gathered monthly.

7. **Calculation Methodology:** Add together the number of duty attorney tickets resolved.

8. **Scope:** Indicator is aggregated.

9. **Caveats:** No weaknesses; indicator is not a surrogate; the source of the date does not have a bias; there is not a caveat.

10.   **Responsible Person:** Civil Division Deputy Director

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

Program: **CIVIL**

Objective: **I.5**

Indicator Name: **Number of walk-ins resolved**

Indicator LaPAS PI Code: 25010

1. **Type and Level**: Output - Key

2. **Rationale:** It is necessary to track key indicators**.**

3. **Use:** It will be used for internal management purposes and performance-based budgeting as an indicator of workload.

4. **Clarity:** Clearly identified

5. **Validity, Reliability and Accuracy:** No, the indicator is valid.

6. **Data Source, Collection and Reporting:** Information shall be gathered monthly.

7. **Calculation Methodology:** Add together the number of resolved walk-in tickets.

8. **Scope:** Indicator is aggregated.

9. **Caveats:** No weaknesses; indicator is not a surrogate; the source of the date does not have a bias; there is not a caveat.

10.   **Responsible Person:** Civil Division Deputy Director

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

Program: **CIVIL**

Objective: **I.5**

Indicator Name: **Number of private request letters resolved**

Indicator LaPAS PI Code: 25011

1. **Type and Level**: Output - Key

2. **Rationale:** It is necessary to track key indicators**.**

3. **Use:** It will be used for internal management purposes and performance-based budgeting as an indicator of workload.

4. **Clarity:** Clearly identified

5. **Validity, Reliability and Accuracy:** No, the indicator is valid.

6. **Data Source, Collection and Reporting:** Information shall be gathered monthly.

7. **Calculation Methodology:** Add together the number of private request letters resolved.

8. **Scope:** Indicator is aggregated.

9. **Caveats:** No weaknesses; indicator is not a surrogate; the source of the date does not have a bias; there is not a caveat.

10.   **Responsible Person:** Civil Division Deputy Director

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

Program: **CIVIL**

Objective: **I.5**

Indicator Name: **Number of responses to specialized inquiries**

Indicator LaPAS PI Code: 25013

1. **Type and Level**: Output - Key

2. **Rationale:** It is necessary to track key indicators**.**

3. **Use:** It will be used for internal management purposes and performance-based budgeting as an indicator of workload.

4. **Clarity:** Clearly identified

5. **Validity, Reliability and Accuracy:** No, the indicator is valid.

6. **Data Source, Collection and Reporting:** Information shall be gathered monthly.

7. **Calculation Methodology:** Add together the number of responses to specialized inquiries.

8. **Scope:** Indicator is aggregated.

9. **Caveats:** No weaknesses; indicator is not a surrogate; the source of the date does not have a bias; there is not a caveat.

10.   **Responsible Person:** Civil Division Deputy Director

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

Program: **CIVIL**

Objective: **I.5**

Indicator Name: **Total number of constituent tickets resolved**

Indicator LaPAS PI Code: 25014

1. **Type and Level**: Output - Key

2. **Rationale:** It is necessary to track key indicators**.**

3. **Use:** It will be used for internal management purposes and performance-based budgeting as an indicator of workload.

4. **Clarity:** Clearly identified

5. **Validity, Reliability and Accuracy:** No, the indicator is valid.

6. **Data Source, Collection and Reporting:** Information shall be gathered monthly.

7. **Calculation Methodology:** Add together the total number of constituent tickets resolved.

8. **Scope:** Indicator is aggregated.

9. **Caveats:** No weaknesses; indicator is not a surrogate; the source of the date does not have a bias; there is not a caveat.

10.   **Responsible Person:** Civil Division Deputy Director

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

Program: **CIVIL**

Objective: **I.5**

Indicator Name: **Total number of constituent tickets unresolved**

Indicator LaPAS PI Code: 25015

1. **Type and Level**: Output - Key

2. **Rationale:** It is necessary to track key indicators**.**

3. **Use:** It will be used for internal management purposes and performance-based budgeting as an indicator of workload.

4. **Clarity:** Clearly identified

5. **Validity, Reliability and Accuracy:** No, the indicator is valid.

6. **Data Source, Collection and Reporting:** Information shall be gathered monthly.

7. **Calculation Methodology:** Add together the total number of constituent tickets unresolved.

8. **Scope:** Indicator is aggregated.

9. **Caveats:** No weaknesses; indicator is not a surrogate; the source of the date does not have a bias; there is not a caveat.

10.   **Responsible Person:** Civil Division Deputy Director

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

Program: **CIVIL**

Objective: **I.6**

Indicator Name: **Total dollar amount of settlements approved**

Indicator LaPAS PI Code: 25019

1. **Type and Level**: Input - Supporting

2. **Rationale:** It is necessary to track supporting indicators**.**

3. **Use:** It will be used for internal management purposes and performance-based budgeting as an indicator of workload.

4. **Clarity:** Clearly identified

5. **Validity, Reliability and Accuracy:** No, the indicator is valid.

6. **Data Source, Collection and Reporting:** Information shall be gathered monthly.

7. **Calculation Methodology:** Add together the total dollar amounts of settlements approved.

8. **Scope:** Indicator is aggregated.

9. **Caveats:** No weaknesses; indicator is not a surrogate; the source of the date does not have a bias; there is not a caveat.

10.   **Responsible Person:** Civil Division Deputy Director

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

Program: **CIVIL**

Objective: **I.6**

Indicator Name: **Number of settlements received for review**

Indicator LaPAS PI Code: 25016

1. **Type and Level**: Output - Key

2. **Rationale:** It is necessary to track key indicators**.**

3. **Use:** It will be used for internal management purposes and performance-based budgeting as an indicator of workload.

4. **Clarity:** Clearly identified

5. **Validity, Reliability and Accuracy:** No, the indicator is valid.

6. **Data Source, Collection and Reporting:** Information shall be gathered monthly.

7. **Calculation Methodology:** Add together the number of settlements received for review.

8. **Scope:** Indicator is aggregated.

9. **Caveats:** No weaknesses; indicator is not a surrogate; the source of the date does not have a bias; there is not a caveat.

10.   **Responsible Person:** Civil Division Deputy Director

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

Program: **CIVIL**

Objective: **I.6**

Indicator Name: **Number of settlements approved**

Indicator LaPAS PI Code: 25017

1. **Type and Level**: Output - Supporting

2. **Rationale:** It is necessary to track supporting indicators**.**

3. **Use:** It will be used for internal management purposes and performance-based budgeting as an indicator of workload.

4. **Clarity:** Clearly identified

5. **Validity, Reliability and Accuracy:** No, the indicator is valid.

6. **Data Source, Collection and Reporting:** Information shall be gathered monthly.

7. **Calculation Methodology:** Add together the number of settlements approved.

8. **Scope:** Indicator is aggregated.

9. **Caveats:** No weaknesses; indicator is not a surrogate; the source of the date does not have a bias; there is not a caveat.

10.   **Responsible Person:** Civil Division Deputy Director

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

Program: **CIVIL**

Objective: **I.6**

Indicator Name: **Number of settlements approved within statutory time limits**

Indicator LaPAS PI Code: 25018

1. **Type and Level**: Output - Supporting

2. **Rationale:** It is necessary to track supporting indicators**.**

3. **Use:** It will be used for internal management purposes and performance-based budgeting as an indicator of workload.

4. **Clarity:** Clearly identified

5. **Validity, Reliability and Accuracy:** No, the indicator is valid.

6. **Data Source, Collection and Reporting:** Information shall be gathered monthly.

7. **Calculation Methodology:** Add together the number of settlements approved within statutory time limits.

8. **Scope:** Indicator is aggregated.

9. **Caveats:** No weaknesses; indicator is not a surrogate; the source of the date does not have a bias; there is not a caveat.

10.   **Responsible Person:** Civil Division Deputy Director

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

Program: **CIVIL**

Objective: **I.6**

Indicator Name: **Number of settlements disapproved**

Indicator LaPAS PI Code: 25020

1. **Type and Level**: Outcome - General

2. **Rationale:** It is necessary to track general indicators**.**

3. **Use:** It will be used for internal management purposes and performance-based budgeting as an indicator of workload.

4. **Clarity:** Clearly identified

5. **Validity, Reliability and Accuracy:** No, the indicator is valid.

6. **Data Source, Collection and Reporting:** Information shall be gathered monthly.

7. **Calculation Methodology:** Add together the total number of settlements disapproved.

8. **Scope:** Indicator is aggregated.

9. **Caveats:** No weaknesses; indicator is not a surrogate; the source of the date does not have a bias; there is not a caveat.

10.   **Responsible Person:** Civil Division Deputy Director

CIVIL PROGRAM: PUBLIC PROTECTION

2024-2028 STRATEGIC PLAN
SUPPORTING INTERNAL/EXTERNAL DOCUMENTATION

The Civil Program is a compilation of highly specialized attorneys who are responsible for work that directly impacts state government. The Civil Division defends the State of Louisiana by providing competent and superior professional legal services while defending the State's constitution and its duly enacted laws, as well as to provide legal representation, counsel and assistance to fulfill the needs of the State of Louisiana.

Insurance and Securities Section

Insurance and Securities Section has direct involvement in and primary knowledge of every insurance liquidation in Louisiana. This section performs legal work, supervises contract counsel, and works with the Department of Insurance. Staff personnel conduct research in insolvency cases and maintain a proactive position in the areas of insurance liquidation. This section reviews legal bills of contract attorneys, incorporates terms of engagements and development with contract attorneys and the Department of Insurance case management plans for each liquidation.

Internal/External Assessment

(1)   Who are the organization's customers/clients, other stakeholders, and expectation groups? What are their needs and expectations?

The Insurance Section statutorily represents the Commissioner of Insurance in all Receivership matters. The Section's clients consist of:

A. Commissioner of Insurance - The expectation of the Commissioner of Insurance expects legal advice and counsel regarding the various receivership estates and other general receivership matters.

B. Receivers appointed by the Commissioner of Insurance and other receivership staff - Their expectation is for competent legal representation which includes timely legal advice and counsel, timely filed pleadings, and competent courtroom presentation and demeanor.

Stakeholders consist of:

A. Policyholders and creditors - They expect that the Section would represent and oversee receivership matters including pursuing claims of the receivership estates to ensure maximum payments are made on policyholder claims.

B. Citizens at large - The citizens expectations are that the Section oversee the receivership process as well as be available for questions regarding the receivership process and/or their individual claims.

(2)   Where has the organization been?

The Insurance Section was formed as a result of the numerous insurance receiverships which were occurring in Louisiana in the 1980's. At one time, Louisiana had over 64 companies in receivership.   Several of the receiverships involved extremely large companies and were having an adverse impact on the insurance situation in the State of Louisiana. The legislature, in an effort to streamline cost and to provide for checks and balances in the receivership process passed legislation which required the Attorney General's office to provide representation in all receivership estates and oversee all outside counsel.

This Section was formed to implement this legislation and has continued to do so since that time. The Section is designed to be self-supporting by billing for its services to the various insurance receivership estates.

(3)   Where is the organization now?

The Section continues to maintain its role to provide legal services for the Commissioner of Insurance and receivers, and receivership staff in all liquidation matters, and to oversee outside counsels who have been retained to handle individual matters in the various receivership estates.

(4)   What opportunities for positive change exist?

Because of the nature of mergers, acquisitions, etc. more and more insurance liquidations are becoming multi-state litigation efforts. The Section has the opportunity to make positive contributions to insurance receivership law with participation with other state insurance regulators and various task forces which have been formed by National Association of Insurance Commissioners.

The increased public awareness of insurance matters could provide the opportunity to develop and implement a consumer awareness program to advise consumers, businesses, and lawmakers about the receivership process and their rights during the receivership process.

The Louisiana Insurance Guaranty Association and the Louisiana Life and Health Insurance Guaranty Association are also quasi-state insurance organizations which present an opportunity to the Section for increased representation in insurance matters.

(5)   What are the organization's strengths and weaknesses?
Strengths:

1. Competent staff;
2. Productive;
3. Teamwork;
4. Able to meet deadlines and work well under pressure;
5. Self- supporting; and
6. Accommodating.

Weaknesses:
1. The staff needs continual training opportunities which deal exclusively with receivership and insurance law. This will also assist in achieving the opportunities listed above.
2. Failure of individuals to recognize the uniqueness of the receivership law and that it requires specialized knowledge.

(6)   What are your (the staff's) expectations of the agency?

1. Resources to complete job assignments, provide competent legal advice to clients, and to meet the concerns of stakeholders and consumers;
2. Support and approval for more training specifically dealing with insurance related matters;
3. Pay commensurate with the handling of a specialized field of law.

(1)   What is the current external environment?

The Section is dealing with receiverships which are more complex than previous receivership cases. There are more multi-state receiverships in which it is necessary for the section to travel to other states to meet with insurance staff and observe and make decisions on litigations regarding the receivership estates. In addition, the placing of large Health Maintenance Organizations in receivership has created a unique situation for receivership staff and the procedure for handling receivership matters.

External factors which may influence the section include:

a. The number of companies placed in receivership - If the cost of healthcare increases and the costs of doing business continue to rise, other insurance companies may be placed in receivership. If this number should continue to grow, it will be necessary for this Section to either hire additional staff to meet the demand or allow more of the work to be done by outside counsel.

b. Relationship between the Commissioner of Insurance and the Insurance Section - A positive relationship with the Department of Insurance and its view that the Section is performing its job in a competent, knowledgeable, and professional manner results in more successful work environment and could lead to an expanded role of the Section in handling legal matters for other insurance related matters.

c. Funding – Since this section is a self-supporting section, the continued ability to secure funds for the section would influence the Section's ability to perform its job functions.

d. State Uniformity - There has been a push by the federal government for uniformity among the states in the handling of liquidation matters, since most states handle these functions, including the legal work, through their Department of Insurance, such a move in Louisiana could affect the existence of the Section.

(2)   How may the environment differ in the future?

The Section expects to see more multi-state insurance receiverships. There is also an expectation that insurance companies will become a subsidiary of corporations with varied interest and locations, thereby making the receivership process more complex.

Of concern to the Attorney General's office is that in most states the legal work for receivership sections are handled as part of or through the Department of Insurance and are not a part of the Attorney General's office. Because of the push for uniformity in insurance regulation by the federal government and by states, there may be a move to have this function returned to the Department of Insurance.

Tobacco Section

Tobacco Section enforces the Tobacco Master Settlement Agreement (MSA) and MSA-related legislation by investigation and litigating violations; performing statewide site and event checks for violations; educating public officials and the public through presentations on the MSA; and coordinating enforcement efforts with other state Attorneys General. Through the Tobacco Section, the Attorney General enforces the Master Settlement Agreement (MSA). The MSA outlines numerous rights and responsibilities of the Attorney General. However, the section's primary responsibility has been to investigate and/or litigate suspected violations of the MSA and to investigate and/or litigate suspected violations of state and/or federal laws including consumer protection laws with respect to the manufacture, use, marketing and sale of tobacco products. The section also coordinates enforcement efforts with the National Association of Attorneys General (NAAG) and the other states regarding various issues which arise under the MSA or MSA-related statues.

Internal/External Assessment

*(1)   Who are the organization's customers/clients, other stakeholders, and
          expectation groups? What are their needs and expectations?*

The Tobacco Settlement Enforcement Section of the Attorney General's Office has the primary function of enforcing the Master Settlement Agreement (MSA) and other related tobacco laws.

The Section's clients consist of the citizens of the State of Louisiana. Their expectation is that the Section will ensure that tobacco companies, who sell cigarettes and roll-your-own

products, follow the guidelines and rules as delineated in the MSA and other tobacco laws, or pay into qualified escrow accounts so that funds are available should the state secure a judgment against a manufacturer. Further, that the Section serves as a community resource for tobacco related information.

Stakeholders consist of:

A. State legislature and Tobacco Bond holders - Their expectations are that the Section will enforce the MSA and tobacco related laws to ensure that manufacturers pay the funds due the state under the Master Settlement Agreement so that programs that rely on the funds may continue to be implemented by the state. The Section serves as a resource for tobacco related information.

B. Public Health - Their expectations are that the Section will continue to enforce the Public Health provisions of the MSA and serve as a resource for tobacco related matters.

C. Wholesalers and manufacturers - Their expectations are that the Section will enforce the MSA and tobacco related laws, to ensure that the wholesalers have an approved list of manufacturers, and that the manufacturers are on a level playing field as to sale of their product.

D. Department of Revenue – They expect assistance and coordination from the Tobacco Section in enforcing tobacco related matters, including legal representation if required on certain tobacco matters.

(2)   Where has the organization been?

The Tobacco Section was established in 1999 and began as a unit under the Governmental Section of the Civil Division. On April 1, 2004, it became its own Section under the Public Protection Division. The Section maintains the same staff positions as when it was initially begun.

The Section has reviewed the applications of tobacco manufacturers who wish to sell in Louisiana and approved or disapproved same to sell cigarettes or roll-your-own tobacco in the State of Louisiana. The Section has also removed manufacturers from its approved list and filed lawsuits against them for failure to pay into a qualified escrow account, as delineated by the MSA and other tobacco laws.

The Section has done numerous site inspections, consumer awareness presentations, and audits of tobacco wholesalers. The Section members also participate in numerous telephone conferences with NAAG and other states, which are invaluable in providing current status of various activities concerning the MSA. The Section is in constant contact with other states regarding recent developments in these matters, such as escrow payments, suits, and attempts to serve the suits in order to proceed against manufacturers not in compliance with the MSA.

The Section has represented the Department of Revenue in tobacco related litigation. It has participated with other states in numerous efforts regarding public health violations, youth advertisement, and other related matters under the MSA.

Although the organizational staff has remained the same, within the last two years, the Section's focus has expanded. The organization began to actively audit wholesalers, completed a computer database program which allows the Section to update its approved list of manufacturers and make such list available to manufacturers simultaneously on the DOJ website. The Section has collected penalty money from non-compliant manufacturers. It has increased training opportunities for staff. The Section has improved its coordination and relationship with the Department of Revenue, the community, and our Public Health stakeholders.

In addition, in 2003 and 2004 two major pieces of legislation designed to ensure compliance by wholesalers and manufacturers were initiated by the Section and passed by the Legislature.

(3)   Where is the organization now?

The Section continues its duties as outlined in the previous section. With the passage of the complementary legislation in June of 2004, the Section will become more active in the enforcement of tobacco laws as it affects both manufacturers and wholesalers.

Because of the renewed relationship with the state public health community, the Section plans to become more pro-active regarding enforcement of the public health aspects of the MSA. The Section may consider hiring an attorney who would be specifically designated to handle public health issues under the MSA.

The Section continues to improve on its efforts to receive correct and up-to-date information from manufacturers and wholesalers regarding tobacco products sold in Louisiana.

Our Section compares favorably on average to most states by size and function, and is meeting the performance indicators and targets that have been set. The Section may need to improve the time period for our initial response to manufacturers who wish to sell tobacco products in Louisiana.

Overall, the Section is in an excellent position to enhance its work productivity and response to clients, stakeholders, and expectation groups.

(4)   What opportunities for positive change exist?

The Section is poised to make changes as a result of technological initiatives, new legislation, and improved relationship with stakeholders. These changes also assist us in meeting the concerns of our clients and stakeholders.

As part of the requirement that the Section notify wholesalers of changes in the approval list of manufacturers, it will be soliciting e-mail addresses from all wholesalers and manufacturers so that it can notify them via e-mail of all changes that affect wholesalers and manufacturers. This will meet the needs of the wholesalers and manufacturers in ordering, purchasing, and selling only those products which have been approved for sale in the state.

The legislation has given the Section more authority and empowered the Section to gather more information in order to do a more thorough investigation of all manufacturers who sell or wish to sell tobacco products in the State of Louisiana.

Because of the Section's improved relationship with stakeholders and the community we are able to address public health and youth smoking prevention matters which are of concern to our citizens and whose enforcement is provided for under the MSA.

(5)   What are the organization's strengths and weaknesses?

Strengths:
A. Competent and Knowledgeable Staff;
B. Ability to work as a unit;
C. Working relationship with Louisiana Department of Revenue, National Association of Attorneys General (NAAG), other state attorneys general offices, and people in the tobacco industry;
D. Genuine Interest by staff in the work we are doing and a desire to be efficient, productive, and competent;
E. Resources and training are provided to accomplish duties.

Weaknesses:
A. Increased participation in public health matters;
B. Verification of sales figures with Revenue or other related parties.

(1)   What is the current external environment?

Because of the nature of the Section's duties, in addition to funding resources and administration inside the Attorney General's Office, the state legislature has the most direct impact on the Section's ability to do its job because it passes the laws which assist the Section in carrying out its responsibilities.

(2)   How may the environment differ in the future?

There is no expected change in the environment in the near future. The issues which exist at this time will be ongoing for some time. The resolution of these issues will determine if there will be significant changes in the external environment.

If issues are resolved in favor of the states, the primary environmental factors will not change.

If the issues are not resolved favorably, the Section could be in a position of needing additional legislation to regulate and tax manufacturers and resources to meet the increased need of such regulation.

Equal Housing Opportunity Section

Equal Opportunity Section is responsible for the administration and enforcement of the Louisiana Equal Housing Opportunity Act. This section is active in the investigation, conciliation, and judicial enforcement of fair housing claims. Staff personnel cooperate with the federal government in the enforcement of statutes prohibiting discrimination in public accommodations based on an individual's race, color, national origin, religion, sex, handicap or familial status. The section also provides information to Louisiana citizens on their rights regarding the rent/purchase of dwellings under the Louisiana Equal Housing Opportunity Act and the federal Fair Housing Act.

Internal/External Assessment

(1)   Who are the organization's customers/clients, other stakeholders, and expectation groups? What are their needs and expectations?

The organization's customers are all citizens of the State of Louisiana, property management companies, real estate agencies, non-profit fair housing organizations, and others. The organization is subject to oversight and works in conjunction with the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) pursuit to a Cooperative Agreement. The citizens and others expect the agency to enforce and educate regarding the federal and state fair housing act. On a comparative analysis of metropolitan and rural areas, the rural areas are not as aware of their rights under the federal and state fair housing laws as the metropolitan areas.

(2)   Where has the organization been?

The Equal Housing Opportunity Section was created as a result of the Louisiana Open Housing Act in 1991. A federal grant was received from the (HUD) which authorizes the section to act as the enforcement office for both federal and state of Louisiana fair housing laws.

Since 1991, the section has resolved one thousand, three hundred fifty-five fair housing complaints through efforts which include, but are not limited to, conciliation, mediation, litigation, and findings that there was cause or no reasonable cause to believe that housing discrimination occurred. The section has continued to meet the needs of both internal and external assessment by advertisement, seminars, and other outreach methods. The section continues to grow as the fair housing complaints increase.

(3)   Where is the organization now?

The Equal Housing Opportunity Section is continuing to enforce the federal and state fair housing laws by making the public aware of their rights as citizens of the state regarding the nondiscriminatory sale or rental of housing.

In comparison with the federal salary scale for fair housing enforcement officers, the enforcement budget for the state is under-scaled. The functions of the state enforcement officers are more demanding than the federal officers because the state enforces both federal and state laws with less staff and funding. The state's salary scale should be comparable to the yearly federal geographic scale for the Louisiana region.

(4)   What opportunities for positive change exist?

The public and the Department are sometimes unaware of the functions of the Equal Housing Opportunity Section on behalf of citizens of the State. Although, public announcements of the fair housing laws have been made through media buys, there is still a misconception of the enforcement efforts of what the department can and cannot enforce. (i.e. housing authorities' certification process, multi-family housing placements, section eight certification, etc.) While conducting fair housing seminars, it has been discovered that the rural areas of the State have limited knowledge of the enforcement of the fair housing

laws by the section and is in need of education and outreach.

(5)   What are the organization's strengths and weaknesses?

The size and composition of the section's workforce is in need of additional federal funding to service all geographical areas of the State. The additional staff would include outreach and governmental affairs personnel. The outreach efforts are to include education and enforcement of fair housing laws for the entire population. The governmental affairs personnel would provide the legislative leaders with information pertaining to the needs and awareness of federal funding and technical obligations of the Equal Housing Opportunity Section.

(6)   What are the staff's expectations?

The staff members are required to enforce and maintain a professional neutral position at all times during the scope of the investigative process. Compliance officers are required to maintain a level of knowledge regarding fair housing, laws, issues, cases, enforcement process, and perform continual education annually. All other staff members are to maintain equal quality of knowledge regarding fair housing in a professional manner.

(7)   What is the current external environment?

Discrimination continues to occur in fair housing because there is a lack of knowledge of the law and the enforcement process of the fair housing act. There is a need for all local government agencies to be aware of the fair housing act while receiving federal funds that pertain to fair housing laws, thereby bridging the gap in enforcement between the metropolitan areas and rural areas.

(8)   How may the environment differ in the future?

The biggest external threat is the increase in predatory lending among the protected classes. There is a need to continue educating the citizens, landlords, other local and government agency regarding the impact of housing discrimination in the state.

Consumer Protection Section

Consumer Protection Section has the responsibility of enforcing consumer protection laws in this state and serving as a public trustee in connection with conserving, protecting and

replenishing Louisiana's natural resources. In the Consumer Protection area, the section conducts investigations of unfair or deceptive trade practices. The section works with local, state and federal authorities in joint investigations. The section conducts consumer awareness seminars throughout the state on subjects such as shoplifting, fraud, theft, and other deceptive trade practices. The section mediates and investigates consumer reported complaints and inquiries and enforces the antitrust and related laws relative to the regulation of trade and commerce including protecting small business interests and those injured by antitrust violations, organized business extortion and theft. Within Consumer Protection Section is the Auto Fraud Unit. The Auto Fraud Unit mediates complaints of citizens with car dealers, assures the delivery of title and registration of motor vehicles, advises consumers of their rights concerning automobile issues, and investigates and mediates the packing of auto sale contracts. The unit coordinates efforts with state and federal agencies to combat odometer fraud, investigates and assists state in remittance of sales tax money due the state and educates consumers on automobile fraud.

Internal/External Assessment

(1)   Who are the organizations customers/clients, other stakeholders, and expectation groups? What are their needs and expectations?

The customers of the Consumer Protection Section are the consumers who purchase a product or safety. Additionally, the public at large benefits when enforcement actions are filed against businesses operating unfairly, mediation efforts when they are able to file a complaint, or when companies have to register when doing business in Louisiana.

Their needs and expectations are protection from unfair trade practices and a place to turn when they have a complaint.

(2)   Where has the organization been?

The organization has been increasing in strength with the addition of personnel and dollars for enforcement. There are an increased number of laws passed that strengthen the Unfair Trade Practices Act and a number of new laws that make a practice an "unfair trade practice". Better in-house databases have been developed and personnel are better informed on how to use them.

(3)   Where is the organization now?

New personnel has made it possible to better track the activity of businesses operating, quality of staff has improved so that enforcement actions are taken with some assurance of success. Consumers benefit when the Section is able to provide better public protection in consumer transactions.

The number of actions filed against businesses has and will continue to increase. The success rate of mediation of consumer complaints can improve with better education of the mediators. This is dependent on the number and quality of in-house education programs

for the attorneys and para-professionals. There are an increased number of educational opportunities for attorneys from outside of the workplace.

(4)   What opportunities for positive change exist?

There is an increase in the number of opportunities to participate in multi-state actions and thereby increase the number of assurance of voluntary compliance with national companies (a consent that they will abide by the law). With the increase in the number of actions both in-house and multi-state, there is an increase in the dollars collected for consumer enforcement and education.
This increase in monetary resources can provide much needed litigation support, and improve the quality and number of outreach activities.

The Consumer Protection Section can also participate with other consumer advocates and group to strengthen their efforts against unfair business practices.

(5)   What are the organization's strengths and weaknesses?

The consumer protection section has the advantage of communicating with the public at large. When complaints are filed with the mediation unit, the staff deals directly with consumers. How that interaction takes place and the degree of satisfaction is largely dependent upon HOW the complaint is handled and not necessarily the outcome. The complaints filed are also a source of what transactions are problematic and can be a source of information. Complaints are often the first indication that a business is operating illegally in Louisiana.

We need to continue reaching the public at large to educate them regarding signs of fraudulent business practices. The Consumer Section must also be more proactive in enforcement of its regulations.

(1)   What is the current external environment?

Perhaps the external environment that affects the consumer section the most is the way in which business transactions are conducted. More and more, business is transacted on the internet or through other means of communication technology. This makes it harder to track and more difficult to locate the offenders. And when businesses are locating in cyberspace it is more difficult to get jurisdiction, service of process, or just find out who is committing the unfair trade practice. Particularly in the field of lending, borrowers are finding sources of loans outside of our jurisdiction. TV advertising invites fraudulent offers to consumers. In sum, technology and media advancements are facilitating scams to a wider and less suspecting audience.

(2)   How may the environment differ in the future?

Stated advances in technology make it more difficult to find the source of a fraud. Business transactions can take place anywhere across the globe but look like they are credible and local to an unsuspecting consumer.

The consumer section will need to develop the tools for tracking down fraud and the expertise to use the new tools and technology.

Community Education Assistance Section

Community Education Assistance Section is comprised of The Domestic Violence project. The Domestic Violence project provides educational and technical assistance to private industry and government agencies in addressing domestic violence as a safety issue. In addition, the project assists law enforcement by providing vital training on domestic violence arrests and enforcement of protection orders.

Where has the program been?

The Community Education Assistance Section continues to be on the cutting edge of policy and program development in the area of school safety and domestic violence. The Attorney General's office has been recognized nationally for its school safety-training program and its domestic violence in the workplace-training program. The Louisiana Attorney General's office is the first Attorney General's office to establish a statewide Domestic Violence in the Workplace Initiative.

Where is the program now?

The Community Education Assistance Section staff has been stable over the past several years. The section continues to rely on grants for it's funding, requiring a lot of coordination with the accounting section. The programs within this section have always been recognized nationally for their effectiveness and innovativeness. Other Attorneys General offices and public agencies contact this section for information regarding the programs. The section staff has also traveled across the state and country to present these programs as benchmarks.

STRATEGY ANALYSIS CHECKLIST

Program: CIVIL – PUBLIC PROTECTION – INSURANCE SECTION

Objective I.7:   In the Insurance Section, file 100% of motions of payment with the court, within 10 days following the end of each monthly billing cycle by June 30, 2028.

Strategy I.7.a: Use case tracking/work management to ensure timely billing and payments.

Analysis
    __X_ Cost/benefit analysis conducted
    _____ Other analysis used
    _____ Impact on other strategies considered

Authorization
    __X_ Authorization exists
    _____ Authorization needed

Organization Capacity
    _____ Needed structural or procedural changes identified
    __X_ Resource needs identified

Time Frame
    _____ Already ongoing
    __X_ New, startup date estimated
    _____ Lifetime of strategy identified

Fiscal Impact
    __X_ Impact on operating budget
    _____ Impact on capital outlay budget
    _____ Means of finance identified

STRATEGY ANALYSIS CHECKLIST

Program: CIVIL – PUBLIC PROTECTION – TOBACCO SECTION

Objective I.8: Through the Tobacco Section, enforce the terms of the Master Settlement Agreement against the Participating Manufacturers by conducting at least 200 inspections of tobacco retail establishments, notify violators of violations within 15 days, when applicable, and re-inspect within 6 months each fiscal year by June 30, 2028.

Strategy I.8.a: Hold quarterly internal Tobacco Section meetings to monitor the progress of completing at least 50 inspections per quarter.

Analysis
  _____ Cost/benefit analysis conducted
  _____ Other analysis used
  __X_ Impact on other strategies considered

Authorization
  __X _ Authorization exists
  _____ Authorization needed

Organization Capacity
  _____ Needed structural or procedural changes identified
  __X_ Resource needs identified

Time Frame
  _____ Already ongoing
  __X_ New, startup date estimated
  _____ Lifetime of strategy identified

Fiscal Impact
  __X_ Impact on operating budget
  _____ Impact on capital outlay budget
  _____ Means of finance identified

STRATEGY ANALYSIS CHECKLIST

Program: CIVIL – PUBLIC PROTECTION – TOBACCO SECTION

Objective I.9:   Through the Tobacco Section, the DOJ shall solicit and/or perform a minimum of 24 presentations to Louisiana citizens in a variety of venues on the dangers of tobacco use and issues related to the Master Settlement Agreement each fiscal year by June 30, 2028.

Strategy I.9.a: Actively solicit opportunities to make presentations by contacting a variety of non-profit entities, including schools and other agencies.

Analysis
    __X_ Cost/benefit analysis conducted
    _____ Other analysis used
    _____ Impact on other strategies considered

Authorization
    __X_ Authorization exists
    _____ Authorization needed

Organization Capacity
    _____ Needed structural or procedural changes identified
    __X_ Resource needs identified

Time Frame
    _____ Already ongoing
    __X_ New, startup date estimated
    _____ Lifetime of strategy identified

Fiscal Impact
    __X_ Impact on operating budget
    _____ Impact on capital outlay budget
    _____ Means of finance identified

Program: CIVIL – PUBLIC PROTECTION – EQUAL HOUSING
OPPORTUNITY SECTION

Objective I.10: Qualify for full payment from HUD on 50% of processed fair housing
complaints each fiscal year by June 30, 2028.

Strategy I.10.a: Process Fair Housing complaints within 5 days of completion of inquiry and
have notification letters sent to all parties.

Analysis
    _____ Cost/benefit analysis conducted
    _____ Other analysis used
    __X_ Impact on other strategies considered

Authorization
    __X Authorization exists
    _____ Authorization needed

Organization Capacity
    _____ Needed structural or procedural changes identified
    __X_ Resource needs identified

Time Frame
    __X_ Already ongoing
    _____ New, startup date estimated
    _____ Lifetime of strategy identified

Fiscal Impact
    __X_ Impact on operating budget
    _____ Impact on capital outlay budget
    _____ Means of finance identified

<div style="border: 1px solid black; text-align: center;">

STRATEGY ANALYSIS CHECKLIST

</div>

Program: CIVIL – PUBLIC PROTECTION – EQUAL HOUSING
OPPORTUNITY SECTION

Objective I.10: Qualify for full payment from HUD on 50% of processed fair
housing complaints each fiscal year by June 30, 2028.

Strategy I.10.b: Full review by supervisor of investigation of all complaints within 75 days
of commencement of investigation.

Analysis
_____ Cost/benefit analysis conducted
_____ Other analysis used
__X_ Impact on other strategies considered

Authorization
__X_ Authorization exists
_____ Authorization needed

Organization Capacity
_____ Needed structural or procedural changes identified
__X_ Resource needs identified

Time Frame
_____ Already ongoing
__X_ New, startup date estimated
_____ Lifetime of strategy identified

Fiscal Impact
__X_ Impact on operating budget
_____ Impact on capital outlay budget
_____ Means of finance identified

STRATEGY ANALYSIS CHECKLIST

Program: CIVIL – PUBLIC PROTECTION – EQUAL HOUSING
OPPORTUNITY SECTION

Objective I.10: Qualify for full payment from HUD on 50% of processed fair
housing complaints each fiscal year by June 30, 2028.

Strategy I.10.c: Provide Fair Housing education and outreach efforts as well as provide
Fair Housing outreach materials as required by HUD.

Analysis
_____ Cost/benefit analysis conducted
_____ Other analysis used
__X_ Impact on other strategies considered

Authorization
__X_ Authorization exists
_____ Authorization needed

Organization Capacity
_____ Needed structural or procedural changes identified
__X_ Resource needs identified

Time Frame
_____ Already ongoing
__X_ New, startup date estimated
_____ Lifetime of strategy identified

Fiscal Impact
__X_ Impact on operating budget
_____ Impact on capital outlay budget
_____ Means of finance identified

STRATEGY ANALYSIS CHECKLIST

Program: CIVIL – PUBLIC PROTECTION – CONSUMER PROTECTION

Objective I.11: Respond to 100% of verified consumer disputes within 15 days of receipt by June 30, 2028.

Strategy I.11a: Maintain and monitor computer applications to support consumer complaint processing and resolution.

Analysis

_____ Cost/benefit analysis conducted
_____ Other analysis used
__X_ Impact on other strategies considered

Authorization

__X_ Authorization exists
_____ Authorization needed

Organization Capacity

_____ Needed structural or procedural changes identified
__X_ Resource needs identified

Time Frame

__X_ Already ongoing
_____ New, startup date estimated
_____ Lifetime of strategy identified

Fiscal Impact

__X_ Impact on operating budget
_____ Impact on capital outlay budget
_____ Means of finance identified

STRATEGY ANALYSIS CHECKLIST

Program: CIVIL – PUBLIC PROTECTION – CONSUMER PROTECTION

Objective I.12:   Close 85% of verified consumer complaints within 90 days of receipt by June 30, 2028.

Strategy I.12.a: Maintain and monitor computer applications to support processing of reports of civil insurance fraud, resolution, and recovery of penalties and fines.

Analysis
　　　　__X _ Cost/benefit analysis conducted
　　　　_____ Other analysis used
　　　　_____ Impact on other strategies considered

Authorization
　　　　__X__Authorization exists
　　　　_____ Authorization needed

Organization Capacity
　　　　_____ Needed structural or procedural changes identified
　　　　__X__Resource needs identified

Time Frame
　　　　__X__Already ongoing
　　　　_____ New, startup date estimated
　　　　_____ Lifetime of strategy identified

STRATEGY ANALYSIS CHECKLIST

Program: CIVIL – PUBLIC PROTECTION – CONSUMER PROTECTION

Objective I.12:   Close 85% of verified consumer complaints within 90 days of receipt by   June 30, 2028.

Strategy I.12.b: Section Chief will monitor cases to ensure prompt action.

Analysis
_____ Cost/benefit analysis conducted
_____ Other analysis used
__X_ Impact on other strategies considered

Authorization
__X_ Authorization exists
_____ Authorization needed

Organization Capacity
_____ Needed structural or procedural changes identified
__X_ Resource needs identified

Time Frame
__X_ Already ongoing
_____ New, startup date estimated
_____ Lifetime of strategy identified

Fiscal Impact
__X_ Impact on operating budget
_____ Impact on capital outlay budget
_____ Means of finance identified

STRATEGY ANALYSIS CHECKLIST

Program: CIVIL – PUBLIC PROTECTION – DOMESTIC VIOLENCE

Objective II.1:   To provide violence, abuse, and sexual harassment response in-service training to 1,500 law enforcement officers and 1000 personnel (non-DOJ) by June 30, 2028.

Strategy II.1.a: Review and update training materials quarterly

Analysis
     _____ Cost/benefit analysis conducted
     __x__ Other analysis used
     _____ Impact on other strategies considered

Authorization
     __x__ Authorization exists
     _____ Authorization needed

Organization Capacity
     _____ Needed structural or procedural changes identified
     __x__ Resource needs identified

Time Frame
     _____ Already ongoing
     __x__ New, startup date estimated
     _____ Lifetime of strategy identified

Fiscal Impact
     __x__ Impact on operating budget
     _____ Impact on capital outlay budget
     _____ Means of finance identified

Program: CIVIL – PUBLIC PROTECTION – DOMESTIC VIOLENCE

Objective II.1:   To provide violence, abuse, and sexual harassment response in-service training to 1,500 law enforcement officers by June 30, 2028.

Strategy II.1.b: Domestic Violence Coordinator shall contact law enforcement groups, schedule training sessions, and arrange for records to be maintained.

Analysis
_____ Cost/benefit analysis conducted
__x__ Other analysis used
_____ Impact on other strategies considered

Authorization
__x__ Authorization exists
_____ Authorization needed

Organization Capacity
_____ Needed structural or procedural changes identified
__x__ Resource needs identified

Time Frame
_____ Already ongoing
__x__ New, startup date estimated
_____ Lifetime of strategy identified

Fiscal Impact
__x__ Impact on operating budget
_____ Impact on capital outlay budget
_____ Means of finance identified

STRATEGY ANALYSIS CHECKLIST

Program: CIVIL – PUBLIC PROTECTION – DOMESTIC VIOLENCE

Objective II.2:   To provide violence, abuse, and sexual harassment training to 1,500 non-DOJ personnel by June 30, 2028.

Strategy II.2.a: Review and update training materials quarterly.

Analysis
_____ Cost/benefit analysis conducted
__x__ Other analysis used
_____ Impact on other strategies considered

Authorization
__x__ Authorization exists
_____ Authorization needed

Organization Capacity
_____ Needed structural or procedural changes identified
__x__ Resource needs identified

Time Frame
_____ Already ongoing
__x__ New, startup date estimated
_____ Lifetime of strategy identified

Fiscal Impact
__x__ Impact on operating budget
_____ Impact on capital outlay budget
_____ Means of finance identified

Program: CIVIL – PUBLIC PROTECTION – DOMESTIC VIOLENCE

Objective II.3:   To distribute 5,000 juvenile crime prevention awareness materials to students and community agencies by June 30, 2028.

Strategy II.3.a:

Analysis
 _____ Cost/benefit analysis conducted
 __x__ Other analysis used
 _____ Impact on other strategies considered

Authorization
 __x__ Authorization exists
 _____ Authorization needed

Organization Capacity
 _____ Needed structural or procedural changes identified
 __x__ Resource needs identified

Time Frame
 _____ Already ongoing
 __x__ New, startup date estimated
 _____ Lifetime of strategy identified

Fiscal Impact
 __x__ Impact on operating budget
 _____ Impact on capital outlay budget
 _____ Means of finance identified

STRATEGY ANALYSIS CHECKLIST

Program: CIVIL – PUBLIC PROTECTION – HUMAN TRAFFICKING

Objective II.3:   To provide in-service Human Trafficking trainings to 250 law
                      enforcement personnel by June 30, 2028.

Strategy II.3.a:

Analysis
_____ Cost/benefit analysis conducted
__x__ Other analysis used
_____ Impact on other strategies considered

Authorization
__x__ Authorization exists
_____ Authorization needed

Organization Capacity
_____ Needed structural or procedural changes identified
__x__ Resource needs identified

Time Frame
_____ Already ongoing
__x__ New, startup date estimated
_____ Lifetime of strategy identified

Fiscal Impact
__x__ Impact on operating budget
_____ Impact on capital outlay budget
_____ Means of finance identified

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

Program: **CIVIL – PUBLIC PROTECTION**

Objective: **I.7**

Indicator Name: **Number of motions filed**

1. **Type and Level**: Output - General

2. **Rationale:** It is necessary to support the outcome measures**.**

3. **Use:** It will be used for internal management purposes and performance-based budgeting as an indicator of workload.

4. **Clarity:** Clearly identified

5. **Validity, Reliability and Accuracy:** No, the indicator is valid.

6. **Data Source, Collection and Reporting:** Information shall be gathered monthly.

7. **Calculation Methodology:** Add together all motions filed.

8. **Scope:** Indicator is aggregated.

9. **Caveats:** No weaknesses; indicator is not a surrogate; the source of the date does not have a bias; there is not a caveat.

10.   **Responsible Person:** Insurance and Securities Section Chief

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

Program: **CIVIL – PUBLIC PROTECTION**

Objective: **I.7**

Indicator Name: **Number of motions filed within 10 days following the end of each monthly billing cycle**

1. **Type and Level**: Output - General

2. **Rationale:** It is necessary to support the outcome measures**.**

3. **Use:** It will be used for internal management purposes and performance-based budgeting as an indicator of workload.

4. **Clarity:** Clearly identified

5. **Validity, Reliability and Accuracy:** No, the indicator is valid.

6. **Data Source, Collection and Reporting:** Information shall be gathered monthly.

7. **Calculation Methodology:** add together all motions filed within 10 days.

8. **Scope:** Indicator is aggregated.

9. **Caveats:** No weaknesses; indicator is not a surrogate; the source of the date does not have a bias; there is not a caveat.

10.   **Responsible Person:** Insurance and Securities Section Chief

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

Program: **CIVIL – PUBLIC PROTECTION**

Objective: **I.7**

Indicator Name: **Percentage of billing invoices submitted within 10 days**

following the end of each monthly billing cycle

Indicator LaPAS PI Code: 21836

1. **Type and Level**: Outcome - Supporting

2. **Rationale:** It is necessary to track supporting indicators**.**

3. **Use:** It will be used for internal management purposes and performance-based budgeting as an indicator of workload.

4. **Clarity:** Clearly identified

5. **Validity, Reliability and Accuracy:** No, the indicator is valid.

6. **Data Source, Collection and Reporting:** The number of billing invoices submitted for payment within 10 days divided by the total number of billing invoices submitted.

7. **Calculation Methodology:** Information tracked.

8. **Scope:** Indicator is aggregated.

9. **Caveats:** No weaknesses; indicator is not a surrogate; the source of the date does not have a bias; there is not a caveat.

10.   **Responsible Person:** Insurance and Securities Section Chief

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

Program: **CIVIL – PUBLIC PROTECTION**

Objective: **I.7**

Indicator Name: **Number of motions filed within 10 days following the end of each monthly billing cycle**

1. **Type and Level**: Input - General

2. **Rationale:** It is necessary to support the outcome measures**.**

3. **Use:** It will be used for internal management purposes and performance-based budgeting as an indicator of workload.

4. **Clarity:** Clearly identified

5. **Validity, Reliability and Accuracy:** No, the indicator is valid.

6. **Data Source, Collection and Reporting:** Tracking Program houses all the information that is gathered monthly.

7. **Calculation Methodology:** Add up all Civil Insurance Fraud petitions filed.

8. **Scope:** Indicator is aggregated.

9. **Caveats:** No weaknesses; indicator is not a surrogate; the source of the date does not have a bias; there is not a caveat.

10. **Responsible Person:** Consumer Section Chief

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

Program: **CIVIL – PUBLIC PROTECTION**

Objective: **I.8**

Indicator Name: **Number of tobacco retail establishments in Louisiana**

1. **Type and Level**: Input - General

2. **Rationale:** It is necessary to support the outcome measures**.**

3. **Use:** It will be used for internal management purposes and performance-based budgeting as an indicator of workload.

4. **Clarity:** Clearly identified

5. **Validity, Reliability and Accuracy:** No, the indicator is valid.

6. **Data Source, Collection and Reporting:** Information shall be gathered monthly and put into the Tracking System.

7. **Calculation Methodology:** A list will be generated adding together all tobacco retail establishments in Louisiana.

8. **Scope:** Indicator is aggregated.

9. **Caveats:** No weaknesses; indicator is not a surrogate; the source of the date does not have a bias; there is not a caveat.

10.   **Responsible Person:** Tobacco Section Chief-Phone

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

Program: **CIVIL – PUBLIC PROTECTION**

Objective: **I.8**

Indicator Name: **Number of random site checks (inspections) conducted at retail tobacco outlets each quarter**

Indicator LaPAS PI Code: 10450

1. **Type and Level**: Input - General

2. **Rationale:** It is necessary to track to support the outcome measures**.**

3. **Use:** It will be used for internal management purposes and performance-based budgeting as an indicator of workload.

4. **Clarity:** Clearly identified

5. **Validity, Reliability and Accuracy:** No, the indicator is valid.

6. **Data Source, Collection and Reporting:** Information shall be gathered monthly and entered into the Tracking System Database.

7. **Calculation Methodology:** A report will be generated monthly listing all inspections

8. **Scope:** Indicator is aggregated.

9. **Caveats:** No weaknesses; indicator is not a surrogate; the source of the date does not have a bias; there is not a caveat.

10. **Responsible Person:** Tobacco Section Chief

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

Program: CIVIL – PUBLIC PROTECTION

Objective: I.8

Indicator Name: Number of inspections finding a violation

Indicator LaPAS PI Code: 22198

1. **Type and Level**: Output - General

2. **Rationale:** It is necessary to support the outcome measures.

3. **Use:** It will be used for internal management purposes and performance-based budgeting as an indicator of workload.

4. **Clarity:** Clearly identified

5. **Validity, Reliability and Accuracy:** No, the indicator is valid.

6. **Data Source, Collection and Reporting:** Information shall be gathered monthly and entered into the Tracking System Database.

7. **Calculation Methodology:** A report will be generated monthly listing all inspections and inspections finding a violation.

8. **Scope:** Indicator is aggregated.

9. **Caveats:** No weaknesses; indicator is not a surrogate; the source of the date does not have a bias; there is not a caveat.

10. **Responsible Person:** Tobacco Section Chief
Phone () 326-6472
)   326-6099

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

Program: **CIVIL – PUBLIC PROTECTION**

Objective: **I.8**

Indicator Name: **Number of re-inspections within 6 months of the original inspection when a violation has occurred**

1. **Type and Level**: Quality - Supporting

2. **Rationale:** It is necessary to support the outcome measures**.**

3. **Use:** It will be used for internal management purposes and performance-based budgeting as an indicator of workload.

4. **Clarity:** Clearly identified

5. **Validity, Reliability and Accuracy:** No, the indicator is valid.

6. **Data Source, Collection and Reporting:** Information shall be gathered monthly and entered into the Tracking System Database.

7. **Calculation Methodology:** A report will be generated monthly listing inspections finding a violation and the date the violation was corrected.

8. **Scope:** Indicator is aggregated.

9. **Caveats:** No weaknesses; indicator is not a surrogate; the source of the date does not have a bias; there is not a caveat.

10. **Responsible Person:** Tobacco Section Chief

)   326-6099

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

Program: **CIVIL – PUBLIC PROTECTION**

Objective: **I.8**

Indicator Name: **Percentage of re-inspections within 6 months of original inspection finding a violation**

Indicator LaPAS PI Code: 21838

1. **Type and Level**: Quality - Supporting

2. **Rationale:** It is necessary to support the outcome measures**.**

3. **Use:** It will be used for internal management purposes and performance-based budgeting as an indicator of workload.

4. **Clarity:** Clearly identified

5. **Validity, Reliability and Accuracy:** No, the indicator is valid.

6. **Data Source, Collection and Reporting:** Information shall be gathered monthly and entered into the Tracking System Database.

7. **Calculation Methodology:** A report will be generated monthly listing inspections finding a violation and the date the violation was corrected.

8. **Scope:** Indicator is aggregated.

9. **Caveats:** No weaknesses; indicator is not a surrogate; the source of the date does not have a bias; there is not a caveat.

10. **Responsible Person:** Tobacco Section Chief

)   326-6099

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

Program:	**CIVIL – PUBLIC PROTECTION**
Objective:	**I.8**
Indicator Name:	**Number of violation notices sent within 15 days of an inspection finding a violation**

1. **Type and Level**: Outcome - Key

2. **Rationale:** It is necessary to track key indicators**.**

3. **Use:** It will be used for internal management purposes and performance-based budgeting as an indicator of workload.

4. **Clarity:** Clearly identified

5. **Validity, Reliability and Accuracy:** No, the indicator is valid.

6. **Data Source, Collection and Reporting:** Information shall be gathered monthly and entered into the Tracking System Database.

7. **Calculation Methodology:** A report will be maintained listing all violation notices sent out, the date they were sent out, and the date of the inspection that found the violation

8. **Scope:** Indicator is aggregated.

9. **Caveats:** No weaknesses; indicator is not a surrogate; the source of the date does not have a bias; there is not a caveat.

10. **Responsible Person:** Tobacco Section Chief

)   326-6099

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

Program: CIVIL – PUBLIC PROTECTION

Objective: I.8

Indicator Name: Percentage of violation notices sent within 15 days of an inspection finding a violation

Indicator LaPAS PI Code: 21837

1. **Type and Level**: Outcome - Key

2. **Rationale:** It is necessary to track key indicators.

3. **Use:** It will be used for internal management purposes and performance-based budgeting as an indicator of workload.

4. **Clarity:** Clearly identified

5. **Validity, Reliability and Accuracy:** No, the indicator is valid.

6. **Data Source, Collection and Reporting:** Information shall be gathered monthly and entered into the Tracking System Database.

7. **Calculation Methodology:** The number of violation notices sent within 15 days of an inspection finding a violation divided by the total number of violation notices sent.

8. **Scope:** Indicator is aggregated.

9. **Caveats:** No weaknesses; indicator is not a surrogate; the source of the date does not have a bias; there is not a caveat.

10. **Responsible Person:** Tobacco Section Chief

)   326-6099

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

Program: **CIVIL – PUBLIC PROTECTION**

Objective: **I.9**

Indicator Name: **Number of Tobacco presentations solicited and/or performed by the DOJ**

Indicator LaPAS PI Code: 21839

1. **Type and Level**: Outcome - Supporting

2. **Rationale:** It is necessary to track supporting indicators**.**

3. **Use:** It will be used for internal management purposes and performance-based budgeting as an indicator of workload.

4. **Clarity:** Clearly identified

5. **Validity, Reliability and Accuracy:** No, the indicator is valid.

6. **Data Source, Collection and Reporting:** A report will be maintained listing all presentations and sorted monthly.

7. **Calculation Methodology:** Add together all presentations made during the fiscal year.

8. **Scope:** Indicator is aggregated.

9. **Caveats:** No weaknesses; indicator is not a surrogate; the source of the date does not have a bias; there is not a caveat.

10. **Responsible Person:** Tobacco Section Chief

)   326-6099

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

Program: **CIVIL – PUBLIC PROTECTION**

Objective: **I.10.a**

Indicator Name: **Number of fair housing complaints received**

1. **Type and Level**: Input - General

2. **Rationale:** It is necessary to support the outcome measures**.**

3. **Use:** It will be used for internal management purposes and performance-based budgeting as an indicator of workload.

4. **Clarity:** Clearly identified

5. **Validity, Reliability and Accuracy:** No, the indicator is valid.

6. **Data Source, Collection and Reporting:** Information shall be gathered monthly. An Internal Tracking Database is maintained and is currently being updated.

7. **Calculation Methodology:** Add together all fair housing complaints received.

8. **Scope:** Indicator is aggregated.

9. **Caveats:** No weaknesses; indicator is not a surrogate; the source of the date does not have a bias; there is not a caveat.

10. **Responsible Person:** Equal Opportunity – Intake Specialist

)

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

Program: **CIVIL – PUBLIC PROTECTION**

Objective: **I.10.a**

Indicator Name: **Number of cases processed and notification letters sent within 5 days of completion of inquiry**

1. **Type and Level**: Output - General

2. **Rationale:** It is necessary to support the outcome measures**.**

3. **Use:** It will be used for internal management purposes and performance-based budgeting as an indicator of workload.

4. **Clarity:** Clearly identified

5. **Validity, Reliability and Accuracy:** No, the indicator is valid.

6. **Data Source, Collection and Reporting:** Information shall be gathered monthly. An Internal Tracking Database is maintained and is currently being updated.

7. **Calculation Methodology:** Add together all cases processed and notification letters sent within 5 days of completion of inquiry.

8. **Scope:** Indicator is aggregated.

9. **Caveats:** No weaknesses; indicator is not a surrogate; the source of the date does not have a bias; there is not a caveat.

10. **Responsible Person:** Equal Opportunity Section Chief

)

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

Program: **CIVIL – PUBLIC PROTECTION**

Objective: **I.10.a**

Indicator Name: **Number of investigations completed 100 days or 100-day letters sent to all parties within reason for delay noted in HEMS**

1. **Type and Level**: Output - General

2. **Rationale:** It is necessary to support the outcome measures**.**

3. **Use:** It will be used for internal management purposes and performance-based budgeting as an indicator of workload.

4. **Clarity:** Clearly identified

5. **Validity, Reliability and Accuracy:** No, the indicator is valid.

6. **Data Source, Collection and Reporting:** Information shall be gathered monthly. An Internal Tracking Database is maintained and is currently being updated.

7. **Calculation Methodology:** Add together all investigations completed.

8. **Scope:** Indicator is aggregated.

9. **Caveats:** No weaknesses; indicator is not a surrogate; the source of the date does not have a bias; there is not a caveat.

10. **Responsible Person:** Equal Opportunity – Intake Specialist

)

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

Program: CIVIL

Objective: I.10.a

Indicator Name: **Number of cases of cause and no cause cases completed within 100 days or 100-day letters sent to all parties with reason for delay noted in HEMS**

1. **Type and Level**: Output - General

2. **Rationale:** It is necessary to track key indicators**.**

3. **Use:** It will be used for internal management purposes and performance-based budgeting as an indicator of workload.

4. **Clarity:** Clearly identified

5. **Validity, Reliability and Accuracy:** No, the indicator is valid.

6. **Data Source, Collection and Reporting:** Information shall be gathered monthly. An Internal Tracking Database is maintained and is currently being updated.

7. **Calculation Methodology:** Add together number of cases of cause and no cause cases completed.

8. **Scope:** Indicator is aggregated.

9. **Caveats:** No weaknesses; indicator is not a surrogate; the source of the date does not have a bias; there is not a caveat.

10. **Responsible Person:** Equal Opportunity – Intake Specialist

)

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

Program: **CIVIL – PUBLIC PROTECTION**

Objective: **I.10.a**

Indicator Name: **Number of final investigative reports prepared**

1. **Type and Level**: Output - General

2. **Rationale:** It is necessary to support the input measures**.**

3. **Use:** It will be used for internal management purposes and performance-based budgeting as an indicator of workload.

4. **Clarity:** Clearly identified

5. **Validity, Reliability and Accuracy:** No, the indicator is valid.

6. **Data Source, Collection and Reporting:** Information shall be gathered monthly. An Internal Tracking Database is maintained and is currently being updated.

7. **Calculation Methodology:** Add together all final investigative reports prepared.

8. **Scope:** Indicator is aggregated.

9. **Caveats:** No weaknesses; indicator is not a surrogate; the source of the date does not have a bias; there is not a caveat.

10. **Responsible Person:** Consumer Section Chief

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

Program: **CIVIL – PUBLIC PROTECTION**

Objective: **I.10.a**

Indicator Name: **Number of suits filed within 60 days of a cause case closure**
                              date

1. **Type and Level**: Output - General

2. **Rationale:** It is necessary to support the input measures**.**

3. **Use:** It will be used for internal management purposes and performance-based budgeting as an indicator of workload.

4. **Clarity:** Clearly identified

5. **Validity, Reliability and Accuracy:** No, the indicator is valid.

6. **Data Source, Collection and Reporting:** Information shall be gathered monthly. An Internal Tracking Database is maintained and is currently being updated.

7. **Calculation Methodology:** Add together all suits filed within 60 days of a cause case closure date.

8. **Scope:** Indicator is aggregated.

9. **Caveats:** No weaknesses; indicator is not a surrogate; the source of the date does not have a bias; there is not a caveat.

10. **Responsible Person:** Consumer Section Chief

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

Program: **CIVIL – PUBLIC PROTECTION**

Objective: **I.10.a**

Indicator Name: **Percentage of cases closed within HUD performance guidelines**

1. **Type and Level**: Outcome - Key

2. **Rationale:** It is necessary to support the output measures**.**

3. **Use:** It will be used for internal management purposes and performance-based budgeting as an indicator of workload.

4. **Clarity:** Clearly identified

5. **Validity, Reliability and Accuracy:** No, the indicator is valid.

6. **Data Source, Collection and Reporting:** Information shall be gathered monthly. An Internal Tracking Database is maintained and is currently being updated.

7. **Calculation Methodology:** Total number of cases divided by closed cases

8. **Scope:** Indicator is aggregated.

9. **Caveats:** No weaknesses; indicator is not a surrogate; the source of the date does not have a bias; there is not a caveat.

10.   **Responsible Person:** Consumer Section Chief

)

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

Program: **CIVIL – PUBLIC PROTECTION**

Objective: **I.10.b**

Indicator Name: **Number of fair housing complaints received through HUD intake**

1. **Type and Level**: Input - General

2. **Rationale:** It is necessary to support the output measures**.**

3. **Use:** It will be used for internal management purposes and performance-based budgeting as an indicator of workload.

4. **Clarity:** Clearly identified

5. **Validity, Reliability and Accuracy:** No, the indicator is valid.

6. **Data Source, Collection and Reporting:** Information shall be gathered monthly. An Internal Tracking Database is maintained and is currently being updated.

7. **Calculation Methodology:** Add all fair housing complaints received through HUD intake.

8. **Scope:** Indicator is aggregated.

9. **Caveats:** No weaknesses; indicator is not a surrogate; the source of the date does not have a bias; there is not a caveat.

10. **Responsible Person:** Consumer Section Chief

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

Program: **CIVIL – PUBLIC PROTECTION**

Objective: **I.10.b**

Indicator Name: **Number of fair housing complaints received through LADOJ**

                        intake

1. **Type and Level**: Input - General

2. **Rationale:** It is necessary to support the output measures**.**

3. **Use:** It will be used for internal management purposes and performance-based budgeting as an indicator of workload.

4. **Clarity:** Clearly identified

5. **Validity, Reliability and Accuracy:** No, the indicator is valid.

6. **Data Source, Collection and Reporting:** Information shall be gathered monthly. An Internal Tracking Database is maintained and is currently being updated.

7. **Calculation Methodology:** Add the number of fair housing complaints received through LADOJ intake.

8. **Scope:** Indicator is aggregated.

9. **Caveats:** No weaknesses; indicator is not a surrogate; the source of the date does not have a bias; there is not a caveat.

10. **Responsible Person:** Consumer Section Chief

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

Program:	**CIVIL – PUBLIC PROTECTION**
Objective:	**I.10.b**
Indicator Name:	**Number of cases closed administratively**

1. **Type and Level**: Output - General

2. **Rationale:** It is necessary to support the output measures**.**

3. **Use:** It will be used for internal management purposes and performance-based budgeting as an indicator of workload.

4. **Clarity:** Clearly identified

5. **Validity, Reliability and Accuracy:** No, the indicator is valid.

6. **Data Source, Collection and Reporting:** Information shall be gathered monthly. An Internal Tracking Database is maintained and is currently being updated.

7. **Calculation Methodology:** Add all cases closed administratively.

8. **Scope:** Indicator is aggregated.

9. **Caveats:** No weaknesses; indicator is not a surrogate; the source of the date does not have a bias; there is not a caveat.

10. **Responsible Person:** Consumer Section Chief

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

Program: **CIVIL – PUBLIC PROTECTION**

Objective: **I.10.b**

Indicator Name: **Number of cases closed by conciliation**

1. **Type and Level**: Output - General

2. **Rationale:** It is necessary to support the output measures**.**

3. **Use:** It will be used for internal management purposes and performance-based budgeting as an indicator of workload.

4. **Clarity:** Clearly identified

5. **Validity, Reliability and Accuracy:** No, the indicator is valid.

6. **Data Source, Collection and Reporting:** Information shall be gathered monthly. An Internal Tracking Database is maintained and is currently being updated.

7. **Calculation Methodology:** Add together all cases closed by conciliation.

8. **Scope:** Indicator is aggregated.

9. **Caveats:** No weaknesses; indicator is not a surrogate; the source of the date does not have a bias; there is not a caveat.

10. **Responsible Person:** Consumer Section Chief

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

Program:	**CIVIL – PUBLIC PROTECTION**
Objective:	**I.10.b**
Indicator Name:	**Number of cases closed in which cause or no cause**

1. **Type and Level**: Output - General

2. **Rationale:** It is necessary to support the output measures**.**

3. **Use:** It will be used for internal management purposes and performance-based budgeting as an indicator of workload.

4. **Clarity:** Clearly identified

5. **Validity, Reliability and Accuracy:** No, the indicator is valid.

6. **Data Source, Collection and Reporting:** Information shall be gathered monthly. An Internal Tracking Database is maintained and is currently being updated.

7. **Calculation Methodology:** Add together all the cases closed in which cause or no cause.

8. **Scope:** Indicator is aggregated.

9. **Caveats:** No weaknesses; indicator is not a surrogate; the source of the date does not have a bias; there is not a caveat.

10. **Responsible Person:** Consumer Section Chief

)

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

Program: **CIVIL – PUBLIC PROTECTION**

Objective: **I.10.b**

Indicator Name: **Number of cases open with no activity within 10 days**

1. **Type and Level**: Efficiency - Key

2. **Rationale:** It is necessary to support the output measures**.**

3. **Use:** It will be used for internal management purposes and performance-based budgeting as an indicator of workload.

4. **Clarity:** Clearly identified

5. **Validity, Reliability and Accuracy:** No, the indicator is valid.

6. **Data Source, Collection and Reporting:** Information shall be gathered monthly. An Internal Tracking Database is maintained and is currently being updated.

7. **Calculation Methodology:** Add together all the cases open with no activity within 10 days.

8. **Scope:** Indicator is aggregated.

9. **Caveats:** No weaknesses; indicator is not a surrogate; the source of the date does not have a bias; there is not a caveat.

10. **Responsible Person:** Consumer Section Chief

)

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

Program: **CIVIL – PUBLIC PROTECTION**

Objective: **I.10.b**

Indicator Name: **Percentage of cases closed within HUD performance guidelines**

1. **Type and Level**: Outcome - Key

2. **Rationale:** It is necessary to support the output measures**.**

3. **Use:** It will be used for internal management purposes and performance-based budgeting as an indicator of workload.

4. **Clarity:** Clearly identified

5. **Validity, Reliability and Accuracy:** No, the indicator is valid.

6. **Data Source, Collection and Reporting:** Information shall be gathered monthly. An Internal Tracking Database is maintained and is currently being updated.

7. **Calculation Methodology:** Total divided by closed cases

8. **Scope:** Indicator is aggregated.

9. **Caveats:** No weaknesses; indicator is not a surrogate; the source of the date does not have a bias; there is not a caveat.

10.   **Responsible Person:** Consumer Section Chief

)

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

Program: **CIVIL – PUBLIC PROTECTION**

Objective: **I.10.c**

Indicator Name: **Number of Fair Housing Trainings scheduled**

1. **Type and Level**: Output - General

2. **Rationale:** It is necessary to support the output measures**.**

3. **Use:** It will be used for internal management purposes and performance-based budgeting as an indicator of workload.

4. **Clarity:** Clearly identified

5. **Validity, Reliability and Accuracy:** No, the indicator is valid.

6. **Data Source, Collection and Reporting:** Information shall be gathered monthly. An Internal Tracking Database is maintained and is currently being updated.

7. **Calculation Methodology:** Add the number of Fair Housing Trainings scheduled.

8. **Scope:** Indicator is aggregated.

9. **Caveats:** No weaknesses; indicator is not a surrogate; the source of the date does not have a bias; there is not a caveat.

10. **Responsible Person:** Consumer Section Chief

)

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

Program: **CIVIL – PUBLIC PROTECTION**

Objective: **I.10.c**

Indicator Name: **Number of Fair Housing Webinars taken**

1. **Type and Level**: Output - General

2. **Rationale:** It is necessary to support the output measures**.**

3. **Use:** It will be used for internal management purposes and performance-based budgeting as an indicator of workload.

4. **Clarity:** Clearly identified

5. **Validity, Reliability and Accuracy:** No, the indicator is valid.

6. **Data Source, Collection and Reporting:** Information shall be gathered monthly. An Internal Tracking Database is maintained and is currently being updated.

7. **Calculation Methodology:** Add the number of Fair Housing Webinars taken.

8. **Scope:** Indicator is aggregated.

9. **Caveats:** No weaknesses; indicator is not a surrogate; the source of the date does not have a bias; there is not a caveat.

10. **Responsible Person:** Consumer Section Chief

)

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

Program: **CIVIL – PUBLIC PROTECTION**

Objective: **I.10.c**

Indicator Name: **Number of Fair Housing booklets and pamphlets printed**

1. **Type and Level**: Output - General

2. **Rationale:** It is necessary to support the output measures**.**

3. **Use:** It will be used for internal management purposes and performance-based budgeting as an indicator of workload.

4. **Clarity:** Clearly identified

5. **Validity, Reliability and Accuracy:** No, the indicator is valid.

6. **Data Source, Collection and Reporting:** Information shall be gathered monthly. An Internal Tracking Database is maintained and is currently being updated.

7. **Calculation Methodology:** Add number of Fair Housing booklets and pamphlets printed.

8. **Scope:** Indicator is aggregated.

9. **Caveats:** No weaknesses; indicator is not a surrogate; the source of the date does not have a bias; there is not a caveat.

10. **Responsible Person:** Consumer Section Chief

)

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

Program: **CIVIL – PUBLIC PROTECTION**

Objective: **I.10.c**

Indicator Name: **Number of persons attending Fair Housing Training**

1. **Type and Level**: Outcome - General

2. **Rationale:** It is necessary to support the output measures**.**

3. **Use:** It will be used for internal management purposes and performance-based budgeting as an indicator of workload.

4. **Clarity:** Clearly identified

5. **Validity, Reliability and Accuracy:** No, the indicator is valid.

6. **Data Source, Collection and Reporting:** Information shall be gathered monthly. An Internal Tracking Database is maintained and is currently being updated.

7. **Calculation Methodology:** Add number of persons attending Fair Housing Training.

8. **Scope:** Indicator is aggregated.

9. **Caveats:** No weaknesses; indicator is not a surrogate; the source of the date does not have a bias; there is not a caveat.

10. **Responsible Person:** Consumer Section Chief

)

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

Program: **CIVIL – PUBLIC PROTECTION**

Objective: **I.10.c**

Indicator Name: **Number of persons completing the Fair Housing Training Webinar**

1. **Type and Level**: Outcome - General

2. **Rationale:** It is necessary to support the output measures**.**

3. **Use:** It will be used for internal management purposes and performance-based budgeting as an indicator of workload.

4. **Clarity:** Clearly identified

5. **Validity, Reliability and Accuracy:** No, the indicator is valid.

6. **Data Source, Collection and Reporting:** Information shall be gathered monthly. An Internal Tracking Database is maintained and is currently being updated.

7. **Calculation Methodology:** Add number of persons completing the Fair Housing Training Webinar.

8. **Scope:** Indicator is aggregated.

9. **Caveats:** No weaknesses; indicator is not a surrogate; the source of the date does not have a bias; there is not a caveat.

10. **Responsible Person:** Consumer Section Chief

)

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

Program: **CIVIL – PUBLIC PROTECTION**

Objective: **I.10.c**

Indicator Name: **Number of Fair Housing booklets and pamphlets distributed**

1. **Type and Level**: Outcome - General

2. **Rationale:** It is necessary to support the output measures**.**

3. **Use:** It will be used for internal management purposes and performance-based budgeting as an indicator of workload.

4. **Clarity:** Clearly identified

5. **Validity, Reliability and Accuracy:** No, the indicator is valid.

6. **Data Source, Collection and Reporting:** Information shall be gathered monthly. An Internal Tracking Database is maintained and is currently being updated.

7. **Calculation Methodology:** Add number of Fair Housing booklets and pamphlets distributed.

8. **Scope:** Indicator is aggregated.

9. **Caveats:** No weaknesses; indicator is not a surrogate; the source of the date does not have a bias; there is not a caveat.

10. **Responsible Person:** Consumer Section Chief

)

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

Program: **CIVIL – PUBLIC PROTECTION**

Objective: **I.11**

Indicator Name: **Number of verified consumer disputes received.**

1. **Type and Level**: Input - General

2. **Rationale:** It is necessary to support the output measures**.**

3. **Use:** It will be used for internal management purposes and performance-based budgeting as an indicator of workload.

4. **Clarity:** Clearly identified

5. **Validity, Reliability and Accuracy:** No, the indicator is valid.

6. **Data Source, Collection and Reporting:** Information shall be gathered monthly. An Internal Tracking Database is maintained and is currently being updated.

7. **Calculation Methodology:** Add the number of verified consumer disputes received.

8. **Scope:** Indicator is aggregated.

9. **Caveats:** No weaknesses; indicator is not a surrogate; the source of the date does not have a bias; there is not a caveat.

10. **Responsible Person:** Consumer Section Chief
)

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

Program: **CIVIL – PUBLIC PROTECTION**

Objective: **I.11**

Indicator Name: **Number of verified consumer disputes responded to within 15 days of receipt.**

1. **Type and Level**: Output - General

2. **Rationale:** It is necessary to support the output measures**.**

3. **Use:** It will be used for internal management purposes and performance-based budgeting as an indicator of workload.

4. **Clarity:** Clearly identified

5. **Validity, Reliability and Accuracy:** No, the indicator is valid.

6. **Data Source, Collection and Reporting:** Information shall be gathered monthly. An Internal Tracking Database is maintained and is currently being updated.

7. **Calculation Methodology:** Add the number of verified consumer disputes responded to within 15 days of receipt.

8. **Scope:** Indicator is aggregated.

9. **Caveats:** No weaknesses; indicator is not a surrogate; the source of the date does not have a bias; there is not a caveat.

10. **Responsible Person:** Consumer Section Chief

)

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

Program: **CIVIL – PUBLIC PROTECTION**

Objective: **I.11**

Indicator Name: **Percentage of verified consumer disputes that are responded to within 15 days of receipt.**

1. **Type and Level**: Outcome - Key

2. **Rationale:** It is necessary to support the output measures**.**

3. **Use:** It will be used for internal management purposes and performance-based budgeting as an indicator of workload.

4. **Clarity:** Clearly identified

5. **Validity, Reliability and Accuracy:** No, the indicator is valid.

6. **Data Source, Collection and Reporting:** Information shall be gathered monthly. An Internal Tracking Database is maintained and is currently being updated.

7. **Calculation Methodology:** Total number of disputes divided by the disputes responded to

8. **Scope:** Indicator is aggregated.

9. **Caveats:** No weaknesses; indicator is not a surrogate; the source of the date does not have a bias; there is not a caveat.

10.   **Responsible Person:** Consumer Section Chief

)

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

Program: **CIVIL – PUBLIC PROTECTION**

Objective: **I.12**

Indicator Name: **Number of verified consumer complaints received.**

1. **Type and Level**: Input - General

2. **Rationale:** It is necessary to support the output measures**.**

3. **Use:** It will be used for internal management purposes and performance-based budgeting as an indicator of workload.

4. **Clarity:** Clearly identified

5. **Validity, Reliability and Accuracy:** No, the indicator is valid.

6. **Data Source, Collection and Reporting:** Information shall be gathered monthly. An Internal Tracking Database is maintained and is currently being updated.

7. **Calculation Methodology:** Add the number of verified consumer complaints received.

8. **Scope:** Indicator is aggregated.

9. **Caveats:** No weaknesses; indicator is not a surrogate; the source of the date does not have a bias; there is not a caveat.

10. **Responsible Person:** Consumer Section Chief

)

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

Program: **CIVIL – PUBLIC PROTECTION**

Objective: **I.12**

Indicator Name: **Number of verified consumer complaints closed within 90 days of receipt**

1. **Type and Level**: Output - General

2. **Rationale:** It is necessary to support the output measures**.**

3. **Use:** It will be used for internal management purposes and performance-based budgeting as an indicator of workload.

4. **Clarity:** Clearly identified

5. **Validity, Reliability and Accuracy:** No, the indicator is valid.

6. **Data Source, Collection and Reporting:** Information shall be gathered monthly. An Internal Tracking Database is maintained and is currently being updated.

7. **Calculation Methodology:** Add the number of consumer complaints closed within 90 days of receipt.

8. **Scope:** Indicator is aggregated.

9. **Caveats:** No weaknesses; indicator is not a surrogate; the source of the date does not have a bias; there is not a caveat.

10. **Responsible Person:** Consumer Section Chief

)

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

Program:	**CIVIL – PUBLIC PROTECTION**
Objective:	**I.12**
Indicator Name:	**Percentage of verified consumer complaints that are closed within 90 days of receipt.**

1. **Type and Level**: Outcome - Key

2. **Rationale:** It is necessary to support the output measures**.**

3. **Use:** It will be used for internal management purposes and performance-based budgeting as an indicator of workload.

4. **Clarity:** Clearly identified

5. **Validity, Reliability and Accuracy:** No, the indicator is valid.

6. **Data Source, Collection and Reporting:** Information shall be gathered monthly. An Internal Tracking Database is maintained and is currently being updated.

7. **Calculation Methodology:** Total number of complaints divided by the closed complaints

8. **Scope:** Indicator is aggregated.

9. **Caveats:** No weaknesses; indicator is not a surrogate; the source of the date does not have a bias; there is not a caveat.

10.   **Responsible Person:** Consumer Section Chief

)

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

Program: **CIVIL – PUBLIC PROTECTION**

Objective: **II.1**

Indicator Name: **Number of trainings requested**

1. Type and Level: Input **-** General

2. Rationale: It is necessary to track key indicators

3. Use: It will be used for internal management purposes and performance-based budgeting as an indicator of workload.

4. Clarity: Clearly identified.

5. Validity, Reliability and Accuracy: No, the indicator is valid.

6. Data Source, Collection and Reporting: Information shall be gathered manually monthly using an Excel Spreadsheet.

7. Calculation Methodology: Add up all trainings requested.

8. Scope: Indicator is aggregated.

9. Caveats: No weaknesses; indicator is not a surrogate; the source of the date does not have a bias; there is not a caveat.

10. Responsible Person: Domestic Violence and Human Trafficking Coordinator

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

Program: **CIVIL – PUBLIC PROTECTION**

Objective: **II.1**

Indicator Name: **Number of training sessions scheduled**

1. Type and Level: Output **-** General

2. Rationale: It is necessary to track key indicators

3. Use: It will be used for internal management purposes and performance-based budgeting as an indicator of workload.

4. Clarity: Clearly identified.

5. Validity, Reliability and Accuracy: No, the indicator is valid.

6. Data Source, Collection and Reporting: Information shall be gathered manually monthly using an Excel Spreadsheet.

7. Calculation Methodology: Add up all trainings scheduled.

8. Scope: Indicator is aggregated.

9. Caveats: No weaknesses; indicator is not a surrogate; the source of the date does not have a bias; there is not a caveat.

10. Responsible Person: Domestic Violence and Human Trafficking Coordinator

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

Program: **CIVIL – PUBLIC PROTECTION**

Objective: **II.1**

Indicator Name: **Number of training sessions completed**

1. Type and Level: Output **-** General

2. Rationale: It is necessary to track key indicators

3. Use: It will be used for internal management purposes and performance-based budgeting as an indicator of workload.

4. Clarity: Clearly identified.

5. Validity, Reliability and Accuracy: No, the indicator is valid.

6. Data Source, Collection and Reporting: Information shall be gathered manually monthly using an Excel Spreadsheet.

7. Calculation Methodology: Add up all training sessions completed.

8. Scope: Indicator is aggregated.

9. Caveats: No weaknesses; indicator is not a surrogate; the source of the date does not have a bias; there is not a caveat.

10. Responsible Person: Domestic Violence and Human Trafficking Coordinator

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

Program: **CIVIL – PUBLIC PROTECTION**

Objective: **II.1**

Indicator Name: **Number of law enforcement officers who received DOJ violence and abuse response in-service training.**

Indicator LaPAS PI Code: 21843

1. Type and Level: Outcome **-** Key

2. Rationale: It is necessary to track key indicators

3. Use: It will be used for internal management purposes and performance-based budgeting as an indicator of workload.

4. Clarity: Clearly identified.

5. Validity, Reliability and Accuracy: No, the indicator is valid.

6. Data Source, Collection and Reporting: Information shall be gathered manually monthly using an Excel Spreadsheet.

7. Calculation Methodology: Add up all law enforcement officers that were given a certificate for completion of an in-service training session.

8. Scope: Indicator is aggregated.

9. Caveats: No weaknesses; indicator is not a surrogate; the source of the date does not have a bias; there is not a caveat.

10. Responsible Person: Domestic Violence and Human Trafficking Coordinator

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

Program: **CIVIL – PUBLIC PROTECTION**

Objective: **II.2**

Indicator Name: **Number of trainings requested**

1. Type and Level: Input **-** Key

2. Rationale: It is necessary to track key indicators

3. Use: It will be used for internal management purposes and performance-based budgeting as an indicator of workload.

4. Clarity: Clearly identified.

5. Validity, Reliability and Accuracy: No, the indicator is valid.

6. Data Source, Collection and Reporting: Information shall be gathered manually monthly using an Excel Spreadsheet.

7. Calculation Methodology: Add up all requests for trainings.

8. Scope: Indicator is aggregated.

9. Caveats: No weaknesses; indicator is not a surrogate; the source of the date does not have a bias; there is not a caveat.

10. Responsible Person: Domestic Violence and Human Trafficking Coordinator

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

Program: **CIVIL – PUBLIC PROTECTION**

Objective: **II.2**

Indicator Name: **Number of presentations requested**

1. Type and Level: Input **-** General

2. Rationale: It is necessary to track key indicators

3. Use: It will be used for internal management purposes and performance-based budgeting as an indicator of workload.

4. Clarity: Clearly identified.

5. Validity, Reliability and Accuracy: No, the indicator is valid.

6. Data Source, Collection and Reporting: Information shall be gathered manually monthly using an Excel Spreadsheet.

7. Calculation Methodology: Add up all presentations given.

8. Scope: Indicator is aggregated.

9. Caveats: No weaknesses; indicator is not a surrogate; the source of the date does not have a bias; there is not a caveat.

10. Responsible Person: Domestic Violence and Human Trafficking Coordinator

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

Program: **CIVIL – PUBLIC PROTECTION**

Objective: **II.2**

Indicator Name: **Number of trainings sessions scheduled**

1. Type and Level: Output **-** General

2. Rationale: It is necessary to track key indicators

3. Use: It will be used for internal management purposes and performance-based budgeting as an indicator of workload.

4. Clarity: Clearly identified.

5. Validity, Reliability and Accuracy: No, the indicator is valid.

6. Data Source, Collection and Reporting: Information shall be gathered manually monthly using an Excel Spreadsheet.

7. Calculation Methodology: Add up all training sessions scheduled.

8. Scope: Indicator is aggregated.

9. Caveats: No weaknesses; indicator is not a surrogate; the source of the date does not have a bias; there is not a caveat.

10. Responsible Person: Domestic Violence and Human Trafficking Coordinator

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

Program: **CIVIL – PUBLIC PROTECTION**

Objective: **II.2**

Indicator Name: **Number of training sessions completed**

1. Type and Level: Output **-** Key

2. Rationale: It is necessary to track key indicators

3. Use: It will be used for internal management purposes and performance-based budgeting as an indicator of workload.

4. Clarity: Clearly identified.

5. Validity, Reliability and Accuracy: No, the indicator is valid.

6. Data Source, Collection and Reporting: Information shall be gathered manually monthly using an Excel Spreadsheet.

7. Calculation Methodology: Add up all training sessions completed.

8. Scope: Indicator is aggregated.

9. Caveats: No weaknesses; indicator is not a surrogate; the source of the date does not have a bias; there is not a caveat.

10. Responsible Person: Domestic Violence and Human Trafficking Coordinator

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

Program: **CIVIL – PUBLIC PROTECTION**

Objective: **II.2**

Indicator Name: **Number of people that received DOJ violence, abuse, and sexual harassment awareness training**

1. Type and Level: Outcome **-** Key

2. Rationale: It is necessary to track key indicators

3. Use: It will be used for internal management purposes and performance-based budgeting as an indicator of workload.

4. Clarity: Clearly identified.

5. Validity, Reliability and Accuracy: No, the indicator is valid.

6. Data Source, Collection and Reporting: Information shall be gathered manually monthly using an Excel Spreadsheet.

7. Calculation Methodology: Add up all people that received DOJ violence, abuse, and sexual harassment awareness training.

8. Scope: Indicator is aggregated.

9. Caveats: No weaknesses; indicator is not a surrogate; the source of the date does not have a bias; there is not a caveat.

10. Responsible Person: Domestic Violence and Human Trafficking Coordinator

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

Program: **CIVIL – PUBLIC PROTECTION**

Objective: **II.2**

Indicator Name: **Percentage of people that received DOJ violence, abuse, and sexual harassment awareness training**

1. Type and Level: Outcome **-** Key

2. Rationale: It is necessary to track key indicators

3. Use: It will be used for internal management purposes and performance-based budgeting as an indicator of workload.

4. Clarity: Clearly identified.

5. Validity, Reliability and Accuracy: No, the indicator is valid.

6. Data Source, Collection and Reporting: Information shall be gathered manually monthly using an Excel Spreadsheet.

7. Calculation Methodology: MATH

8. Scope: Indicator is aggregated.

9. Caveats: No weaknesses; indicator is not a surrogate; the source of the date does not have a bias; there is not a caveat.

10. Responsible Person: Domestic Violence and Human Trafficking Coordinator

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

Program: **CIVIL – PUBLICPROTECTION**

Objective: **II.3**

Indicator Name: **Number of trainings requested**

1. Type and Level: Input **-** General

2. Rationale: It is necessary to track supporting indicators

3. Use: It will be used for internal management purposes and performance-based budgeting as an indicator of workload.

4. Clarity: Clearly identified.

5. Validity, Reliability and Accuracy: No, the indicator is valid.

6. Data Source, Collection and Reporting: Information shall be gathered manually monthly using an Excel Spreadsheet.

7. Calculation Methodology: Total number of trainings requested.

8. Scope: Indicator is aggregated.

9. Caveats: No weaknesses; indicator is not a surrogate; the source of the date does not have a bias; there is not a caveat.

10. Responsible Person: Domestic Violence and Human Trafficking Coordinator

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

Program: **CIVIL – PUBLIC PROTECTION**

Objective: **II.3**

Indicator Name: **Number of curriculum developed**

1. Type and Level: Output **-** Supporting

2. Rationale: It is necessary to track supporting indicators

3. Use: It will be used for internal management purposes and performance-based budgeting as an indicator of workload.

4. Clarity: Clearly identified.

5. Validity, Reliability and Accuracy: No, the indicator is valid.

6. Data Source, Collection and Reporting: Information shall be gathered manually monthly using an Excel Spreadsheet.

7. Calculation Methodology: Add up all curriculums developed for trainings.

8. Scope: Indicator is aggregated.

9. Caveats: No weaknesses; indicator is not a surrogate; the source of the date does not have a bias; there is not a caveat.

10. Responsible Person: Domestic Violence and Human Trafficking Coordinator

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

Program: **CIVIL – PUBLIC PROTECTION**

Objective: **II.3**

Indicator Name: **Number of requests for in-service trainings received**

1. Type and Level: Output **-** General

2. Rationale: It is necessary to support the outcome measures.

3. Use: It will be used for internal management purposes and performance-based budgeting as an indicator of workload.

4. Clarity: Clearly identified.

5. Validity, Reliability and Accuracy: No, the indicator is valid.

6. Data Source, Collection and Reporting: Information shall be gathered manually monthly using an Excel Spreadsheet.

7. Calculation Methodology: Add up all request received for in-service training.

8. Scope: Indicator is aggregated.

9. Caveats: No weaknesses; indicator is not a surrogate; the source of the date does not have a bias; there is not a caveat.

10. Responsible Person: Domestic Violence and Human Trafficking Coordinator

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

Program: **CIVIL – PUBLIC PROTECTION**

Objective: **II.3**

Indicator Name: **Number of in-service trainings performed to law enforcement**

1. Type and Level: Outcome **-** Key

2. Rationale: It is necessary to track key indicators

3. Use: It will be used for internal management purposes and performance-based budgeting as an indicator of workload.

4. Clarity: Clearly identified.

5. Validity, Reliability and Accuracy: No, the indicator is valid.

6. Data Source, Collection and Reporting: Information shall be gathered manually monthly using an Excel Spreadsheet.

7. Calculation Methodology: Add up the all law enforcement officers that received certificates of completion for training.

8. Scope: Indicator is aggregated.

9. Caveats: No weaknesses; indicator is not a surrogate; the source of the date does not have a bias; there is not a caveat.

10. Responsible Person: Domestic Violence and Human Trafficking Coordinator

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

Program: **CIVIL – PUBLIC PROTECTION**

Objective: **II.3**

Indicator Name: **Number of in-service trainings performed to community agencies**

1. Type and Level: Outcome **-** Key

2. Rationale: It is necessary to track key indicators

3. Use: It will be used for internal management purposes and performance-based budgeting as an indicator of workload.

4. Clarity: Clearly identified.

5. Validity, Reliability and Accuracy: No, the indicator is valid.

6. Data Source, Collection and Reporting: Information shall be gathered manually monthly using an Excel Spreadsheet.

7. Calculation Methodology: Add up the all in-service trainings given to community agencies.

8. Scope: Indicator is aggregated.

9. Caveats: No weaknesses; indicator is not a surrogate; the source of the date does not have a bias; there is not a caveat.

10. Responsible Person: Domestic Violence and Human Trafficking Coordinator

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

Program: CIVIL – PUBLIC PROTECTION

Objective: III.1

Indicator Name: Percentage of billing invoices submitted within 10 days following the end of each monthly billing cycle

1. **Type and Level**: Output - General

2. **Rationale:** It is necessary to support the outcome measures.

3. **Use:** It will be used for internal management purposes and performance-based budgeting as an indicator of workload.

4. **Clarity:** Clearly identified

5. **Validity, Reliability and Accuracy:** No, the indicator is valid.

6. **Data Source, Collection and Reporting:** Tracking Program houses all the information that is gathered monthly.

7. **Calculation Methodology:** Summarize the number of complaints that are responded to with an informal resolution within 60 day of receipt.

8. **Scope:** Indicator is aggregated.

9. **Caveats:** No weaknesses; indicator is not a surrogate; the source of the date does not have a bias; there is not a caveat.

10. **Responsible Person:** Consumer Section Chief

2024-2028 STRATEGIC PLAN
SUPPORTING INTERNAL/EXTERNAL DOCUMENTATION

INTERNAL

Customers, expectation groups and stakeholders

The Criminal Program has many customers, expectation groups, and stakeholders identified as follows: the citizens of the state, the Legislature, District Attorneys, local and other state law enforcement agencies, the courts, Attorney's General Offices in other states, other agencies of state government, various agencies of the Federal government, Federal law enforcement, area schools and universities, various banking and financial groups and organizations and other divisions and programs of the Department of Justice.

Where is the organization now?

The Criminal Division includes the General Prosecution Section, Appeals and Special Services Section, Public Corruption Unit, Insurance Fraud Unit, Sexual Predator Apprehension Team, and the Medicaid Fraud Control Unit. The Investigation Division has been restructured to consist of the Trial/Special Assignments Section, Investigations Section, Fugitive Apprehension Unit, and High Technology Crime Unit.

Further, the present administration has begun a very pro-active public campaign against fraud and other corruptive practices in state government. Several high profile cases have already been prosecuted and our office has been instrumental in several ongoing investigations regarding these issues which will result in further referrals for prosecution.

What are the program's strengths and weaknesses?

The prosecutor group's strengths are displayed in the assemblage of attorneys and investigators which are comprised of hard working, conscientious employees with expertise and widely diversified professional skills.

The greatest strength of the program is the present staff of prosecutors who have collective experience of over 150 years in the practice of law.

Another area of strength is the type of professional personalities within the prosecution team. Good work ethic, experience in criminal litigation, common sense, and the ability to grasp the local "lay of the land", are all extremely important skills that our attorneys possess.

The programs primary weakness is the fact that we have only 15 full time prosecutors who have to prosecute in 64 parishes' state wide. The variety of venues and the vastness

of the geographic area of coverage create enormous logistic, procedural, political and practical challenges to the limited number of prosecutors in the office at this time.

In addition, the types of cases recused to our office include, for the most part, high profile and sometimes politically charged issues which must go to trial. The rate of actual trials per case load is unusually greater than with normal prosecutorial offices.

We also anticipate that due to the present attorney general's pro-active involvement with law enforcement that our case load will again double, increasing lawyer fatigue and delays in prosecution. The program suffers from a lack of qualified paralegal positions.

Training has also suffered due to lack of funding, and morale had begun to decrease because of no opportunity for raises.

EXTERNAL

What are the current issues that affect the organization's activities?

The present political climate presents an external force where more and more cases are being referred to the office of the Attorney General as a direct result of the very pro-active role taken by the presently elected incumbent.

Elderly abuse, consumer protection issues, and public corruption are all issues at the forefront of the attorney general's program as well as the public eye. As a result our office has been inundated with additional complaints for investigation and prosecution in these areas.

Therefore, the most significant external issue that affects the Criminal Program is the uncertainty of funding on a year to year basis to account for this increase in business. It becomes a very difficult task to plan for years in advance when the funding is so tenuous and there is no mechanism in place to recoup prosecution costs. Currently we do not even have money to order transcripts from hearings that are vital to a successful prosecution. Experts are also key in many of our prosecutions. Again, experts must be paid and this is an area of concern because a prosecution should not be "hamstrung" because of an inability to hire good experts.

Finally, with the ever increasing number of computer and other high tech crimes, including identity theft and internet fraud, the division, which also houses the foremost state computer forensic unit, is becoming more and more burdened with specialty prosecutions of this nature, since we are the primary investigatory and only state wide prosecution unit in this area.

STRATEGY ANALYSIS CHECKLIST

Program: CRIMINAL

Objective I.1:   Through the Criminal Division, to handle in-house 95% of all cases received through recusal.

Strategy I.1.a: The Director shall review all cases received to determine if recusal is needed.

Analysis
   _____ Cost/benefit analysis conducted
   __X__ Other analysis used
   _____ Impact on other strategies considered

Authorization
   __X__ Authorization exists
   _____ Authorization needed

Organization Capacity
   _____ Needed structural or procedural changes identified
   __X__ Resource needs identified

Time Frame
   _____ Already ongoing
   _____ New, startup date estimated
   _____ Lifetime of strategy identified

Fiscal Impact
   __X__ Impact on operating budget
   _____ Impact on capital outlay budget
   _____ Means of finance identified

STRATEGY ANALYSIS CHECKLIST

Program: CRIMINAL

Objective I.2:   The Insurance Fraud Support Unit of the Criminal Division will provide legal support to law enforcement agencies investigating criminal insurance fraud referrals by responding to requests for legal consultation within two working days. Furthermore the Insurance Fraud Support Unit will attend the Louisiana State Police Insurance Fraud Unit monthly intelligence sharing meeting 90% of the time by June 30, 2028.

Strategy I.2.a: Use task management system to log and track requests for legal assistance.

Analysis
　　　_____ Cost/benefit analysis conducted
　　　__X__ Other analysis used
　　　_____ Impact on other strategies considered

Authorization
　　　__X__ Authorization exists
　　　_____ Authorization needed

Organization Capacity
　　　_____ Needed structural or procedural changes identified
　　　__X__ Resource needs identified

Time Frame
　　　_____ Already ongoing
　　　_____ New, startup date estimated
　　　_____ Lifetime of strategy identified

Fiscal Impact
　　　__X__ Impact on operating budget
　　　_____ Impact on capital outlay budget
　　　_____ Means of finance identified

STRATEGY ANALYSIS CHECKLIST

Program: CRIMINAL

Objective I.2:   The Insurance Fraud Support Unit of the Criminal Division will provide legal support to law enforcement agencies investigating criminal insurance fraud referrals by responding to requests for legal consultation within two working days. Furthermore the Insurance Fraud Support Unit will attend the Louisiana State Police Insurance Fraud Unit monthly intelligence sharing meeting 90% of the time by June 30, 2028.

Strategy I.2.b: Supervisor will assure attendance at all State Police Insurance Fraud meetings.

Analysis
_____ Cost/benefit analysis conducted
__X__ Other analysis used
_____ Impact on other strategies considered

Authorization
__X__ Authorization exists
_____ Authorization needed

Organization Capacity
_____ Needed structural or procedural changes identified
__X__ Resource needs identified

Time Frame
_____ Already ongoing
_____ New, startup date estimated
_____ Lifetime of strategy identified

Fiscal Impact
__X__ Impact on operating budget
_____ Impact on capital outlay budget
_____ Means of finance identified

STRATEGY ANALYSIS CHECKLIST

Program: CRIMINAL

Objective I.3:   The Medicaid Fraud Control Unit of the Criminal
                      Division will open 250 investigations of provider fraud and patient
                      abuse annually by June 30, 2028.

Strategy I.3.a: Outreach to law enforcement, healthcare providers, professional
                      organizations and community organizations to encourage the
                      reporting of provider fraud and patient abuse.

Analysis
_____ Cost/benefit analysis conducted
__X__ Other analysis used
_____ Impact on other strategies considered

Authorization
__X__ Authorization exists
_____ Authorization needed

Organization Capacity
_____ Needed structural or procedural changes identified
__X__ Resource needs identified

Time Frame
_____ Already ongoing
_____ New, startup date estimated
_____ Lifetime of strategy identified

Fiscal Impact
__X__ Impact on operating budget
_____ Impact on capital outlay budget
_____ Means of finance identified

STRATEGY ANALYSIS CHECKLIST

Program: CRIMINAL

Objective I.4:   The Medicaid Fraud Control Unit of the Criminal
                       Division will notify complainants in 90% of opened cases within 5
                       working days of complaint.

Strategy I.4.a: Section Chief shall review complainant response time of
                       investigators using the modified case tracking/time management
                       system.

Analysis
_____ Cost/benefit analysis conducted
__X__ Other analysis used
_____ Impact on other strategies considered

Authorization
__X__ Authorization exists
_____ Authorization needed

Organization Capacity
_____ Needed structural or procedural changes identified
__X__ Resource needs identified

Time Frame
_____ Already ongoing
_____ New, startup date estimated
_____ Lifetime of strategy identified

Fiscal Impact
__X__ Impact on operating budget
_____ Impact on capital outlay budget
_____ Means of finance identified

STRATEGY ANALYSIS CHECKLIST

Program: CRIMINAL

Objective I.5:   Generate 240 Internet Crimes Against Children cases by June 30, 2028.

Strategy I.5.a: Engage in at least 300 hours proactive online investigation per fiscal year.

Analysis
_____ Cost/benefit analysis conducted
__X__ Other analysis used
_____ Impact on other strategies considered

Authorization
__X__ Authorization exists
_____ Authorization needed

Organization Capacity
_____ Needed structural or procedural changes identified
__X__ Resource needs identified

Time Frame
_____ Already ongoing
_____ New, startup date estimated
_____ Lifetime of strategy identified

Fiscal Impact
__X__ Impact on operating budget
_____ Impact on capital outlay budget
_____ Means of finance identified

STRATEGY ANALYSIS CHECKLIST

Program: CRIMINAL

Objective I.6:   Complete 1,500 Forensic Lab examinations by June 30, 2028.

Strategy I.6.a: Implement and maintain evidence and task tracking system for forensic lab examinations.

Strategy I.6.b: Ensure that all examiners obtain ENCASE certification.

Analysis

   _____ Cost/benefit analysis conducted
   __X__ Other analysis used
   _____ Impact on other strategies considered

Authorization

   __X__ Authorization exists
   _____ Authorization needed

Organization Capacity

   _____ Needed structural or procedural changes identified
   __X__ Resource needs identified

Time Frame

   _____ Already ongoing
   _____ New, startup date estimated
   _____ Lifetime of strategy identified

Fiscal Impact

   __X__ Impact on operating budget
   _____ Impact on capital outlay budget
   _____ Means of finance identified

STRATEGY ANALYSIS CHECKLIST

Program: CRIMINAL

Objective I.7:   Investigate 1,000 non-ICAC CCU complaints by June 30, 2028.

Strategy I.7.a: Cyber Crime Unit supervisor shall prioritize and assign cases based on the seriousness and potential threat to the public.

Analysis
_____ Cost/benefit analysis conducted
__X__ Other analysis used
_____ Impact on other strategies considered

Authorization
__X__ Authorization exists
_____ Authorization needed

Organization Capacity
_____ Needed structural or procedural changes identified
__X__ Resource needs identified

Time Frame
_____ Already ongoing
_____ New, startup date estimated
_____ Lifetime of strategy identified

Fiscal Impact
__X__ Impact on operating budget
_____ Impact on capital outlay budget
_____ Means of finance identified

STRATEGY ANALYSIS CHECKLIST

Program: CRIMINAL

Objective I.8:   Initiate or assist in 500 investigations per fiscal year by June 30, 2028.

Strategy I.8.a: Carefully screen complaints and requests for investigation to identify potential criminal violations warranting investigation.

Strategy I.8.b: Assist in 100% of investigations in recusal cases upon request by Criminal Division.

Analysis
_____ Cost/benefit analysis conducted
__X__ Other analysis used
_____ Impact on other strategies considered

Authorization
__X__ Authorization exists
_____ Authorization needed

Organization Capacity
_____ Needed structural or procedural changes identified
__X__ Resource needs identified

Time Frame
_____ Already ongoing
_____ New, startup date estimated
_____ Lifetime of strategy identified

Fiscal Impact
__X__ Impact on operating budget
_____ Impact on capital outlay budget
_____ Means of finance identified

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

Program: **CRIMINAL**

Objective: **I.3**

Indicator Name: **Number of investigations opened**

Indicator LaPAS PI Code: **21861**

1. **Type and Level**: Efficiency - KEY

2. **Rationale:** It is necessary to track to support the outcome measures.

3. **Use:**   It will be used for internal management purposes and performance-based budgeting as an indicator of workload.

4. **Clarity:**   Clearly identified

5. **Validity, Reliability and Accuracy:**   No, the indicator is valid.

6. **Data Source, Collection and Reporting:** The MFCU case tracking database captures all performance information. All data will be reported on a monthly basis

7. **Calculation Methodology:** The number of fraud cases where case research is entered in the data base, search by date range.

8. **Scope:** Indicator is aggregated.

9. **Caveats:** No weaknesses; indicator is not a surrogate; the source of the date does not have a bias; there is not a caveat.

10. **Responsible Person:**

       Chief Investigator
       Unit Director, Medicaid Fraud Control Unit

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

Program: **CRIMINAL**

Objective: **I.1**

Indicator Name: **Number cases closed**

Indicator LaPAS PI Code: **12323**

1. **Type and Level**: Input - General

2. **Rationale:** It is necessary to track to support the outcome measures.

3. **Use:**   It will be used for internal management purposes and performance-based budgeting as an indicator of workload.

4. **Clarity:**   Clearly identified

5. **Validity, Reliability and Accuracy:**   No, the indicator is valid.

6. **Data Source, Collection and Reporting** The Criminal Case Tracking system captures all performance information related to the number of cases closed. All data will be reported on a monthly basis

7. **Calculation Methodology:** Tracking Program retrieves data by date range search of the date closed.

8. **Scope:** Indicator is aggregated.

9. **Caveats:** No weaknesses; indicator is not a surrogate; the source of the date does not have a bias; there is not a caveat.

10. **Responsible Person:**

> Executive Manager
> Criminal Division

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

Program: **CRIMINAL**

Objective: **I.1**

Indicator Name: **Number of recusals**

Indicator LaPAS PI Code: **12324**

1. **Type and Level**: Input - General

2. **Rationale:** It is necessary to track to support the outcome measures.

3. **Use:**   It will be used for internal management purposes and performance-based budgeting as an indicator of workload.

4. **Clarity:**   Clearly identified

5. **Validity, Reliability and Accuracy:**   No, the indicator is valid.

6. **Data Source, Collection and Reporting:** The Criminal Case Tracking system captures all performance information related to the number of recusals. All data will be reported on a monthly basis

7. **Calculation Methodology:** Tracking Program retrieves data by date range search of the nature field which is marked recusals.

8. **Scope:** Indicator is aggregated.

9. **Caveats:** No weaknesses; indicator is not a surrogate; the source of the date does not have a bias; there is not a caveat.

10. **Responsible Person:**

       Executive Manager
       Criminal Division

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

Program: **CRIMINAL**

Objective: **I.1**

Indicator Name: **Number of requests for assistance**

Indicator LaPAS PI Code: **12325**

1. **Type and Level**: Input - General

2. **Rationale:** It is necessary to track to support the outcome measures.

3. **Use:**   It will be used for internal management purposes and performance-based budgeting as an indicator of workload.

4. **Clarity:**   Clearly identified

5. **Validity, Reliability and Accuracy:**   No, the indicator is valid.

6. **Data Source, Collection and Reporting:** The Criminal Case Tracking system captures all performance information related to the number of requests for assistance. All data will be reported on a monthly basis

7. **Calculation Methodology:** Tracking Program retrieves data by date range search of the nature field marked request for assistance.

8. **Scope:** Indicator is aggregated.

9. **Caveats:** No weaknesses; indicator is not a surrogate; the source of the date does not have a bias; there is not a caveat.

10. **Responsible Person:**

       Executive Manager
       Criminal Division

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

Program: **CRIMINAL**

Objective: **I.1**

Indicator Name: **Number of parishes served**

Indicator LaPAS PI Code: **12328**

1. **Type and Level**: Input - General

2. **Rationale:** It is necessary to track to support the outcome measures.

3. **Use:**   It will be used for internal management purposes and performance-based budgeting as an indicator of workload.

4. **Clarity:**   Clearly identified

5. **Validity, Reliability and Accuracy:**   No, the indicator is valid.

6. **Data Source, Collection and Reporting:** The Criminal Case Tracking system captures all performance information related to the number of parishes served. All data will be reported on a monthly basis

7. **Calculation Methodology:** Tracking Program retrieves data by date range search of the parish field and open active cases.

8. **Scope:** Indicator is aggregated.

9. **Caveats:** No weaknesses; indicator is not a surrogate; the source of the date does not have a bias; there is not a caveat.

10. **Responsible Person:**

> Executive Manager
> Criminal Division

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

Program: **CRIMINAL**

Objective: **I.1**

Indicator Name: **Number of cases opened**

Indicator LaPAS PI Code: 12322

1. **Type and Level**: Input - General

2. **Rationale:** It is necessary to track to support the outcome measures.

3. **Use:** It will be used for internal management purposes and performance-based budgeting as an indicator of workload.

4. **Clarity:** Clearly identified

5. **Validity, Reliability and Accuracy:** No, the indicator is valid.

6. **Data Source, Collection and Reporting:** The Criminal Case Tracking system captures all performance information related to the number of cases opened. All data will be reported on a monthly basis

7. **Calculation Methodology:** Tracking Program retrieves data by date range search of the date opened..

8. **Scope:** Indicator is aggregated.

9. **Caveats:** No weaknesses; indicator is not a surrogate; the source of the date does not have a bias; there is not a caveat.

10. **Responsible Person:**

    Executive Manager
    Criminal Division

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

Program: **CRIMINAL**

Objective: **I.1**

Indicator Name: **Number of cases that are recused**

Indicator LaPAS PI Code: **New**

1. **Type and Level**: Efficiency - Supporting

2. **Rationale:** It is necessary to track to support the outcome measures.

3. **Use:**   It will be used for internal management purposes and performance-based budgeting as an indicator of workload.

4. **Clarity:**   Clearly identified

5. **Validity, Reliability and Accuracy:**   No, the indicator is valid.

6. **Data Source, Collection and Reporting** The Criminal Case Tracking system captures all performance information related to the number of cases that are recused. All data will be reported on a monthly basis

7. **Calculation Methodology:** Tracking Program retrieves data by date range search of the number of cases received that are recused.

8. **Scope:** Indicator is aggregated.

9. **Caveats:** No weaknesses; indicator is not a surrogate; the source of the date does not have a bias; there is not a caveat.

10. **Responsible Person:**

> Executive Manager
> Criminal Division

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

Program:	**CRIMINAL**
Objective:	**I.1**
Indicator Name:	**Percentage of cases received that are recused.**

Indicator LaPAS PI Code: **25022**

1. **Type and Level**: Outcome - Key

2. **Rationale:** It is necessary to track key indicators**.**

3. **Use:**   It will be used for internal management purposes and performance-based budgeting as an indicator of workload.

4. **Clarity:**   Clearly identified

5. **Validity, Reliability and Accuracy:**   No, the indicator is valid.

6. **Data Source, Collection and Reporting:** The Criminal Case Tracking system captures all performance information related to the percentage of cases received that are recused. All data will be reported on a monthly basis

7. **Calculation Methodology:** Tracking Program retrieves data by number of cases received handled in-house and the number of cases that are recused. The percentage is calculated from the total number of cases received and the number of cases recused.

8. **Scope:** Indicator is aggregated.

9. **Caveats:** No weaknesses; indicator is not a surrogate; the source of the date does not have a bias; there is not a caveat.

10. **Responsible Person:**

        Executive Manager
        Criminal Division

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

Program: **CRIMINAL**

Objective: **I.2**

Indicator Name: **Number of requests for legal consultation**

Indicator LaPAS PI Code: **21860**

1. **Type and Level**: Input - General

2. **Rationale:** It is necessary to track to support the outcome measures.

3. **Use:** It will be used for internal management purposes and performance-based budgeting as an indicator of workload.

4. **Clarity:** Clearly identified

5. **Validity, Reliability and Accuracy:** No, the indicator is valid.

6. **Data Source, Collection and Reporting:** The Criminal Case Tracking system captures all performance information related to the number of requests for legal consultation. All data will be reported on a monthly basis

7. **Calculation Methodology:** Tracking Program retrieves data by date range search of the nature field marked request for consultation.

8. **Scope:** Indicator is aggregated.

9. **Caveats:** No weaknesses; indicator is not a surrogate; the source of the date does not have a bias; there is not a caveat.

10. **Responsible Person:**

        Insurance Fraud Control Unit, Section Chief
        Director, Criminal Division
        Phone: 225-326-6210
        Fax: 225-326-6295

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

Program: **CRIMINAL**

Objective: **I.2**

Indicator Name: **Number of scheduled intelligence sharing meeting**

Indicator LaPAS PI Code: **22200**

1. **Type and Level**: Input - General

2. **Rationale:** It is necessary to track to support the outcome measures.

3. **Use:**   It will be used for internal management purposes and performance-based budgeting as an indicator of workload.

4. **Clarity:**   Clearly identified

5. **Validity, Reliability and Accuracy:**   No, the indicator is valid.

6. **Data Source, Collection and Reporting:** The data is collected and maintained by the Section Chief in an excel spreadsheet. All data will be reported on a monthly basis

7. **Calculation Methodology:** Hand count.

8. **Scope:** Indicator is aggregated.

9. **Caveats:** No weaknesses; indicator is not a surrogate; the source of the date does not have a bias; there is not a caveat.

10. **Responsible Person:**

        Insurance Fraud Control Unit, Section Chief
        Director, Criminal Division
        Phone: 225-326-6210
        Fax: 225-326-6295

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

Program: **CRIMINAL**

Objective: **I.2**

Indicator Name: **Number of requests for legal consultation responded to within 2 working days**

Indicator LaPAS PI Code: **21858**

1. **Type and Level**: Output - Supporting

2. **Rationale:** It is necessary to track to support the outcome measures.

3. **Use:**   It will be used for internal management purposes and performance-based budgeting as an indicator of workload.

4. **Clarity:**   Clearly identified

5. **Validity, Reliability and Accuracy:**   No, the indicator is valid.

6. **Data Source, Collection and Reporting:** The Criminal Case Tracking system captures all performance information related to the number of requests for legal consultation. All data will be reported on a monthly basis

7. **Calculation Methodology:** Tracking Program retrieves data by date range search of the nature field marked request for consultation.

8. **Scope:** Indicator is aggregated.

9. **Caveats:** No weaknesses; indicator is not a surrogate; the source of the date does not have a bias; there is not a caveat.

10. **Responsible Person:**

        Insurance Fraud Control Unit, Section Chief
        Director, Criminal Division

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

Program: **CRIMINAL**

Objective: **I.2**

Indicator Name: **Number of scheduled intelligence sharing meeting attended by DOJ**

Indicator LaPAS PI Code: **22201**

1. **Type and Level**: Output - General

2. **Rationale:** It is necessary to track to support the outcome measures.

3. **Use:**   It will be used for internal management purposes and performance-based budgeting as an indicator of workload.

4. **Clarity:**   Clearly identified

5. **Validity, Reliability and Accuracy:**   No, the indicator is valid.

6. **Data Source, Collection and Reporting:** The data is collected and maintained by the Section Chief in the calendar program. All data will be reported on a monthly basis

7. **Calculation Methodology:** Hand count.

8. **Scope:** Indicator is aggregated.

9. **Caveats:** No weaknesses; indicator is not a surrogate; the source of the date does not have a bias; there is not a caveat.

10. **Responsible Person:**

        Insurance Fraud Control Unit, Section Chief
        Director, Criminal Division

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

Program: **CRIMINAL**

Objective: **I.2**

Indicator Name: **Percent of requests for legal consultation responded to within 2 working days**

Indicator LaPAS PI Code: **21858**

1. **Type and Level**: Outcome - Supporting

2. **Rationale:** It is necessary to track key indicators**.**

3. **Use:**   It will be used for internal management purposes and performance-based budgeting as an indicator of workload.

4. **Clarity:**   Clearly identified

5. **Validity, Reliability and Accuracy:**   No, the indicator is valid.

6. **Data Source, Collection and Reporting:** The Criminal Case Tracking system captures all performance information related to the number of requests for legal consultation. All data will be reported on a monthly basis

7. **Calculation Methodology:** Tracking Program retrieves data by date range search of the nature field marked request for consultation and calculates the percentage responded to within 2 working days.

8. **Scope:** Indicator is aggregated.

9. **Caveats:** No weaknesses; indicator is not a surrogate; the source of the date does not have a bias; there is not a caveat.

10. **Responsible Person:**

> Insurance Fraud Control Unit, Section Chief
> Director, Criminal Division

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

Program: **CRIMINAL**

Objective: **I.2**

Indicator Name: **Percent of scheduled intelligence sharing meeting attended by DOJ**

Indicator LaPAS PI Code: **21859**

1. **Type and Level**: Outcome - Supporting

2. **Rationale:** It is necessary to track key indicators**.**

3. **Use:**   It will be used for internal management purposes and performance-based budgeting as an indicator of workload.

4. **Clarity:**   Clearly identified

5. **Validity, Reliability and Accuracy:**   No, the indicator is valid.

6. **Data Source, Collection and Reporting:** The data is collected and maintained by the Section Chief in the calendar program. All data will be reported on a monthly basis

7. **Calculation Methodology:** Hand count and use of calculator. Data system being developed to automate this indicator.

8. **Scope:** Indicator is aggregated.

9. **Caveats:** No weaknesses; indicator is not a surrogate; the source of the date does not have a bias; there is not a caveat.

10. **Responsible Person:**

       Insurance Fraud Control Unit, Section Chief
       Director, Criminal Division

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

Program: **CRIMINAL**

Objective: **I.3**

Indicator Name: **Dollar amount of civil monetary penalty collected**

Indicator LaPAS PI Code: **12352**

1. **Type and Level**: Efficiency - General

2. **Rationale:** It is necessary to track to support the outcome measures.

3. **Use:**   It will be used for internal management purposes and performance-based budgeting as an indicator of workload.

4. **Clarity:**   Clearly identified

5. **Validity, Reliability and Accuracy:**   No, the indicator is valid.

6. **Data Source, Collection and Reporting:** The MFCU case tracking database captures all performance information. All data will be reported on a monthly basis

7. **Calculation Methodology:** The dollar amount of civil monetary penalty collected is entered in the data base for every case collected, search by date range.

8. **Scope:** Indicator is aggregated.

9. **Caveats:** No weaknesses; indicator is not a surrogate; the source of the date does not have a bias; there is not a caveat.

10. **Responsible Person:**

       Chief Investigator
       Unit Director, Medicaid Fraud Control Unit

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

Program: **CRIMINAL**

Objective: **I.3**

Indicator Name: **Dollar amount of civil monetary penalties ordered**

Indicator LaPAS PI Code: **12363**

1. **Type and Level**: Output - General

2. **Rationale:** It is necessary to track to support the outcome measures.

3. **Use:**   It will be used for internal management purposes and performance-based budgeting as an indicator of workload.

4. **Clarity:**   Clearly identified

5. **Validity, Reliability and Accuracy:**   No, the indicator is valid.

6. **Data Source, Collection and Reporting:** The MFCU case tracking database captures all performance information. All data will be reported on a monthly basis

7. **Calculation Methodology:** The dollar amount of civil monetary penalty ordered is entered in the data base for every case, search by date range.

8. **Scope:** Indicator is aggregated.

9. **Caveats:** No weaknesses; indicator is not a surrogate; the source of the date does not have a bias; there is not a caveat.

10. **Responsible Person:**

       Chief Investigator
       Unit Director, Medicaid Fraud Control Unit

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

Program: **CRIMINAL**

Objective: **I.3**

Indicator Name: **Dollar amount of investigation/prosecution costs collected**

Indicator LaPAS PI Code: **12353**

1. **Type and Level**: Output - General

2. **Rationale:** It is necessary to track to support the outcome measures.

3. **Use:**   It will be used for internal management purposes and performance-based budgeting as an indicator of workload.

4. **Clarity:**   Clearly identified

5. **Validity, Reliability and Accuracy:**   No, the indicator is valid.

6. **Data Source, Collection and Reporting:** The MFCU case tracking database captures all performance information. All data will be reported on a monthly basis

7. **Calculation Methodology:** The dollar amount of investigation/prosecution costs collected is entered in the data base for every case, search by date range.

8. **Scope:** Indicator is aggregated.

9. **Caveats:** No weaknesses; indicator is not a surrogate; the source of the date does not have a bias; there is not a caveat.

10. **Responsible Person:**

> Chief Investigator
> Unit Director, Medicaid Fraud Control Unit

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

Program: **CRIMINAL**

   Objective: **I.3**

   Indicator Name: **Dollar amount of investigation/prosecution costs ordered**

   Indicator LaPAS PI Code: **12365**

1. **Type and Level**: Output - General

2. **Rationale:** It is necessary to track to support the outcome measures.

3. **Use:**   It will be used for internal management purposes and performance-based budgeting as an indicator of workload.

4. **Clarity:**   Clearly identified

5. **Validity, Reliability and Accuracy:**   No, the indicator is valid.

6. **Data Source, Collection and Reporting:** The MFCU case tracking database captures all performance information. All data will be reported on a monthly basis

7. **Calculation Methodology:** The dollar amount of investigation/prosecution costs ordered is entered in the data base for every case, search by date range.

8. **Scope:** Indicator is aggregated.

9. **Caveats:** No weaknesses; indicator is not a surrogate; the source of the date does not have a bias; there is not a caveat.

10. **Responsible Person:**

        Chief Investigator
        Unit Director, Medicaid Fraud Control Unit

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

Program: **CRIMINAL**

Objective: **I.3**
   Indicator Name: **Dollar amount of restitution collected administratively**

Indicator LaPAS PI Code: **12354**

1. **Type and Level**: Output - General

2. **Rationale:** It is necessary to track to support the outcome measures.

3. **Use:**   It will be used for internal management purposes and performance-based budgeting as an indicator of workload.

4. **Clarity:**   Clearly identified

5. **Validity, Reliability and Accuracy:**   No, the indicator is valid.

6. **Data Source, Collection and Reporting:** The MFCU case tracking database captures all performance information. All data will be reported on a monthly basis

7. **Calculation Methodology:** The dollar amount restitution collected administratively is entered in the data base for every case, search by date range.

8. **Scope:** Indicator is aggregated.

9. **Caveats:** No weaknesses; indicator is not a surrogate; the source of the date does not have a bias; there is not a caveat.

10. **Responsible Person:**

       Chief Investigator
       Unit Director, Medicaid Fraud Control Unit

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

Program: **CRIMINAL**

Objective: **I.3**

Indicator Name: **Dollar amount of administrative restitution ordered**

Indicator LaPAS PI Code: **12367**

1. **Type and Level**: Output - General

2. **Rationale:** It is necessary to track to support the outcome measures.

3. **Use:**   It will be used for internal management purposes and performance-based budgeting as an indicator of workload.

4. **Clarity:** Clearly identified

5. **Validity, Reliability and Accuracy:** No, the indicator is valid.

6. **Data Source, Collection and Reporting:** The MFCU case tracking database captures all performance information. All data will be reported on a monthly basis

7. **Calculation Methodology:** The dollar amount of administrative restitution ordered is entered in the data base for every case, search by date range.

8. **Scope:** Indicator is aggregated.

9. **Caveats:** No weaknesses; indicator is not a surrogate; the source of the date does not have a bias; there is not a caveat.

10. **Responsible Person:**

Chief Investigator
Unit Director, Medicaid Fraud Control Unit

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

Program: **CRIMINAL**

Objective: **I.3**

Indicator Name: **Dollar amount of criminal restitution collected**

Indicator LaPAS PI Code: **12360**

1. **Type and Level**: Output - General

2. **Rationale:** It is necessary to track to support the outcome measures.

3. **Use:** It will be used for internal management purposes and performance-based budgeting as an indicator of workload.

4. **Clarity:** Clearly identified

5. **Validity, Reliability and Accuracy:** No, the indicator is valid.

6. **Data Source, Collection and Reporting:** The MFCU case tracking database captures all performance information. All data will be reported on a monthly basis

7. **Calculation Methodology:** The dollar amount of criminal restitution collected is entered in the data base for every case, search by date range.

8. **Scope:** Indicator is aggregated.

9. **Caveats:** No weaknesses; indicator is not a surrogate; the source of the date does not have a bias; there is not a caveat.

10. **Responsible Person:**

> Chief Investigator
> Unit Director, Medicaid Fraud Control Unit

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

Program: **CRIMINAL**

Objective: **I.3**

Indicator Name: **Dollar amount of criminal restitution ordered**

Indicator LaPAS PI Code: **12360**

1. **Type and Level**: Output - General

2. **Rationale:** It is necessary to track to support the outcome measures.

3. **Use:**   It will be used for internal management purposes and performance-based budgeting as an indicator of workload.

4. **Clarity:**   Clearly identified

5. **Validity, Reliability and Accuracy:**   No, the indicator is valid.

6. **Data Source, Collection and Reporting:** The MFCU case tracking database captures all performance information. All data will be reported on a monthly basis

7. **Calculation Methodology:** The dollar amount of criminal restitution ordered is entered in the data base for every case, search by date range.

8. **Scope:** Indicator is aggregated.

9. **Caveats:** No weaknesses; indicator is not a surrogate; the source of the date does not have a bias; there is not a caveat.

10. **Responsible Person:**

       Chief Investigator
       Unit Director, Medicaid Fraud Control Unit

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

Program: **CRIMINAL**

Objective: **I.3**

Indicator Name: **Total dollar amount of collections – all sources**

Indicator LaPAS PI Code: **12347**

1. **Type and Level**: Output - General

2. **Rationale:** It is necessary to track to support the outcome measures.

3. **Use:**   It will be used for internal management purposes and performance-based budgeting as an indicator of workload.

4. **Clarity:**   Clearly identified

5. **Validity, Reliability and Accuracy:**   No, the indicator is valid.

6. **Data Source, Collection and Reporting:** The MFCU case tracking database captures all performance information. All data will be reported on a monthly basis

7. **Calculation Methodology:** The dollar amount of collections is entered in the data base for every case, search by date range.

8. **Scope:** Indicator is aggregated.

9. **Caveats:** No weaknesses; indicator is not a surrogate; the source of the date does not have a bias; there is not a caveat.

10. **Responsible Person:**

   Chief Investigator
   Unit Director, Medicaid Fraud Control Unit

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

Program: **CRIMINAL**

Objective: **I.3**

Indicator Name: **Total judgments obtained during fiscal year – all sources**

Indicator LaPAS PI Code: **12358**

1. **Type and Level**: Output - General

2. **Rationale:** It is necessary to track to support the outcome measures.

3. **Use:**   It will be used for internal management purposes and performance-based budgeting as an indicator of workload.

4. **Clarity:**   Clearly identified

5. **Validity, Reliability and Accuracy:**   No, the indicator is valid.

6. **Data Source, Collection and Reporting:** The MFCU case tracking database captures all performance information. All data will be reported on a monthly basis

7. **Calculation Methodology:** The total amount of judgments obtained is entered in the data base for every case, search by date range.

8. **Scope:** Indicator is aggregated.

9. **Caveats:** No weaknesses; indicator is not a surrogate; the source of the date does not have a bias; there is not a caveat.

10. **Responsible Person:**

        Chief Investigator
        Unit Director, Medicaid Fraud Control Unit

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

Program: **CRIMINAL**

Objective: **I.3**

Indicator Name: **Dollar amount of funds ordered**

Indicator LaPAS PI Code: **12362**

1. **Type and Level**: Output - General

2. **Rationale:** It is necessary to track to support the outcome measures.

3. **Use:**   It will be used for internal management purposes and performance-based budgeting as an indicator of workload.

4. **Clarity:**   Clearly identified

5. **Validity, Reliability and Accuracy:**   No, the indicator is valid.

6. **Data Source, Collection and Reporting:** The MFCU case tracking database captures all performance information. All data will be reported on a monthly basis

7. **Calculation Methodology:** The dollar amount of funds ordered is entered in the data base for every case, search by date range.

8. **Scope:** Indicator is aggregated.

9. **Caveats:** No weaknesses; indicator is not a surrogate; the source of the date does not have a bias; there is not a caveat.

10. **Responsible Person:**

> Chief Investigator
> Unit Director, Medicaid Fraud Control Unit

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

Program: **CRIMINAL**

    Objective: **I.3**

    Indicator Name: **Dollar amount of civil restitution collected**

    Indicator LaPAS PI Code: **New**

1. **Type and Level**: Input - General

2. **Rationale:** It is necessary to track to support the outcome measures.

3. **Use:**   It will be used for internal management purposes and performance-based budgeting as an indicator of workload.

4. **Clarity:**   Clearly identified

5. **Validity, Reliability and Accuracy:**   No, the indicator is valid.

6. **Data Source, Collection and Reporting:** The MFCU case tracking database captures all performance information. All data will be reported on a monthly basis

7. **Calculation Methodology:** Dollar amount of civil restitution collected entered in the data base, search by date range.

8. **Scope:** Indicator is aggregated.

9. **Caveats:** No weaknesses; indicator is not a surrogate; the source of the date does not have a bias; there is not a caveat.

10. **Responsible Person:**

        Chief Investigator
        Unit Director, Medicaid Fraud Control Unit

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

Program: **CRIMINAL**

Objective: **I.3**

Indicator Name: **Dollar amount of civil restitution ordered**

Indicator LaPAS PI Code: **New**

1. **Type and Level**: Input - General

2. **Rationale:** It is necessary to track to support the outcome measures.

3. **Use:**   It will be used for internal management purposes and performance-based budgeting as an indicator of workload.

4. **Clarity:**   Clearly identified

5. **Validity, Reliability and Accuracy:**   No, the indicator is valid.

6. **Data Source, Collection and Reporting:** The MFCU case tracking database captures all performance information. All data will be reported on a monthly basis

7. **Calculation Methodology:** Dollar amount of civil restitution ordered entered in the data base, search by date range.

8. **Scope:** Indicator is aggregated.

9. **Caveats:** No weaknesses; indicator is not a surrogate; the source of the date does not have a bias; there is not a caveat.

10. **Responsible Person:**

        Chief Investigator
        Unit Director, Medicaid Fraud Control Unit

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

Program: **CRIMINAL**

Objective: **I.3**

Indicator Name: **Dollar amount of civil and criminal fines collected**

Indicator LaPAS PI Code: New

1. **Type and Level**: Input - General

2. **Rationale:** It is necessary to track to support the outcome measures.

3. **Use:**   It will be used for internal management purposes and performance-based budgeting as an indicator of workload.

4. **Clarity:**   Clearly identified

5. **Validity, Reliability and Accuracy:**   No, the indicator is valid.

6. **Data Source, Collection and Reporting:** The MFCU case tracking database captures all performance information. All data will be reported on a monthly basis

7. **Calculation Methodology:** Dollar amount of civil and criminal fines collected entered in the data base, search by date range.

8. **Scope:** Indicator is aggregated.

9. **Caveats:** No weaknesses; indicator is not a surrogate; the source of the date does not have a bias; there is not a caveat.

10. **Responsible Person:**

> Chief Investigator
> Unit Director, Medicaid Fraud Control Unit

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

Program: **CRIMINAL**

Objective: **I.3**

Indicator Name: **Dollar amount of civil and criminal fines ordered**

Indicator LaPAS PI Code: **New**

1. **Type and Level**: Input - General

2. **Rationale:** It is necessary to track to support the outcome measures.

3. **Use:**   It will be used for internal management purposes and performance-based budgeting as an indicator of workload.

4. **Clarity:**   Clearly identified

5. **Validity, Reliability and Accuracy:**   No, the indicator is valid.

6. **Data Source, Collection and Reporting:** The MFCU case tracking database captures all performance information. All data will be reported on a monthly basis

7. **Calculation Methodology:** Dollar amount of civil and criminal fines ordered entered in the data base, search by date range.

8. **Scope:** Indicator is aggregated.

9. **Caveats:** No weaknesses; indicator is not a surrogate; the source of the date does not have a bias; there is not a caveat.

10. **Responsible Person:**

> Chief Investigator
> Unit Director, Medicaid Fraud Control Unit

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

Program: **CRIMINAL**

Objective: **I.3**

Indicator Name: **Number of outreach training programs provided to law enforcement, healthcare providers, professional organizations and community organizations**

Indicator LaPAS PI Code: **New**

1. **Type and Level**: Outcome - Key

2. **Rationale:** It is necessary to track to support the outcome measures.

3. **Use:** It will be used for internal management purposes and performance-based budgeting as an indicator of workload.

4. **Clarity:** Clearly identified

5. **Validity, Reliability and Accuracy:** No, the indicator is valid.

6. **Data Source, Collection and Reporting:** The MFCU case tracking database captures all performance information. All data will be reported on a monthly basis

7. **Calculation Methodology:** Dollar amount of civil and criminal fines ordered entered in the data base, search by date range.

8. **Scope:** Indicator is aggregated.

9. **Caveats:** No weaknesses; indicator is not a surrogate; the source of the date does not have a bias; there is not a caveat.

10. **Responsible Person:**

   Chief Investigator
   Unit Director, Medicaid Fraud Control Unit

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

Program: **CRIMINAL**

Objective: **I.4**

Indicator Name: **Number of complaints received**

Indicator LaPAS PI Code: **New**

1. **Type and Level**: Input - General

2. **Rationale:** It is necessary to track to support the outcome measures.

3. **Use:**   It will be used for internal management purposes and performance-based budgeting as an indicator of workload.

4. **Clarity:**   Clearly identified

5. **Validity, Reliability and Accuracy:**   No, the indicator is valid.

6. **Data Source, Collection and Reporting:** The MFCU case tracking database captures all performance information. All data will be reported on a monthly basis

7. **Calculation Methodology:** The number of complaints entered in the data base, search by date range.

8. **Scope:** Indicator is aggregated.

9. **Caveats:** No weaknesses; indicator is not a surrogate; the source of the date does not have a bias; there is not a caveat.

10. **Responsible Person:**

       Chief Investigator
       Unit Director, Medicaid Fraud Control Unit

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

Program: **CRIMINAL**

    Objective: **I.4**

    Indicator Name: **Number of cases where complainant was notified within five days**

    Indicator LaPAS PI Code: **New**

1. **Type and Level**: Input - General

2. **Rationale:** It is necessary to track to support the outcome measures.

3. **Use:**   It will be used for internal management purposes and performance-based budgeting as an indicator of workload.

4. **Clarity:**   Clearly identified

5. **Validity, Reliability and Accuracy:**   No, the indicator is valid.

6. **Data Source, Collection and Reporting:** The MFCU case tracking database captures all performance information. All data will be reported on a monthly basis

7. **Calculation Methodology:** The number of cases where date notified is within five days of received date entered in the data base, search by date range.

8. **Scope:** Indicator is aggregated.

9. **Caveats:** No weaknesses; indicator is not a surrogate; the source of the date does not have a bias; there is not a caveat.

10. **Responsible Person:**

       Chief Investigator
       Unit Director, Medicaid Fraud Control Unit

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

Program:	**CRIMINAL**
Objective:	**I.4**
Indicator Name:	**Percent of open cases where complainant was notified within five working days of acceptance of complaint**

Indicator LaPAS PI Code: **21868**

1. **Type and Level**: Outcome - Key

2. **Rationale:** It is necessary to track to support the outcome measures.

3. **Use:**   It will be used for internal management purposes and performance-based budgeting as an indicator of workload.

4. **Clarity:**   Clearly identified

5. **Validity, Reliability and Accuracy:**   No, the indicator is valid.

6. **Data Source, Collection and Reporting:** The MFCU case tracking database captures all performance information. All data will be reported on a monthly basis

7. **Calculation Methodology:** The percent of cases where date notified is within five days of received date entered in the data base, search by date range.

8. **Scope:** Indicator is aggregated.

9. **Caveats:** No weaknesses; indicator is not a surrogate; the source of the date does not have a bias; there is not a caveat.

10. **Responsible Person:**

Chief Investigator
Unit Director, Medicaid Fraud Control Unit

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

Program: **CRIMINAL**

Objective: **I.5**

Indicator Name: Number of ICAC cases opened that are initiated through complaints or information received

Indicator LaPAS PI Code: New

1. **Type and Level**: Output - General

2. **Rationale:** It is necessary to track to support the outcome measures.

3. **Use:**   It will be used for internal management purposes and performance-based budgeting as an indicator of workload.

4. **Clarity:**   Clearly identified

5. **Validity, Reliability and Accuracy:**   No, the indicator is valid.

6. **Data Source, Collection and Reporting:** Data is tracked in the Investigation Tracking system coded to HTCU. All data will be reported on a monthly basis

7. **Calculation Methodology:** The number of complaints marked as ICAC related by date range search.

8. **Scope:** Indicator is aggregated.

9. **Caveats:** No weaknesses; indicator is not a surrogate; the source of the date does not have a bias; there is not a caveat.

10. **Responsible Person:**

        Deputy Director
        Investigation

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

Program: **CRIMINAL**

Objective: **I.5**

Indicator Name: **Number of Internet Crimes Against Children cases opened generated from proactive online investigation per fiscal year**

Indicator LaPAS PI Code: 21869

1. **Type and Level**: Output - Key

2. **Rationale:** It is necessary to track key indicators**.**

3. **Use:**   It will be used for internal management purposes and performance-based budgeting as an indicator of workload.

4. **Clarity:**   Clearly identified

5. **Validity, Reliability and Accuracy:**   No, the indicator is valid.

6. **Data Source, Collection and Reporting:** Data is tracked in the Investigation Tracking system coded to HTCU. All data will be reported on a monthly basis

7. **Calculation Methodology:** The number of DOJ ICAC cases entered as resulting from proactive online investigation.

8. **Scope:** Indicator is aggregated.

9. **Caveats:** No weaknesses; indicator is not a surrogate; the source of the date does not have a bias; there is not a caveat.

10. **Responsible Person:**

       Deputy Director
       Investigation

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

Program: **CRIMINAL**

Objective: **I.5**

Indicator Name: **Number of Internet Crimes Against Children cases opened that are initiated through complaints or information received**

Indicator LaPAS PI Code: New

1. **Type and Level**: Output - Key

2. **Rationale:** It is necessary to track key indicators**.**

3. **Use:** It will be used for internal management purposes and performance-based budgeting as an indicator of workload.

4. **Clarity:** Clearly identified

5. **Validity, Reliability and Accuracy:** No, the indicator is valid.

6. **Data Source, Collection and Reporting:** Data is tracked in the Investigation Tracking system coded to HTCU. All data will be reported on a monthly basis

7. **Calculation Methodology:** The number of DOJ ICAC cases entered as initiating from complaint or information received.

8. **Scope:** Indicator is aggregated.

9. **Caveats:** No weaknesses; indicator is not a surrogate; the source of the date does not have a bias; there is not a caveat.

10. **Responsible Person:**

        Deputy Director
        Investigation

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

Program: **CRIMINAL**

Objective: **I.5**

Indicator Name: **Number of DOJ ICAC cases per 40 hours of DOJ proactive online investigation per fiscal year**

Indicator LaPAS PI Code: 21870

1. **Type and Level**: Efficiency - Supporting

2. **Rationale:** It is necessary to track to support the outcome measures.

3. **Use:**   It will be used for internal management purposes and performance-based budgeting as an indicator of workload.

4. **Clarity:**   Clearly identified

5. **Validity, Reliability and Accuracy:**   No, the indicator is valid.

6. **Data Source, Collection and Reporting:** Data is tracked in the Investigation Tracking system coded to HTCU. All data will be reported on a monthly basis

7. **Calculation Methodology:** The number of DOJ ICAC cases divided by the number of DOJ proactive online hours results in the number per 40 hour of proactive online investigation.

8. **Scope:** Indicator is aggregated.

9. **Caveats:** No weaknesses; indicator is not a surrogate; the source of the date does not have a bias; there is not a caveat.

10. **Responsible Person:**

        Deputy Director
        Investigation

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

Program: **CRIMINAL**

Objective: **I.5**

Indicator Name: **Total CCU arrests**

Indicator LaPAS PI Code: New

1. **Type and Level**: Output - General

2. **Rationale:** It is necessary to track to support the outcome measures.

3. **Use:**   It will be used for internal management purposes and performance-based budgeting as an indicator of workload.

4. **Clarity:**   Clearly identified

5. **Validity, Reliability and Accuracy:**   No, the indicator is valid.

6. **Data Source, Collection and Reporting:** Data is tracked in the Investigation Tracking system coded to HTCU. All data will be reported on a monthly basis

7. **Calculation Methodology:** The number of CCU arrests by date range search.

8. **Scope:** Indicator is aggregated.

9. **Caveats:** No weaknesses; indicator is not a surrogate; the source of the date does not have a bias; there is not a caveat.

10. **Responsible Person:**

        Deputy Director
        Investigation

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

Program: **CRIMINAL**

Objective: **I.6**

Indicator Name: **Number of request for forensic lab examinations received from outside agencies**

Indicator LaPAS PI Code: New

1. **Type and Level**: Input - General

2. **Rationale:** It is necessary to track to support the outcome measures.

3. **Use:**   It will be used for internal management purposes and performance-based budgeting as an indicator of workload.

4. **Clarity:**   Clearly identified

5. **Validity, Reliability and Accuracy:**   No, the indicator is valid.

6. **Data Source, Collection and Reporting:** Data is tracked in the Investigation Tracking system coded to Forensic Lab. All data will be reported on a monthly basis

7. **Calculation Methodology:** The number of requests entered as from outside agencies, search by date range.

8. **Scope:** Indicator is aggregated.

9. **Caveats:** No weaknesses; indicator is not a surrogate; the source of the date does not have a bias; there is not a caveat.

10. **Responsible Person:**

            Deputy Director
            Investigation

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

Program: **CRIMINAL**

Objective: **I.6**

Indicator Name: **Number of forensic lab examinations requested for DOJ cases**

Indicator LaPAS PI Code: New

1. **Type and Level**: Output - General

2. **Rationale:** It is necessary to track to support the outcome measures.

3. **Use:**   It will be used for internal management purposes and performance-based budgeting as an indicator of workload.

4. **Clarity:**   Clearly identified

5. **Validity, Reliability and Accuracy:**   No, the indicator is valid.

6. **Data Source, Collection and Reporting:** Data is tracked in the Investigation Tracking system coded to Forensic Lab. All data will be reported on a monthly basis

7. **Calculation Methodology:** The number of requests entered as from DOJ, search by date range.

8. **Scope:** Indicator is aggregated.

9. **Caveats:** No weaknesses; indicator is not a surrogate; the source of the date does not have a bias; there is not a caveat.

10. **Responsible Person:**

    Deputy Director
    Investigation

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

Program: **CRIMINAL**

Objective: **I.6**

Indicator Name: **Size (in gigabytes) of completed examinations**

Indicator LaPAS PI Code: New

1. **Type and Level**: Output - Supporting

2. **Rationale:** It is necessary to track to support the outcome measures.

3. **Use:**   It will be used for internal management purposes and performance-based budgeting as an indicator of workload.

4. **Clarity:**   Clearly identified

5. **Validity, Reliability and Accuracy:**   No, the indicator is valid.

6. **Data Source, Collection and Reporting:** Data is tracked in the Investigation Tracking system coded to Forensic Lab. All data will be reported on a monthly basis

7. **Calculation Methodology:** The total number of size (gigabytes) of completed examinations, search by date range.

8. **Scope:** Indicator is aggregated.

9. **Caveats:** No weaknesses; indicator is not a surrogate; the source of the date does not have a bias; there is not a caveat.

10. **Responsible Person:**

        Deputy Director
        Investigation

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

Program: **CRIMINAL**

Objective: **I.6**

Indicator Name: **Total forensic examinations completed**

Indicator LaPAS PI Code: New

1. **Type and Level**: Outcome - Supporting

2. **Rationale:** It is necessary to track to support the outcome measures.

3. **Use:**   It will be used for internal management purposes and performance-based budgeting as an indicator of workload.

4. **Clarity:**   Clearly identified

5. **Validity, Reliability and Accuracy:**   No, the indicator is valid.

6. **Data Source, Collection and Reporting:** Data is tracked in the Investigation Tracking system coded to Forensic Lab. All data will be reported on a monthly basis

7. **Calculation Methodology:** The total number of completed examinations, search by date range.

8. **Scope:** Indicator is aggregated.

9. **Caveats:** No weaknesses; indicator is not a surrogate; the source of the date does not have a bias; there is not a caveat.

10. **Responsible Person:**

        Deputy Director
        Investigation

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

Program: **CRIMINAL**

Objective: **I.7**

Indicator Name: **Number of non-ICAC CCU complaints received and reviewed**

Indicator LaPAS PI Code: New

1. **Type and Level**: Input - Supporting

2. **Rationale:** It is necessary to track to support the outcome measures.

3. **Use:** It will be used for internal management purposes and performance-based budgeting as an indicator of workload.

4. **Clarity:** Clearly identified

5. **Validity, Reliability and Accuracy:** No, the indicator is valid.

6. **Data Source, Collection and Reporting:** Data is tracked in the Investigation Tracking system coded to HTCU. All data will be reported on a monthly basis

7. **Calculation Methodology:** The number of complaints received as non-ICAC CCU by date range search.

8. **Scope:** Indicator is aggregated.

9. **Caveats:** No weaknesses; indicator is not a surrogate; the source of the date does not have a bias; there is not a caveat.

10. **Responsible Person:**

       Deputy Director
       Investigation

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

Program: CRIMINAL

Objective: I.7

Indicator Name: **Number of non-ICAC CCU complaints assigned for investigation**

Indicator LaPAS PI Code: New

1. **Type and Level**: Output - Supporting

2. **Rationale:** It is necessary to track to support the outcome measures.

3. **Use:**   It will be used for internal management purposes and performance-based budgeting as an indicator of workload.

4. **Clarity:**   Clearly identified

5. **Validity, Reliability and Accuracy:**   No, the indicator is valid.

6. **Data Source, Collection and Reporting:** Data is tracked in the Investigation Tracking system coded to HTCU. All data will be reported on a monthly basis

7. **Calculation Methodology:** The number of complaints received as non-ICAC CCU assigned for investigation by date range search.

8. **Scope:** Indicator is aggregated.

9. **Caveats:** No weaknesses; indicator is not a surrogate; the source of the date does not have a bias; there is not a caveat.

10. **Responsible Person:**

> Deputy Director
> Investigation

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

Program: **CRIMINAL**

Objective: **I.7**

Indicator Name: **Number of non-ICAC CCU complaints where investigation is completed**

Indicator LaPAS PI Code: New

1. **Type and Level**: Outcome - Supporting

2. **Rationale:** It is necessary to track to support the outcome measures.

3. **Use:**   It will be used for internal management purposes and performance-based budgeting as an indicator of workload.

4. **Clarity:**   Clearly identified

5. **Validity, Reliability and Accuracy:**   No, the indicator is valid.

6. **Data Source, Collection and Reporting:** Data is tracked in the Investigation Tracking system coded to HTCU. All data will be reported on a monthly basis

7. **Calculation Methodology:** The number of complaints received as non-ICAC CCU assigned for investigation marked as completed by date range search.

8. **Scope:** Indicator is aggregated.

9. **Caveats:** No weaknesses; indicator is not a surrogate; the source of the date does not have a bias; there is not a caveat.

10. **Responsible Person:**

          Deputy Director
          Investigation

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

Program: **CRIMINAL**

Objective: **I.7**

Indicator Name: **Number of cases opened as a result of a non-ICAC CCU complaint**

Indicator LaPAS PI Code: New

1. **Type and Level**: Outcome - Key

2. **Rationale:** It is necessary to track to support the outcome measures.

3. **Use:**   It will be used for internal management purposes and performance-based budgeting as an indicator of workload.

4. **Clarity:**   Clearly identified

5. **Validity, Reliability and Accuracy:**   No, the indicator is valid.

6. **Data Source, Collection and Reporting:** Data is tracked in the Investigation Tracking system coded to HTCU. All data will be reported on a monthly basis

7. **Calculation Methodology:** The number of cases opened as a result of complaints received as non-ICAC CCU by date range search.

8. **Scope:** Indicator is aggregated.

9. **Caveats:** No weaknesses; indicator is not a surrogate; the source of the date does not have a bias; there is not a caveat.

10. **Responsible Person:**

       Deputy Director
       Investigation

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

Program: **CRIMINAL**

Objective: **I.8**

Indicator Name: **Number of requests for assistance from law enforcement agencies**

Indicator LaPAS PI Code: New

1. **Type and Level**: Input - General

2. **Rationale:** It is necessary to track to support the outcome measures.

3. **Use:**   It will be used for internal management purposes and performance-based budgeting as an indicator of workload.

4. **Clarity:**   Clearly identified

5. **Validity, Reliability and Accuracy:**   No, the indicator is valid.

6. **Data Source, Collection and Reporting:** Data is tracked in the Investigation Tracking system. All data will be reported on a monthly basis

7. **Calculation Methodology:** The number of requests where assistance from a law enforcement agency is selected. Search by date range search.

8. **Scope:** Indicator is aggregated.

9. **Caveats:** No weaknesses; indicator is not a surrogate; the source of the date does not have a bias; there is not a caveat.

10. **Responsible Person:**

         Deputy Director
         Investigation

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

Program: **CRIMINAL**

Objective: **I.8**

Indicator Name: **Number of requests for assistance from non-law enforcement governmental agencies**

Indicator LaPAS PI Code: New

1. **Type and Level**: Input - General

2. **Rationale:** It is necessary to track to support the outcome measures.

3. **Use:**   It will be used for internal management purposes and performance-based budgeting as an indicator of workload.

4. **Clarity:**   Clearly identified

5. **Validity, Reliability and Accuracy:**   No, the indicator is valid.

6. **Data Source, Collection and Reporting:** Data is tracked in the Investigation Tracking system. All data will be reported on a monthly basis

7. **Calculation Methodology:** The number of requests for assistance from a non-law enforcement governmental agency is selected. Search by date range search.

8. **Scope:** Indicator is aggregated.

9. **Caveats:** No weaknesses; indicator is not a surrogate; the source of the date does not have a bias; there is not a caveat.

10. **Responsible Person:**

           Deputy Director
           Investigation

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

Program: **CRIMINAL**

Objective: **I.8**

Indicator Name: **Number of recusal requests**

Indicator LaPAS PI Code: New

1. **Type and Level**: Input - General

2. **Rationale:** It is necessary to track to support the outcome measures.

3. **Use:**   It will be used for internal management purposes and performance-based budgeting as an indicator of workload.

4. **Clarity:**   Clearly identified

5. **Validity, Reliability and Accuracy:**   No, the indicator is valid.

6. **Data Source, Collection and Reporting:** Data is tracked in the Investigation Tracking system. All data will be reported on a monthly basis

7. **Calculation Methodology:** The number of recusals received. Search by date range search.

8. **Scope:** Indicator is aggregated.

9. **Caveats:** No weaknesses; indicator is not a surrogate; the source of the date does not have a bias; there is not a caveat.

10. **Responsible Person:**

> Deputy Director
> Investigation

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

Program: **CRIMINAL**

Objective: **I.8**

Indicator Name: **Number of open investigations per investigator**

Indicator LaPAS PI Code: 21863

1. **Type and Level**: Input - KEY

2. **Rationale:** It is necessary to track to support the outcome measures.

3. **Use:**   It will be used for internal management purposes and performance-based budgeting as an indicator of workload.

4. **Clarity:**   Clearly identified

5. **Validity, Reliability and Accuracy:**   No, the indicator is valid.

6. **Data Source, Collection and Reporting:** Data is tracked in the Investigation Tracking system. All data will be reported on a monthly basis

7. **Calculation Methodology:** The number of open investigations divided by the number of FTE investigators. Search by date range search.

8. **Scope:** Indicator is aggregated.

9. **Caveats:** No weaknesses; indicator is not a surrogate; the source of the date does not have a bias; there is not a caveat.

10. **Responsible Person:**

       Deputy Director
       Investigation

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

Program: **CRIMINAL**

Objective: **I.8**

Indicator Name: **Number of closed investigations per investigator**

Indicator LaPAS PI Code: 21862

1. **Type and Level**: Output - Supporting

2. **Rationale:** It is necessary to track to support the outcome measures.

3. **Use:** It will be used for internal management purposes and performance-based budgeting as an indicator of workload.

4. **Clarity:** Clearly identified

5. **Validity, Reliability and Accuracy:** No, the indicator is valid.

6. **Data Source, Collection and Reporting:** Data is tracked in the Investigation Tracking system. All data will be reported on a monthly basis

7. **Calculation Methodology:** The number of closed investigations divided by the number of FTE investigators. Search by date range search.

8. **Scope:** Indicator is aggregated.

9. **Caveats:** No weaknesses; indicator is not a surrogate; the source of the date does not have a bias; there is not a caveat.

10. **Responsible Person:**

        Deputy Director
        Investigation

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

Program: **CRIMINAL**

Objective: **I.8**

Indicator Name: **Number of total closed investigations**

Indicator LaPAS PI Code: New

1. **Type and Level**: Output - General

2. **Rationale:** It is necessary to track to support the outcome measures.

3. **Use:**   It will be used for internal management purposes and performance-based budgeting as an indicator of workload.

4. **Clarity:**   Clearly identified

5. **Validity, Reliability and Accuracy:**   No, the indicator is valid.

6. **Data Source, Collection and Reporting:** Data is tracked in the Investigation Tracking system. All data will be reported on a monthly basis

7. **Calculation Methodology:** The number of closed investigations. Search by date range search.

8. **Scope:** Indicator is aggregated.

9. **Caveats:** No weaknesses; indicator is not a surrogate; the source of the date does not have a bias; there is not a caveat.

10. **Responsible Person:**

       Deputy Director
       Investigation

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

Program: **CRIMINAL**

Objective: **I.8**

Indicator Name: **Number of new investigations opened**

Indicator LaPAS PI Code: 21861

1. **Type and Level**: Outcome - Key

2. **Rationale:** It is necessary to track key indicators**.**

3. **Use:**   It will be used for internal management purposes and performance-based budgeting as an indicator of workload.

4. **Clarity:**   Clearly identified

5. **Validity, Reliability and Accuracy:**   No, the indicator is valid.

6. **Data Source, Collection and Reporting:** Data is tracked in the Investigation Tracking system. All data will be reported on a monthly basis

7. **Calculation Methodology:** The number of new investigations opened. Search by date range search.

8. **Scope:** Indicator is aggregated.

9. **Caveats:** No weaknesses; indicator is not a surrogate; the source of the date does not have a bias; there is not a caveat.

10. **Responsible Person:**

       Deputy Director
       Investigation

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

Program: **CRIMINAL**

Objective: **I.8**

Indicator Name: **Number of new investigations opened due to DOJ initiated**

Indicator LaPAS PI Code: New

1. **Type and Level**: Outcome - Supporting

2. **Rationale:** It is necessary to track key indicators**.**

3. **Use:**   It will be used for internal management purposes and performance-based budgeting as an indicator of workload.

4. **Clarity:**   Clearly identified

5. **Validity, Reliability and Accuracy:**   No, the indicator is valid.

6. **Data Source, Collection and Reporting:** Data is tracked in the Investigation Tracking system. All data will be reported on a monthly basis

7. **Calculation Methodology:** The number of new investigations opened where DOJ initiated is selected. Search by date range search.

8. **Scope:** Indicator is aggregated.

9. **Caveats:** No weaknesses; indicator is not a surrogate; the source of the date does not have a bias; there is not a caveat.

10. **Responsible Person:**

        Deputy Director
        Investigation

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

Program: **CRIMINAL**

Objective: **I.8**

Indicator Name: **Number of new investigations opened due to requested assistance**

Indicator LaPAS PI Code: **New**

1. **Type and Level**: Outcome - Supporting

2. **Rationale:** It is necessary to track key indicators**.**

3. **Use:**   It will be used for internal management purposes and performance-based budgeting as an indicator of workload.

4. **Clarity:**   Clearly identified

5. **Validity, Reliability and Accuracy:**   No, the indicator is valid.

6. **Data Source, Collection and Reporting:** Data is tracked in the Investigation Tracking system. All data will be reported on a monthly basis

7. **Calculation Methodology:** The number of new investigations opened where assistance is requested. Search by date range search.

8. **Scope:** Indicator is aggregated.

9. **Caveats:** No weaknesses; indicator is not a surrogate; the source of the date does not have a bias; there is not a caveat.

10. **Responsible Person:**

       Deputy Director
       Investigation

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

Program: **CRIMINAL**

Objective: **I.9**

Indicator Name: **Number of requests for fugitive apprehension assistance from law enforcement agencies**

Indicator LaPAS PI Code: NEW

1. **Type and Level**: Outcome - Supporting

2. **Rationale:** It is necessary to track key indicators**.**

3. **Use:**   It will be used for internal management purposes and performance-based budgeting as an indicator of workload.

4. **Clarity:**   Clearly identified

5. **Validity, Reliability and Accuracy:**   No, the indicator is valid.

6. **Data Source, Collection and Reporting:** Data is tracked in the Investigation Tracking system. All data will be reported on a monthly basis

7. **Calculation Methodology:** The number of requests for fugitive apprehension
                            assistance
assistance from law enforcement agencies. Search by date range search.

8. **Scope:** Indicator is aggregated.

9. **Caveats:** No weaknesses; indicator is not a surrogate; the source of the date does not have a bias; there is not a caveat.

10. **Responsible Person:**

        Deputy Director
        Investigation

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

Program: **CRIMINAL**

Objective: **I.9**

Indicator Name: **Number of outstanding warrants**

Indicator LaPAS PI Code: New

1. **Type and Level**: Outcome - Supporting

2. **Rationale:** It is necessary to track key indicators**.**

3. **Use:**   It will be used for internal management purposes and performance-based budgeting as an indicator of workload.

4. **Clarity:** Clearly identified

5. **Validity, Reliability and Accuracy:**   No, the indicator is valid.

6. **Data Source, Collection and Reporting:** Data is tracked in the Investigation Tracking system. All data will be reported on a monthly basis

7. **Calculation Methodology:** The number of outstanding warrants on fugitives. Search by date range search.

8. **Scope:** Indicator is aggregated.

9. **Caveats:** No weaknesses; indicator is not a surrogate; the source of the date does not have a bias; there is not a caveat.

10. **Responsible Person:**

        Deputy Director
        Investigation

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

Program: **CRIMINAL**

Objective: **I.9**

Indicator Name: **Number of fugitive apprehension arrests**

Indicator LaPAS PI Code: New

1. **Type and Level**: Outcome - **Key**

2. **Rationale:** It is necessary to track key indicators**.**

3. **Use:**   It will be used for internal management purposes and performance-based budgeting as an indicator of workload.

4. **Clarity:**   Clearly identified

5. **Validity, Reliability and Accuracy:**   No, the indicator is valid.

6. **Data Source, Collection and Reporting:** Data is tracked in the Investigation Tracking system. All data will be reported on a monthly basis

7. **Calculation Methodology:** The number of arrests in the fugitive apprehension section. Search by date range search.

8. **Scope:** Indicator is aggregated.

9. **Caveats:** No weaknesses; indicator is not a surrogate; the source of the date does not have a bias; there is not a caveat.

10. **Responsible Person:**

> Deputy Director
> Investigation

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

Program: **CRIMINAL**

Objective: **I.9**

Indicator Name: **Number of total closed investigations**

Indicator LaPAS PI Code: New

1. **Type and Level**: Output - Supporting

2. **Rationale:** It is necessary to track key indicators**.**

3. **Use:**   It will be used for internal management purposes and performance-based budgeting as an indicator of workload.

4. **Clarity:** Clearly identified

5. **Validity, Reliability and Accuracy:**   No, the indicator is valid.

6. **Data Source, Collection and Reporting:** Data is tracked in the Investigation Tracking system. All data will be reported on a monthly basis

7. **Calculation Methodology:** The number of fugitive apprehension cases closed. Search by date range search.

8. **Scope:** Indicator is aggregated.

9. **Caveats:** No weaknesses; indicator is not a surrogate; the source of the date does not have a bias; there is not a caveat.

10. **Responsible Person:**

    Deputy Director
    Investigation

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

Program: **CRIMINAL**

Objective: **I.9**

Indicator Name: **Number of outstanding warrants cleared**

Indicator LaPAS PI Code: New

1. **Type and Level**: Outcome - **Key**

2. **Rationale:** It is necessary to track key indicators**.**

3. **Use:**   It will be used for internal management purposes and performance-based budgeting as an indicator of workload.

4. **Clarity:**   Clearly identified

5. **Validity, Reliability and Accuracy:**   No, the indicator is valid.

6. **Data Source, Collection and Reporting:** Data is tracked in the Investigation Tracking system. All data will be reported on a monthly basis

7. **Calculation Methodology:** The number of warrants cleared by fugitive apprehension unit. Search by date range search.

8. **Scope:** Indicator is aggregated.

9. **Caveats:** No weaknesses; indicator is not a surrogate; the source of the date does not have a bias; there is not a caveat.

10. **Responsible Person:**

       Deputy Director
       Investigation

INTERNAL ENVIROMENT

(1).   Customers/clients/stakeholders

Customers/clients: The Gaming Division's clients include the citizen's of the State of Louisiana, Louisiana Gaming Control Board, Louisiana State Police, Louisiana State Racing Commission, Louisiana Lottery Corporation, and the Department of Revenue and Taxation, Charitable Gaming Unit.

Stakeholders: There do not appear to be stakeholders in the Gaming Division except perhaps contract counsel, court reporters, hearing officers and expert witnesses who receive compensation for services provided to the State and or the Louisiana Gaming Control Board.

(2)   Major accomplishments which demonstrate how well needs of internal and external customers have been met

The Gaming Division's customers and clients expect the Division to provide competent and effective legal advice, counsel and representation in matters including proposed enforcement actions, rule promulgation, civil suits, subpoenas, public inquiries, application processing, suspensions, revocations and administrative actions. They further expect the Division to assist in the strict regulation of the gaming industry to ensure that gaming is conducted honestly and free from criminal and corruptive elements.

The Division has provided competent and effective representation to its internal customers (clients) and has assisted in protecting the general public by serving to ensure that the gaming industry is free from criminal and corruptive elements.

Division personnel have been organized so that legal representation may be provided in an efficient manner. The Division consists of three sections which provide specific legal services to its clients. The sections within the Gaming Division are: 1) Licensing and Compliance; 2) Adjudication and Litigation; 3) General Gaming.

The Division has fully implemented a case tracking system. The system has enhanced the Division's ability to provide consistent and competent services to its client agencies. The case tracking system has also improved the storing of all case file documents for easy retrieval and increased the Division's ability to successfully meet established performance objectives.

(3)   Changes that have occurred in the Division over the last several years

The Gaming Division has streamlined its internal organizational structure into three sections – Licensing and Compliance, Adjudication and Litigation, and General Gaming.

The case tracking system has been enhanced to provide a database for searching all previous gaming decisions issued by the Louisiana Gaming Control Board and the Administrative Hearing Office.

(4)   Current activities and programs

The Gaming Division provides legal representation related to particular types of gaming activity, specifically Riverboat, Video Draw Poker, Louisiana Lottery, Charitable Gaming, Racetrack Gaming (including slots at the racetracks), Indian Gaming, Landbased Casino Gaming and Sports Betting.

(5)   Strengths and weaknesses of the Gaming Division

Strengths
The Division's legal staff is comprised of hard working, conscientious attorneys with expertise and widely diversified legal skills.

Weaknesses
Limitation of support staff.

EXTERNAL ENVIRONMENT

(1)   Threats to the Division's activities

1)   Employee turnover rate due to non-competitive salaries;
2)   Legislative changes; and
3)   Divisional Budget

(2)   Major current issues or problems that affect organization (local, statewide, regional, etc.)

1)   Legal challenges to licensees voluntary procurement goals and the state's monitoring compliance;
2)   Declining gaming revenue due to economy and competition from other jurisdictions; and
3)   Establishing the role of the Attorney General's Office in a multitude of gaming matters.

(3)   Current events, issues, trends emerging in the field

_____

_____

1) Expansion of gaming in existing and new jurisdictions to address state budget problems;
2) Potential proliferation of "sweepstakes" businesses which take several forms, but have in common the offering of a type of gambling experience that does not appear to fall within current gaming laws; and
3) Increasing issues with online raffles.

(4)   How environment may differ in the future

Increased staff time may be required to provide effective counsel in response to the issues and/or problems that affect gaming regulation in Louisiana. In addition, organizational changes may be necessary due to the increase of responsibility of the Division and Attorney General's Office in particular areas of gaming.

STRATEGY ANALYSIS CHECKLIST

PROGRAM: **GAMING**

OBJECTIVE: I.1:   Forward 95% of video gaming and casino gaming approval files to the Louisiana Gaming Control Board within 20 business days of assignment by June 30, 2028.

STRATEGY: I.1.a: Licensing and Compliance Section Chief shall use case tracking system to manage timeliness of file processing.

Analysis

            Cost/benefit analysis conducted
  X   Other analysis used
  X   Impact on other strategies considered

Authorization

  X   Authorization exists
         Authorization needed

Organization Capacity

         Needed structural or procedural changes identified
         Resource needs identified

Time Frame

  X   Already ongoing
         New, startup date estimated
         Lifetime of strategy identified

Fiscal Impact

         Impact on operating budget
         Impact on capital outlay budget
         Means of finance identified

STRATEGY ANALYSIS CHECKLIST

PROGRAM: **GAMING**

OBJECTIVE: I.2:   Forward 95% of all video gaming administrative action and denial files to the Louisiana Gaming Control Board within 60 business days of assignment by June 30, 2028.

STRATEGY: I.2.a: Licensing and Compliance Section Chief shall use case tracking system to manage timeliness of file processing.

Analysis

            Cost/benefit analysis conducted
  X   Other analysis used
  X   Impact on other strategies considered

Authorization

  X   Authorization exists
        Authorization needed

Organization Capacity

        Needed structural or procedural changes identified
        Resource needs identified

Time Frame

  X   Already ongoing
        New, startup date estimated
        Lifetime of strategy identified

Fiscal Impact

        Impact on operating budget
        Impact on capital outlay budget
        Means of finance identified

STRATEGY ANALYSIS CHECKLIST

PROGRAM: **GAMING**

OBJECTIVE: I.3:   Forward 95% of all casino gaming administrative action and denial
                            files to the Louisiana Gaming Control Board within 30 business
                            days of assignment by June 30, 2028.

STRATEGY: I.3.a: Licensing and Compliance Section Chief shall use case tracking
                            system to manage timeliness of file processing.

Analysis

	Cost/benefit analysis conducted
X	Other analysis used
X	Impact on other strategies considered

Authorization

X	Authorization exists
	Authorization needed

Organization Capacity

	Needed structural or procedural changes identified
	Resource needs identified

Time Frame

X	Already ongoing
	New, startup date estimated
	Lifetime of strategy identified

Fiscal Impact

	Impact on operating budget
	Impact on capital outlay budget
	Means of finance identified

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION
Program: GAMING PROGRAM

Objective: I.1

Indicator Name: Number of casino gaming approval files received from State Police

1. **Type and Level**: Input - General

2. **Rationale:** It is necessary to track to support the outcome measures.

3. **Use:** The indicator will be used for management purposes and for performance-based budgeting as an indicator of workload.

4. **Clarity:** Indicator clearly identifies what is being measured. Indicator does not contain jargon or acronyms.

5. **Validity, Reliability and Accuracy:** No, the indicator is valid.

6. **Data Source, Collection and Reporting:** The Gaming Case Tracking program tracks all data related to performance indicators. All data will be reported on a monthly basis.

7. **Calculation Methodology:** Standard calculation by counting the number of casino gaming approval files received from State Police.

8. **Scope:** The indicator is aggregated.

9. **Caveats:** No weakness or limitation; No proxy or surrogate; Source of data does not have a bias; No caveats.

10.   **Responsible Person:** Tracking Manager, Licensing and Compliance,

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

Program: **GAMING PROGRAM**

Objective: **I.1**

Indicator Name: **Number of video gaming approval files received from State Police**

1. **Type and Level**: Input - General

2. **Rationale:** It is necessary to track to support the outcome measures.

3. **Use:** The indicator will be used for management purposes and for performance-based budgeting as an indicator of workload.

4. **Clarity:** Indicator clearly identifies what is being measured. Indicator does not contain jargon or acronyms.

5. **Validity, Reliability and Accuracy:** No, the indicator is valid.

6. **Data Source, Collection and Reporting:** The Gaming Case Tracking program tracks all data related to performance indicators. All data will be reported on a monthly basis.

7. **Calculation Methodology:** Standard calculation by counting the number of video gaming approval files received from State Police.

8. **Scope:** The indicator is aggregated.

9. **Caveats:** No weakness or limitation. No proxy or surrogate. Source of data does not have a bias. No caveats.

10.   **Responsible Person:** Tracking Manager, Licensing and Compliance,

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

Program: **GAMING PROGRAM**

Objective: **I.1**

Indicator Name: **Number of casino gaming approval files processed by Licensing and Compliance**

Indicator LaPAS PI Code: 22204

1. **Type and Level**:   Output - General

2. **Rationale:** It is necessary to track to key indicators.

3. **Use:** The indicator will be used for management purposes and for performance-based budgeting as an indicator of workload.

4. **Clarity:** Indicator clearly identifies what is being measured. Indicator does not contain jargon or acronyms.

5. **Validity, Reliability and Accuracy:** No, the indicator is valid.

6. **Data Source, Collection and Reporting:** The Gaming Case Tracking program tracks all data related to performance indicators. All data will be reported on a monthly basis.

7. **Calculation Methodology:** Standard calculation by counting the number of casino gaming approval files processed.

8. **Scope:** The indicator is aggregated.

9. **Caveats:** No weakness or limitation. No proxy or surrogate. Source of data does not have a bias. No caveats.

10.   **Responsible Person:** Tracking Manager, Licensing and Compliance,

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

Program: **GAMING PROGRAM**

Objective: **I.1**

Indicator Name: **Number of video gaming approval files processed by Licensing and Compliance**

Indicator LaPAS PI Code: 22203

1. **Type and Level**:   Output - General

2. **Rationale:** It is necessary to track to key indicators.

3. **Use:** The indicator will be used for management purposes and for performance-based budgeting as an indicator of workload.

4. **Clarity:** Indicator clearly identifies what is being measured. Indicator does not contain jargon or acronyms.

5. **Validity, Reliability and Accuracy:** No, the indicator is valid.

6. **Data Source, Collection and Reporting:** The Gaming Case Tracking program tracks all data related to performance indicators. All data will be reported on a monthly basis.

7. **Calculation Methodology:** Standard calculation by counting the number of video gaming approval files processed.

8. **Scope:** The indicator is aggregated.

9. **Caveats:** No weakness or limitation. No proxy or surrogate. Source of data does not have a bias. No caveats.

10.   **Responsible Person:** Tracking Manager, Licensing and Compliance,

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

Program: **GAMING PROGRAM**

Objective: **I.1**

Indicator Name: **Number of casino gaming approval files returned to State Police**

Indicator LaPAS PI Code: New

1. **Type and Level**:   Output - General

2. **Rationale:** It is necessary to track to key indicators.

3. **Use:** The indicator will be used for management purposes and for performance-based budgeting as an indicator of workload.

4. **Clarity:** Indicator clearly identifies what is being measured. Indicator does not contain jargon or acronyms.

5. **Validity, Reliability and Accuracy:** No, the indicator is valid.

6. **Data Source, Collection and Reporting:** The Gaming Case Tracking program tracks all data related to performance indicators. All data will be reported on a monthly basis.

7. **Calculation Methodology:** Standard calculation by counting the number of casino gaming approval files returned to State Police

8. **Scope:** The indicator is aggregated.

9. **Caveats:** No weakness or limitation. No proxy or surrogate. Source of data does not have a bias. No caveats.

10.   **Responsible Person:** Tracking Manager, Licensing and Compliance,

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

Program: **GAMING PROGRAM**

Objective: **I.1**

Indicator Name: **Number of video gaming approval files returned to State Police**

Indicator LaPAS PI Code: New

1. **Type and Level**:   Output - General

2. **Rationale:** It is necessary to track to key indicators.

3. **Use:** The indicator will be used for management purposes and for performance-based budgeting as an indicator of workload.

4. **Clarity:** Indicator clearly identifies what is being measured. Indicator does not contain jargon or acronyms.

5. **Validity, Reliability and Accuracy:** No, the indicator is valid.

6. **Data Source, Collection and Reporting:** The Gaming Case Tracking program tracks all data related to performance indicators. All data will be reported on a monthly basis.

7. **Calculation Methodology:** Standard calculation by counting the number of video gaming approval files returned to State Police

8. **Scope:** The indicator is aggregated.

9. **Caveats:** No weakness or limitation. No proxy or surrogate. Source of data does not have a bias. No caveats.

10.   **Responsible Person:** Tracking Manager, Licensing and Compliance,

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

Program: **GAMING PROGRAM**

Objective: **I.1**

Indicator Name: **Average number of business days from assignment of casino gaming approval files until forwarded to Louisiana Gaming Control Board**

Indicator LaPAS PI Code: 21882

1. **Type and Level**:   Efficiency - Supporting

2. **Rationale:** It is necessary to track to support the outcome measures.

3. **Use:** The indicator will be used for management purposes and for performance-based budgeting as an indicator of workload.

4. **Clarity:** Indicator clearly identifies what is being measured. Indicator does not contain jargon or acronyms.

5. **Validity, Reliability and Accuracy:** No, the indicator is valid.

6. **Data Source, Collection and Reporting:** The Gaming Case Tracking program tracks all data related to performance indicators. All data will be reported on a monthly basis.

7. **Calculation Methodology:** Standard calculation by calculating the average number of business days from assignment of casino gaming approval files until forwarded to Board

8. **Scope:** The indicator is aggregated.

9. **Caveats:** No weakness or limitation. No proxy or surrogate. Source of data does not have a bias. No caveats.

10.   **Responsible Person:** Tracking Manager, Licensing and Compliance,

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

Program: **GAMING PROGRAM**

Objective: **I.1**

Indicator Name: **Average number of business days from assignment of video gaming approval files until forwarded to Louisiana Gaming Control Board**

Indicator LaPAS PI Code: 21880

1. **Type and Level**: Efficiency - Supporting

2. **Rationale:** It is necessary to track to support the outcome measures.

3. **Use:** The indicator will be used for management purposes and for performance-based budgeting as an indicator of workload.

4. **Clarity:** Indicator clearly identifies what is being measured. Indicator does not contain jargon or acronyms.

5. **Validity, Reliability and Accuracy:** No, the indicator is valid.

6. **Data Source, Collection and Reporting:** The Gaming Case Tracking program tracks all data related to performance indicators. All data will be reported on a monthly basis.

7. **Calculation Methodology:** Standard calculation by calculating the average number of business days from assignment of video gaming approval files until forwarded to Board

8. **Scope:** The indicator is aggregated.

9. **Caveats:** No weakness or limitation. No proxy or surrogate. Source of data does not have a bias. No caveats.

10.   **Responsible Person:** Tracking Manager, Licensing and Compliance,

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

Program: **GAMING PROGRAM**

Objective: **I.1**

Indicator Name: **Number of casino gaming approval files processed within 20 business days of assignment**

Indicator LaPAS PI Code: New

1. **Type and Level**: Efficiency - Supporting

2. **Rationale:** It is necessary to track key indicators.

3. **Use:** The indicator will be used for management purposes and for performance-based budgeting as an indicator of workload.

4. **Clarity:** Indicator clearly identifies what is being measured. Indicator does not contain jargon or acronyms.

5. **Validity, Reliability and Accuracy:** No, the indicator is valid.

6. **Data Source, Collection and Reporting:** The Gaming Case Tracking program tracks all data related to performance indicators. All data will be reported on a monthly basis.

7. **Calculation Methodology:** Standard calculation by counting the number of casino gaming approval files processed within 20 business days of assignment.

8. **Scope:** The indicator is aggregated.

9. **Caveats:** No weakness or limitation. No proxy or surrogate. Source of data does not have a bias. No caveats.

10.   **Responsible Person:** Tracking Manager, Licensing and Compliance,

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

Program: **GAMING PROGRAM**

Objective: **I.1**

Indicator Name: **Number of video gaming approval files processed within 20 business days of assignment**

Indicator LaPAS PI Code: New

1. **Type and Level**: Efficiency - Supporting

2. **Rationale:** It is necessary to track key indicators.

3. **Use:** The indicator will be used for management purposes and for performance-based budgeting as an indicator of workload.

4. **Clarity:** Indicator clearly identifies what is being measured. Indicator does not contain jargon or acronyms.

5. **Validity, Reliability and Accuracy:** No, the indicator is valid.

6. **Data Source, Collection and Reporting:** The Gaming Case Tracking program tracks all data related to performance indicators. All data will be reported on a monthly basis.

7. **Calculation Methodology:** Standard calculation by counting the number of video gaming approval files processed within 20 business days of assignment.

8. **Scope:** The indicator is aggregated.

9. **Caveats:** No weakness or limitation. No proxy or surrogate. Source of data does not have a bias. No caveats.

10.   **Responsible Person:** Tracking Manager, Licensing and Compliance,

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

Program: **GAMING PROGRAM**

Objective: **I.1**

Indicator Name: **Percent of casino gaming approval files processed within 20 business days of assignment**

Indicator LaPAS PI Code: 21883

1. **Type and Level**: Outcome - Supporting

2. **Rationale:** It is necessary to track key indicators.

3. **Use:** The indicator will be used for management purposes and for performance-based budgeting as an indicator of workload.

4. **Clarity:** Indicator clearly identifies what is being measured. Indicator does not contain jargon or acronyms.

5. **Validity, Reliability and Accuracy:** No, the indicator is valid.

6. **Data Source, Collection and Reporting:** The Gaming Case Tracking program tracks all data related to performance indicators. All data will be reported on a monthly basis.

7. **Calculation Methodology:** Standard calculation by calculating the percent of casino gaming approval files processed within 20 business days of assignment.

8. **Scope:** The indicator is aggregated.

9. **Caveats:** No weakness or limitation. No proxy or surrogate. Source of data does not have a bias. No caveats.

10.   **Responsible Person:** Tracking Manager, Licensing and Compliance,

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

Program: **GAMING PROGRAM**

Objective: **I.1**

Indicator Name: **Percent of video gaming approval files processed within 20 business days of assignment**

Indicator LaPAS PI Code: 21881

1. **Type and Level**: Outcome - Supporting

2. **Rationale:** It is necessary to track key indicators.

3. **Use:** The indicator will be used for management purposes and for performance-based budgeting as an indicator of workload.

4. **Clarity:** Indicator clearly identifies what is being measured. Indicator does not contain jargon or acronyms.

5. **Validity, Reliability and Accuracy:** No, the indicator is valid.

6. **Data Source, Collection and Reporting:** The Gaming Case Tracking program tracks all data related to performance indicators. All data will be reported on a monthly basis.

7. **Calculation Methodology:** Standard calculation by calculating the percent of video gaming approval files processed within 20 business days of assignment.

8. **Scope:** The indicator is aggregated.

9. **Caveats:** No weakness or limitation. No proxy or surrogate. Source of data does not have a bias. No caveats.

10.   **Responsible Person:** Tracking Manager, Licensing and Compliance,

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

Program: **GAMING PROGRAM**

Objective: **I.1**

Indicator Name: **Number of complex casino gaming approval files processed in more than 20 business days of assignment**

Indicator LaPAS PI Code: 23427

1. **Type and Level**: Outcome - General

2. **Rationale:** It is necessary to track key indicators.

3. **Use:** The indicator will be used for management purposes and for performance-based budgeting as an indicator of workload.

4. **Clarity:** Indicator clearly identifies what is being measured. Indicator does not contain jargon or acronyms.

5. **Validity, Reliability and Accuracy:** No, the indicator is valid.

6. **Data Source, Collection and Reporting:** The Gaming Case Tracking program tracks all data related to performance indicators. All data will be reported on a monthly basis.

7. **Calculation Methodology:** Standard calculation by counting the number of complex casino gaming approval files processed in more than 20 business days of assignment.

8. **Scope:** The indicator is aggregated.

9. **Caveats:** No weakness or limitation. No proxy or surrogate. Source of data does not have a bias. No caveats.

10.   **Responsible Person:** Tracking Manager, Licensing and Compliance,

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

Program: **GAMING PROGRAM**

Objective: **I.1**

Indicator Name: **Number of complex video gaming approval files processed in more than 20 business days of assignment**

Indicator LaPAS PI Code: New

1. **Type and Level**: Outcome - General

2. **Rationale:** It is necessary to track key indicators.

3. **Use:** The indicator will be used for management purposes and for performance-based budgeting as an indicator of workload.

4. **Clarity:** Indicator clearly identifies what is being measured. Indicator does not contain jargon or acronyms.

5. **Validity, Reliability and Accuracy:** No, the indicator is valid.

6. **Data Source, Collection and Reporting:** The Gaming Case Tracking program tracks all data related to performance indicators. All data will be reported on a monthly basis.

7. **Calculation Methodology:** Standard calculation by counting the number of complex video gaming approval files processed in more than 20 business days of assignment.

8. **Scope:** The indicator is aggregated.

9. **Caveats:** No weakness or limitation. No proxy or surrogate. Source of data does not have a bias. No caveats.

10.   **Responsible Person:** Tracking Manager, Licensing and Compliance,

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

Program: **GAMING PROGRAM**

Objective: **I.2**

Indicator Name: **Number of video gaming administrative action and denial files received from State Police**

1. **Type and Level**: Input - General

2. **Rationale:** It is necessary to track to support the outcome measures.

3. **Use:** The indicator will be used for management purposes and for performance-based budgeting as an indicator of workload.

4. **Clarity:** Indicator clearly identifies what is being measured. Indicator does not contain jargon or acronyms.

5. **Validity, Reliability and Accuracy:** No, the indicator is valid.

6. **Data Source, Collection and Reporting:** The Gaming Case Tracking program tracks all data related to performance indicators. All data will be reported on a monthly basis.

7. **Calculation Methodology:** Standard calculation by calculating the number of video gaming administrative action and denial files received from State Police.

8. **Scope:** The indicator is aggregated.

9. **Caveats:** No weakness or limitation. No proxy or surrogate. Source of data does not have a bias. No caveats.

10.   **Responsible Person:** Tracking Manager, Licensing and Compliance,

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

Program: **GAMING PROGRAM**

Objective: **I.2**

Indicator Name: **Number of video gaming administrative action and denial files Processed by Licensing and Compliance**

1. **Type and Level**: Output - General

2. **Rationale:** It is necessary to track to support the outcome measures.

3. **Use:** The indicator will be used for management purposes and for performance-based budgeting as an indicator of workload.

4. **Clarity:** Indicator clearly identifies what is being measured. Indicator does not contain jargon or acronyms.

5. **Validity, Reliability and Accuracy:** No, the indicator is valid.

6. **Data Source, Collection and Reporting:** The Gaming Case Tracking program tracks all data related to performance indicators. All data will be reported on a monthly basis.

7. **Calculation Methodology:** Standard calculation by calculating the number of video gaming administrative action and denial files processed by Licensing and Compliance.

8. **Scope:** The indicator is aggregated.

9. **Caveats:** No weakness or limitation. No proxy or surrogate. Source of data does not have a bias. No caveats.

10.   **Responsible Person:** Tracking Manager, Licensing and Compliance,

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

Program: **GAMING PROGRAM**

Objective: **I.2**

Indicator Name: **Number of video gaming administrative action and denial files Returned to State Police**

1. **Type and Level**: Output - General

2. **Rationale:** It is necessary to track to support the outcome measures.

3. **Use:** The indicator will be used for management purposes and for performance-based budgeting as an indicator of workload.

4. **Clarity:** Indicator clearly identifies what is being measured. Indicator does not contain jargon or acronyms.

5. **Validity, Reliability and Accuracy:** No, the indicator is valid.

6. **Data Source, Collection and Reporting:** The Gaming Case Tracking program tracks all data related to performance indicators. All data will be reported on a monthly basis.

7. **Calculation Methodology:** Standard calculation by calculating the number of video gaming administrative action and denial files returned to State Police.

8. **Scope:** The indicator is aggregated.

9. **Caveats:** No weakness or limitation. No proxy or surrogate. Source of data does not have a bias. No caveats.

10.   **Responsible Person:** Tracking Manager, Licensing and Compliance,

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

Program: **GAMING PROGRAM**

Objective: **I.2**

Indicator Name: **Average number of business days from assignment of video gaming Administrative action and denial files until forwarded to the Louisiana Gaming Control Board**

Indicator LaPAS PI Code: 21885

1. **Type and Level**: Efficiency - Supporting

2. **Rationale:** It is necessary to track to support the outcome measures.

3. **Use:** The indicator will be used for management purposes and for performance-based budgeting as an indicator of workload.

4. **Clarity:** Indicator clearly identifies what is being measured. Indicator does not contain jargon or acronyms.

5. **Validity, Reliability and Accuracy:** No, the indicator is valid.

6. **Data Source, Collection and Reporting:** The Gaming Case Tracking program tracks all data related to performance indicators. All data will be reported on a monthly basis.

7. **Calculation Methodology:** Standard calculation by calculating the average number of business days from assignment of video gaming administrative action and denial files until forwarded to Board.

8. **Scope:** The indicator is aggregated.

9. **Caveats:** No weakness or limitation. No proxy or surrogate. Source of data does not have a bias. No caveats.

10.   **Responsible Person:** Tracking Manager, Licensing and Compliance,

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

Program: **GAMING PROGRAM**

Objective: **I.2**

Indicator Name: **Number of video gaming administrative action and denial files processed within 60 business days of assignment**

1. **Type and Level**: Efficiency - Supporting

2. **Rationale:** It is necessary to track to support the outcome measures.

3. **Use:** The indicator will be used for management purposes and for performance-based budgeting as an indicator of workload.

4. **Clarity:** Indicator clearly identifies what is being measured. Indicator does not contain jargon or acronyms.

5. **Validity, Reliability and Accuracy:** No, the indicator is valid.

6. **Data Source, Collection and Reporting:** The Gaming Case Tracking program tracks all data related to performance indicators. All data will be reported on a monthly basis.

7. **Calculation Methodology:** Standard calculation by counting the number of number of video gaming administrative action and denial files processed within 60 business days of assignment.

8. **Scope:** The indicator is aggregated.

9. **Caveats:** No weakness or limitation. No proxy or surrogate. Source of data does not have a bias. No caveats.

10.   **Responsible Person:** Tracking Manager, Licensing and Compliance,

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

Program: **GAMING PROGRAM**

Objective: **I.2**

Indicator Name: **Percent of video gaming administrative action and denial files processed within 60 business days of assignment**

Indicator LaPAS PI Code: 21884

1. **Type and Level**: Outcome - Key

2. **Rationale:** It is necessary to track to support the outcome measures.

3. **Use:** The indicator will be used for management purposes and for performance-based budgeting as an indicator of workload.

4. **Clarity:** Indicator clearly identifies what is being measured. Indicator does not contain jargon or acronyms.

5. **Validity, Reliability and Accuracy:** No, the indicator is valid.

6. **Data Source, Collection and Reporting:** The Gaming Case Tracking program tracks all data related to performance indicators. All data will be reported on a monthly basis.

7. **Calculation Methodology:** Standard calculation by calculating the percent of video gaming administrative action and denial files processed within 60 business days of assignment.

8. **Scope:** The indicator is aggregated.

9. **Caveats:** No weakness or limitation. No proxy or surrogate. Source of data does not have a bias. No caveats.

10. **Responsible Person:** Tracking Manager, Licensing and Compliance,

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

Program: **GAMING PROGRAM**

Objective: **I.2**

Indicator Name: **Number of complex video gaming administrative action and denial files processed in more than 60 business days of assignment**

Indicator LaPAS PI Code: 23425

1. **Type and Level**: Outcome - General

2. **Rationale:** It is necessary to track to support the outcome measures.

3. **Use:** The indicator will be used for management purposes and for performance-based budgeting as an indicator of workload.

4. **Clarity:** Indicator clearly identifies what is being measured. Indicator does not contain jargon or acronyms.

5. **Validity, Reliability and Accuracy:** No, the indicator is valid.

6. **Data Source, Collection and Reporting:** The Gaming Case Tracking program tracks all data related to performance indicators. All data will be reported on a monthly basis.

7. **Calculation Methodology:** Standard calculation by counting the number of complex video gaming administrative action and denial files processed in more than 60 business days of assignment.

8. **Scope:** The indicator is aggregated.

9. **Caveats:** No weakness or limitation. No proxy or surrogate. Source of data does not have a bias. No caveats.

10.   **Responsible Person:** Tracking Manager, Licensing and Compliance,

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

Program: **GAMING PROGRAM**

Objective: **I.3**

Indicator Name: **Number of casino gaming administrative action and denial files received from State Police**

1. **Type and Level**: Input - General

2. **Rationale:** It is necessary to track to support the outcome measures.

3. **Use:** The indicator will be used for management purposes and for performance-based budgeting as an indicator of workload.

4. **Clarity:** Indicator clearly identifies what is being measured. Indicator does not contain jargon or acronyms.

5. **Validity, Reliability and Accuracy:** No, the indicator is valid.

6. **Data Source, Collection and Reporting:** The Gaming Case Tracking program tracks all data related to performance indicators. All data will be reported on a monthly basis.

7. **Calculation Methodology:** Standard calculation by counting the number of casino gaming administrative action and denial files received from State Police.

8. **Scope:** The indicator is aggregated.

9. **Caveats:** No weakness or limitation. No proxy or surrogate. Source of data does not have a bias. No caveats.

10.   **Responsible Person:** Tracking Manager, Licensing and Compliance,

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

Program: **GAMING PROGRAM**

Objective: **I.3**

Indicator Name: **Number of casino gaming administrative action and denial files processed by Licensing and Compliance**

Indicator LaPAS PI Code: 11895

1. **Type and Level**: Output - General

2. **Rationale:** It is necessary to track to support the outcome measures.

3. **Use:** The indicator will be used for management purposes and for performance-based budgeting as an indicator of workload.

4. **Clarity:** Indicator clearly identifies what is being measured. Indicator does not contain jargon or acronyms.

5. **Validity, Reliability and Accuracy:** No, the indicator is valid.

6. **Data Source, Collection and Reporting:** The Gaming Case Tracking program tracks all data related to performance indicators. All data will be reported on a monthly basis.

7. **Calculation Methodology:** Standard calculation by counting the number of casino gaming administrative action and denial files processed by Licensing and Compliance.

8. **Scope:** The indicator is aggregated.

9. **Caveats:** No weakness or limitation. No proxy or surrogate. Source of data does not have a bias. No caveats.

10.   **Responsible Person:** Tracking Manager, Licensing and Compliance,

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

Program: **GAMING PROGRAM**

Objective: **I.3**

Indicator Name: **Number of casino gaming administrative action and denial files returned to State Police**

1. **Type and Level**: Output - General

2. **Rationale:** It is necessary to track to support the outcome measures.

3. **Use:** The indicator will be used for management purposes and for performance-based budgeting as an indicator of workload.

4. **Clarity:** Indicator clearly identifies what is being measured. Indicator does not contain jargon or acronyms.

5. **Validity, Reliability and Accuracy:** No, the indicator is valid.

6. **Data Source, Collection and Reporting:** The Gaming Case Tracking program tracks all data related to performance indicators. All data will be reported on a monthly basis.

7. **Calculation Methodology:** Standard calculation by counting the number of casino gaming administrative action and denial files returned to State Police.

8. **Scope:** The indicator is aggregated.

9. **Caveats:** No weakness or limitation. No proxy or surrogate. Source of data does not have a bias. No caveats.

10.   **Responsible Person:** Tracking Manager, Licensing and Compliance,

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

Program: **GAMING PROGRAM**

Objective: **I.3**

Indicator Name: **Average number of business days from assignment of casino gaming administrative action and denial files until forwarded to Louisiana Gaming Control Board**

Indicator LaPAS PI Code: 10464

1. **Type and Level**: Efficiency - Supporting

2. **Rationale:** It is necessary to track to support the outcome measures.

3. **Use:** The indicator will be used for management purposes and for performance-based budgeting as an indicator of workload.

4. **Clarity:** Indicator clearly identifies what is being measured. Indicator does not contain jargon or acronyms.

5. **Validity, Reliability and Accuracy:** No, the indicator is valid.

6. **Data Source, Collection and Reporting:** The Gaming Case Tracking program tracks all data related to performance indicators. All data will be reported on a monthly basis.

7. **Calculation Methodology:** Standard calculation by calculating the average number of business days from assignment of casino administrative action and denial files until forwarded to Board.

8. **Scope:** The indicator is aggregated.

9. **Caveats:** No weakness or limitation. No proxy or surrogate. Source of data does not have a bias. No caveats.

10.   **Responsible Person:** Tracking Manager, Licensing and Compliance,

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

Program: **GAMING PROGRAM**

Objective: **I.3**

Indicator Name: **Percentage of casino gaming administrative action and denial files processed within 30 business days of assignment**

Indicator LaPAS PI Code: 21886

1. **Type and Level**: Outcome - Key

2. **Rationale:** It is necessary to track to support the outcome measures.

3. **Use:** The indicator will be used for management purposes and for performance-based budgeting as an indicator of workload.

4. **Clarity:** Indicator clearly identifies what is being measured. Indicator does not contain jargon or acronyms.

5. **Validity, Reliability and Accuracy:** No, the indicator is valid.

6. **Data Source, Collection and Reporting:** The Gaming Case Tracking program tracks all data related to performance indicators. All data will be reported on a monthly basis.

7. **Calculation Methodology:** Standard calculation by calculating the percent of casino gaming administrative action and denial files processed within 30 business days of assignment.

8. **Scope:** The indicator is aggregated.

9. **Caveats:** No weakness or limitation. No proxy or surrogate. Source of data does not have a bias. No caveats.

10. **Responsible Person:** Tracking Manager, Licensing and Compliance,

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

Program: **GAMING PROGRAM**

Objective: **I.3**

Indicator Name: **Number of complex casino gaming administrative action and denial files processed in more than 30 business days of assignment**

Indicator LaPAS PI Code: New

1. **Type and Level**: Outcome - General

2. **Rationale:** It is necessary to track to support the outcome measures.

3. **Use:** The indicator will be used for management purposes and for performance-based budgeting as an indicator of workload.

4. **Clarity:** Indicator clearly identifies what is being measured. Indicator does not contain jargon or acronyms.

5. **Validity, Reliability and Accuracy:** No, the indicator is valid.

6. **Data Source, Collection and Reporting:** The Gaming Case Tracking program tracks all data related to performance indicators. All data will be reported on a monthly basis.

7. **Calculation Methodology:** Standard calculation by counting the number of complex casino gaming administrative action and denial files processed in more than 30 business days of assignment.

8. **Scope:** The indicator is aggregated.

9. **Caveats:** No weakness or limitation. No proxy or surrogate. Source of data does not have a bias. No caveats.

10.   **Responsible Person:** Tracking Manager, Licensing and Compliance,

THE DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

2024-2028 STRATEGIC PLAN

LITIGATION PROGRAM SITUATION INVENTORY

INTERNAL:

1.   Our major customer is the Office of Risk Management. Additional customers are the state officials and employees to whom we provide a defense when they are sued.
2.   The major change is the increased efforts made to move cases assigned to in-house and contract attorneys to completion. This has resulted in a significant reduction in the number of open cases in litigation and a reduction in outside counsel fees.
3.   The Program continues to provide legal representation of the state, state officials and state employees when sued over events arising out of the activities of state government. Additionally, the Program advises the Office of Risk Management on pre-litigation claims.
4.   Strengths include the core group of experienced attorneys, updated computer equipment, and the use of regional offices.

EXTERNAL:

1.   External threats to the Program include budget cuts affecting hiring and retention of qualified personnel.
2.   External factor that is beyond the control of the Program that could significantly affect the achievement of its goals and objectives is the number of suits that are filed which the Office of Risk Management sends to the Litigation Program for defense.
3.   Another external factor is the number of attorneys available to handle the defense of suits.

STRATEGY ANALYSIS CHECKLIST

Program: **LITIGATION**

Objective I.1:   Through the Litigation Program, to handle in-house at least 85% of new risk litigation cases opened each fiscal year by June 30, 2028.

Strategies

           I.1.a: Management shall review case assignment reports on a monthly basis.

           I.1.b: Management shall, in it's hiring practices, attempt to ensure as wide a range of specialization and experience as possible.

           I.1.c: Management shall monitor attorney workload and progress to ensure that cases are handled efficiently

Analysis
- _____ Cost/benefit analysis conducted
- [X] Other analysis used
- _____ Impact on other strategies considered

Authorization
- [X] Authorization exists
- _____ Authorization needed

Organization Capacity
- _____ Needed structural or procedural changes identified
- [X] Resource needs identified

Time Frame
- [X] Already ongoing
- _____ New, startup date estimated
- _____ Lifetime of strategy identified

Fiscal Impact
- [X] Impact on operating budget
- _____ Impact on capital outlay budget
- _____ Means of finance identified

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

Program: **Litigation Program**

Objective: **I.1**

Indicator Name: Number of new cases received by the Litigation Program in the fiscal year.

Indicator LaPAS PI Code: 13980

1. **Type and Level**: Input - Supporting

2. **Rationale:** It is necessary to track to support the outcome measures.

3. **Use:** It will be used for internal management purposes and performance-based budgeting as an indicator of workload.

4. **Clarity:** Clearly identified.

5. **Validity, Reliability and Accuracy:** No, the indicator is valid.

6. **Data Source, Collection and Reporting:** Internal database (Litigation Case Tracking), tracked monthly. It is reported in "real time" and the report used is the "New Case Assignment".

7. **Calculation Methodology:** This is a standard calculation of the number of new cases reported in the case tracking data based on a monthly basis.

8. **Scope:** This is aggregated and it can be broken down to section/office level and by type of litigation.

9. **Caveats:** The data is as accurate as the information entered into the system.

10. **Responsible Person:** Litigation Chief Administrative Officer

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

Program: **Litigation Program**

Objective: **I.1**

Indicator Name: Number of open cases.

Indicator LaPAS PI Code: 13968

1. **Type and Level**: Output - Supporting

2. **Rationale:** It is necessary to track to support the outcome measures.

3. **Use:** It will be used for internal management purposes and performance-based budgeting as an indicator of workload.

4. **Clarity:** Clearly identified.

5. **Validity, Reliability and Accuracy:** No, the indicator is valid.

6. **Data Source, Collection and Reporting:** Internal database, tracked monthly. It is reported in "real time". The report used is "Cumulative Total Open Cases"

7. **Calculation Methodology:** This is a standard calculation of the number of open cases reported in the case tracking database on a monthly bases for in-house and contract attorney.

8. **Scope:** This is aggregated and it can be broken down by in-house, section/office, type of litigation and contract.

9. **Caveats:** The data is as accurate as the information entered into the system.

10. **Responsible Person:** Litigation Chief Administrative Officer

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

Program: **Litigation Program**

Objective: **I.1**

Indicator Name: Number of open cases handled by contract attorneys.

Indicator LaPAS PI Code: 531

1. **Type and Level**: Output - Supporting

2. **Rationale:** It is necessary to track to support the outcome measures.

3. **Use:** It will be used for internal management purposes and performance-based budgeting as an indicator of workload.

4. **Clarity:** Clearly identified.

5. **Validity, Reliability and Accuracy:** No, the indicator is valid.

6. **Data Source, Collection and Reporting:** Internal database, tracked monthly. It is reported in "real time". The data used from the "The report used is "Cumulative Total Open Cases"

7. **Calculation Methodology:** This is a standard calculation of the number of open cases reported in the case tracking database on a monthly bases for contract attorneys.

8. **Scope:** This is aggregated and it can be broken down by the number of cases contracted to outside counsel and by type of litigation.

9. **Caveats:** The data is as accurate as the information entered into the system.

10. **Responsible Person**: Litigation Chief Administrative Officer

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

Program: **Litigation Program**

Objective: **I.1**

Indicator Name: Number of open cases handled in-house.

Indicator LaPAS PI Code: 528

1. **Type and Level**: Output - Supporting

2. **Rationale:** It is necessary to track to support the outcome measures.

3. **Use:** It will be used for internal management purposes and performance-based budgeting as an indicator of workload.

4. **Clarity:** Clearly identified.

5. **Validity, Reliability and Accuracy:** No, the indicator is valid.

6. **Data Source, Collection and Reporting:** Internal database, tracked monthly. It is reported in "real time". The report used is "Cumulative Total Open Cases" "

7. **Calculation Methodology:** This is a standard calculation of the number of open cases reported in the case tracking database on a monthly bases for in-house attorneys.

8. **Scope:** This is aggregated and it can be broken down by section/office and type of litigation.

9. **Caveats:** The data is as accurate as the information entered into the system.

10. **Responsible Person:** Litigation Chief Administrative Officer

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

Program: **Litigation Program**

Objective: **I.1**

Indicator Name: Number of new cases assigned to contract attorney.

Indicator LaPAS PI Code: 13981

1. **Type and Level**: Output - Supporting

2. **Rationale:** It is necessary to track to support the outcome measures.

3. **Use:** It will be used for internal management purposes and performance-based budgeting as an indicator of workload.

4. **Clarity:** Clearly identified.

5. **Validity, Reliability and Accuracy:** No, the indicator is valid.

6. **Data Source, Collection and Reporting:** Internal database, tracked monthly. It is reported in "real time". The report used is "New Assignments" "

7. **Calculation Methodology:** This is a standard calculation of the number of new cases assigned and reported in the case tracking database on a monthly bases for contract attorneys.

8. **Scope:** This is aggregated and it can be broken down by the number of cases contracted to outside counsel.

9. **Caveats:** The data is as accurate as the information entered into the system.

10. **Responsible Person:** Litigation Chief Administrative Officer

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

Program: **Litigation Program**

Objective: **I.1**

Indicator Name: Number of new cases assigned in-house.

Indicator LaPAS PI Code: 13982

1. **Type and Level**: Output - Supporting

2. **Rationale:** It is necessary to track to support the outcome measures.

3. **Use:** It will be used for internal management purposes and performance-based budgeting as an indicator of workload.

4. **Clarity:** Clearly identified.

5. **Validity, Reliability and Accuracy:** No, the indicator is valid.

6. **Data Source, Collection and Reporting:** Internal database, tracked monthly. It is reported in "real time". The report used is "Cumulative Total Open Cases" "

7. **Calculation Methodology:** This is a standard calculation of the number of new cases assigned and reported in the case tracking database on a monthly bases for in-house counsel.

8. **Scope:** This is aggregated and it can be broken down by section/office and type of litigation.

9. **Caveats:** The data is as accurate as the information entered into the system.

10. **Responsible Person**: Litigation Chief Administrative Officer

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

Program: **Litigation Program**

Objective: **I.1**

Indicator Name: Percentage of Open Cases handled by In-house Attorneys

Indicator LaPAS PI Code: 13983

1. **Type and Level**: Output - Supporting

2. **Rationale:** It is necessary to track to support the outcome measures.

3. **Use:** It will be used for internal management purposes and performance-based budgeting as an indicator of workload.

4. **Clarity:** Clearly identified.

5. **Validity, Reliability and Accuracy:** No, the indicator is valid.

6. **Data Source, Collection and Reporting:** Internal database, tracked monthly. It is reported in "real time". "Cumulative Total Open Cases"

7. **Calculation Methodology:** Number of open cases handled by in-house attorneys divided by the total number of open cases.

8. **Scope:** This is aggregated it can be broken by the number of cases handled by in-house attorneys.

9. **Caveats:** The data is as accurate as the information entered into the system.

10. **Responsible Person**: Litigation Chief Administrative Officer

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

Program: **Litigation Program**

Objective: **I.1**

Indicator Name: Percentage of Open Cases handled by Contract Attorneys

Indicator LaPAS PI Code: 13971

1. **Type and Level**: Output - Supporting

2. **Rationale:** It is necessary to track to support the outcome measures.

3. **Use:** It will be used for internal management purposes and performance-based budgeting as an indicator of workload.

4. **Clarity:** Clearly identified.

5. **Validity, Reliability and Accuracy:** No, the indicator is valid.

6. **Data Source, Collection and Reporting:** Internal database, tracked monthly. It is reported in "real time". The report used is "Cumulative Total Open Cases"

7. **Calculation Methodology:** Number of open cases handled by contract attorneys divided by the total number of open cases.

8. **Scope:** This is aggregated it can be broken by the number of cases handled by contract attorneys

9. **Caveats:** The data is as accurate as the information entered into the system.

10. **Responsible Person:** Litigation Chief Administrative Officer

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

Program: **Litigation Program**

Objective: **I.1**

Indicator Name: Average number of days open for open contract attorney cases.

Indicator LaPAS PI Code: 21876

1. **Type and Level**: Efficiency - Supporting

2. **Rationale:** It is necessary to track to support the outcome measures.

3. **Use:** It will be used for internal management purposes and performance-based budgeting as an indicator of workload.

4. **Clarity:** Clearly identified.

5. **Validity, Reliability and Accuracy:** No, the indicator is valid.

6. **Data Source, Collection and Reporting:** Internal database, tracked monthly. It is reported in "real time". This report will be developed by MIS.

7. **Calculation Methodology:** Ratio of average days open for open cases for contract attorneys

8. **Scope:** This is aggregated

9. **Caveats:** The data is as accurate as the information entered into the system.

10. **Responsible Person**: Litigation Chief Administrative Officer

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

Program: **Litigation Program**

Objective: **I.1**

Indicator Name: Average number of days open for open in-house attorney cases.

Indicator LaPAS PI Code: 21877

1. **Type and Level**: Efficiency - Supporting

2. **Rationale:** It is necessary to track to support the outcome measures.

3. **Use:** It will be used for internal management purposes and performance-based budgeting as an indicator of workload.

4. **Clarity:** Clearly identified.

5. **Validity, Reliability and Accuracy:** No, the indicator is valid.

6. **Data Source, Collection and Reporting:** Internal database, tracked monthly. It is reported in "real time". This report will be developed by MIS.

7. **Calculation Methodology:** Total number days open for open cases for in-house attorneys divided by number of cases.

8. **Scope:** This is aggregated

9. **Caveats:** The data is as accurate as the information entered into the system.

10. Responsible Person: Litigation Chief Administrative Officer

---

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

Program: **Litigation Program**

Objective: **I.1**

Indicator Name: Percentage of cases handled in-house.

Indicator LaPAS PI Code: 527

1. **Type and Level**: Outcome - Key

2. **Rationale:** It is a necessary indicator to track the reduction of cases assigned to outside attorneys.

3. **Use:** It will be used for internal management purposes and performance-based budgeting as an indicator of workload.

4. **Clarity:** Clearly identified.

5. **Validity, Reliability and Accuracy:** No, the indicator is valid.

6. **Data Source, Collection and Reporting:** Internal database, tracked monthly. It is reported in "real time".

7. **Calculation Methodology:** Percentage of all new risk litigation cases divided by the number of new cases assigned to in-house attorneys monthly.

8. **Scope:** This is aggregated

9. **Caveats:** The data is as accurate as the information entered into the system.

10. **Responsible Person:** Litigation Chief Administrative Officer