

# **TABLE OF CONTENTS**

Department Vision, Mission, Philosophy, and Goals	3
Department Summary	5
Human Resource Policies Beneficial to Women and Families	6
Maintenance of Agency Records	6
Strategic Planning Process	6
Avoidance of Duplication of Efforts	7
Administrative Program	
Mission and Program Activities	8
Objectives	12
Supporting Documentation	15
Performance Indicator Documentation	17
Civil Law Program	
Mission and Program Activities	26
Objectives	35
Supporting Documentation	54
Performance Indicator Documentation	64
Criminal Law and Medicaid Fraud Program	
Mission and Program Activities	150
Objectives	154
Supporting Documentation	168
Performance Indicator Documentation	171
Risk Litigation Program	
Mission and Program Activities	245
Objectives	250
Supporting Documentation	252
Performance Indicator Documentation	253
Gaming Program	
Mission and Program Activities	264
Objectives	266
Supporting Documentation	271
Performance Indicator Documentation	273
Addendum 1	
Top Five Performance Indicators	300

#### Louisiana Department of Justice

#### VISION

The vision of the Louisiana Department of Justice is to create a safer, stronger, and more just Louisiana where the rights of every citizen are protected, the law is applied fairly, and public trust in government is earned and upheld. The department aspires to be a model of legal excellence and ethical leadership, ensuring a justice system that is accessible, impartial, and transparent; communities that are secure from crime, fraud, and exploitation; a government that is accountable and serves with integrity; and a future where justice and opportunity are shared by all Louisianans. Through innovation, collaboration, and a steadfast commitment to the people, the department seeks to build lasting confidence in the rule of law and the promise of justice for generations to come.

#### MISSION

The mission of the Louisiana Department of Justice is to protect the rights and safety of the people of Louisiana through the fair, effective, and ethical enforcement of the law. The department is committed to upholding justice, defending the Constitutions of Louisiana and the United States, combating crime, safeguarding consumers, and ensuring public trust through transparency, accountability, and dedicated public service.

#### PHILOSOPHY

The philosophy of the Louisiana Department of Justice is rooted in the principles of justice, integrity, service, and accountability. It is guided by a steadfast commitment to the rule of law, equal protection under the law, and the belief that government must serve the people with fairness and transparency. The department prioritizes protecting public safety by vigorously enforcing criminal laws, supporting law enforcement, and combating corruption and abuse; defending constitutional rights and ensuring due process for all citizens; serving the public interest by holding powerful interests accountable, safeguarding consumers, and promoting ethical governance; and upholding public trust through professionalism, responsiveness, and a deep respect for the diverse communities of Louisiana. At its core, the philosophy reflects a dedication to justice not as an abstract concept, but as a daily responsibility to the people it serves.

#### GOALS

These goals reflect the department's commitment to justice, service, and the protection of all people across Louisiana.

I. The department will protect public safety by combating violent crime, drug trafficking, human trafficking, and organized criminal activity. This will be accomplished by supporting law enforcement agencies and leading strong prosecutions.

- II. The department will uphold the rule of law by ensuring that the laws of Louisiana and the United States are enforced fairly and consistently, preserving constitutional rights and due process for all.
- III. The department will defend state interests by representing the State of Louisiana in legal matters, including litigation, appeals, and federal challenges, to protect the state's rights, resources, and citizens.
- IV. The department will promote government accountability by investigating and addressing public corruption, misuse of public funds, and unethical conduct by government officials or agencies.
- V. The department will protect consumers and seniors by enforcing consumer protection laws, combating scams and fraud, particularly those targeting vulnerable populations, and advocating for transparency and fairness in business practices.
- VI. The department will educate and engage the public by increasing public awareness of legal rights, public safety issues, and state initiatives through outreach, training, and community partnerships.
- VII. The department will support victims of crime by ensuring victims are treated with dignity and providing the resources, information, and assistance they need throughout the justice process.

The Louisiana Department of Justice (LADOJ) is the largest law firm in the state. In addition to being a regulatory agency, it defends the constitutional rights of the citizens of Louisiana; it defends the state against lawsuits brought against legislation passed by the Louisiana Legislature; and it prosecutes crimes on behalf of, and/or committed by, the citizens of Louisiana. The department is comprised of five programs: Administrative, Civil Law, Criminal Law and Medicaid Fraud, Risk Litigation, and Gaming.

#### Administrative Program

The Administrative Program administers the Executive Office of the Attorney General, the Chief Deputy Attorney General, and the Administrative Services Division. The program provides managerial oversight for the department. The program's functions also include debt collection.

#### Civil Law Program

The Civil Law Program is responsible for providing a full range of civil legal services requested by the officers and agencies of the state. It administers the Civil Division, the Public Protection Division, and the Federalism Division. The program's functions include the assertion and protection of any right or interest of the State of Louisiana, the legal representation of governmental officers, agencies, boards or commissions, the collection of money owed to the State of Louisiana and its agencies, boards, or commissions, the legal protection of state lands, water bottoms, and natural resources, and the active state supervision over boards and commissions that opt into the Occupational Licensing Review Program (OLRP).

## Criminal Law and Medicaid Fraud Program

The Criminal Law and Medicaid Fraud Program prosecutes criminal cases and other matters referred to the department, investigates violations of criminal laws, protects the Medicaid Program and its beneficiaries from fraud, waste, and abuse, maintains integrity in government through investigations of public corruption, assists and protects the state's gaming industry from corruption, prosecutes insurance fraud, maintains an appellate section, and serves all other investigative needs of the department. It administers the Criminal Division, and the Louisiana Bureau of Investigation (LBI) Division.

## **<u>Risk Litigation Program</u>**

The Risk Litigation Program is responsible for providing legal representation to the State of Louisiana, its officers, agents, employees, boards, and commissions in all tort claims seeking damages. The program defends claims managed by the Office of Risk Management (ORM) and by any post-secondary education institution granted an exemption from the state's risk management program.

#### **Gaming Program**

The Gaming Program works to regulate the licensure of the gaming industry by providing oversight to individual gaming entities through the regulation of persons, practices, associations, and activities. It also supports and administers necessary corrective rulemaking and legislation.

## Human Resource Policies Beneficial to Women and Families

The LADOJ strives to maintain a workplace where all employees, including women and families, thrive and are able to reach their full potential. The department instituted a parental leave policy, wherein qualifying employees receive up to six weeks of paid parental leave for births, adoptions, and foster care related to qualifying events. The department also maintains a flexible work policy that allows employees options to choose a work schedule that is outside of core business hours, to facilitate the accommodation of their personal and family needs. The alternate work schedules may begin as early as 6:30 a.m. for Peace Officer Standards and Training certified employees and as early as 7:00 a.m. for all other full-time employees. Furthermore, the LADOJ also has an option to compress the workweek into a 4-day or a 4 ½-day work week, depending upon the employee's Fair Labor Standards Act status.

The LADOJ has an extensive list of employee resources via an internally created Employee Assistance Program that provides tools and guidance to employees and/or family members. The department follows the federal and state guidelines for all state laws including, but not limited to, the Family and Medical Leave Act, the Americans with Disabilities Act, the Pregnancy Discrimination Act, and the Affordable Care Act. Close proximity parking for expectant mothers and a lactation room upon their return into the workforce is provided by the department. Finally, the LADOJ has a Crisis Leave Policy in place that allows a mother to request up to 120 hours of paid leave following the birth of a child while the mother recovers.

#### Maintenance of Agency Records

The LADOJ has an internal electronic filing storage system that allows the department to store a greater volume of documentation that needs to be retained and protected. This system allows the department to generate reports that are more reliable and standardized, and over the years, this system has been revised as needed to ensure that the missions of the LADOJ are met and the citizens of the State of Louisiana are properly represented. The department has the capability to store and retrieve information pertaining to legal documents, accounting documents, human resource files, contracts and performance measurements of the agency.

#### **Strategic Planning Process**

The department's Strategic Plan for Fiscal Year (FY) 2027 - 2031 was developed using a combination of the Undersecretary Management Report, i.e. Annual Management and Program Analysis Report, and an analysis of the programs by the division directors. That analysis considered many factors including financial and performance audits, as well as strategies and action plans in place in order to formulate objectives to identify the department's strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, and threats. The department's plan was updated to reflect changes made to progress the programs towards accomplishing their goals and objectives. The data used in the revision of the Strategic Plan will be preserved and maintained in accordance with the department's approved retention schedule.

## **Avoidance of Duplication of Efforts**

There are no duplication of efforts within the department's programs. Each of the five programs perform functions independent of each other, and each have mandates that are unique to their program. There is no overlapping or duplication of responsibilities or functions between the programs or with other state departments and agencies.

# **ADMINISTRATIVE PROGRAM**

# Mission

The mission of the Administrative Program is to provide superior services to the citizens of Louisiana, to provide management support and oversight to the LADOJ, and to provide support to other governmental entities in the federal, state, and local sectors.

# **Program Activities**

The Administrative Program includes the Executive Office of the Attorney General and the Chief Deputy Attorney General/Chief Deputy Attorney General, provide leadership, policy development, and administrative services, including management and finance functions, coordination of departmental planning, professional services contracts, mail distribution, human resource management and payroll, employee training and development, property control and telecommunications, safety, and internal/external communications.

This division is currently divided into 11 sections: Finance, Accounting, and Budget; Contracts, Grants, and Procurement; Human Resources (HR); Safety, Training, and Workers' Compensation; Property Control, Central Receiving, Fleet Management, and Mail Operations; Governmental Services; Information Technology Systems (IT); Constituent Services; Communications; Outreach; and Collections.

## Finance, Accounting, and Budget

The Finance, Accounting, and Budget Section is responsible for receiving and classifying all revenues, processing vendor payments and employee reimbursements, and preparing fiscal reports in accordance with policies and procedures established by the Louisiana Legislature, Division of Administration, and other related state departments.

This section is also responsible for maintaining and tracking the department's budget, conceiving methods of accountability for all of the LADOJ programs. It also develops, maintains, and operates a performance based management system within the LADOJ.

## Contracts, Grants, and Procurement

The Contracts, Grants, and Procurement Section is responsible for coordinating all purchases, including the procurement of the cellphones, wireless devices, and data plans for the department. It is also responsible for reviewing and processing professional, consulting, and all other contracts and memorandums of understanding, tracking federal grant awards and related expenditures, and coordinating all purchases and auditing all purchasing card transactions to ensure adherence to all federal and state laws, policies, rules, and regulations.

# Human Resources

The HR Section is responsible for the management of new, existing, and retired employees at the LADOJ. In order to ensure their core duties are fulfilled, this section's duties include recruitment, selection, and placement of new hires, including their orientation and onboarding, performance

based classification and compensation structures, application management, organizational structure management, employee relations, including grievances and discipline, employee recognition and awards, benefits administration, including insurance and retirement, payroll and time administration, and compliance with all federal and state labor laws.

# Safety, Training, and Workers Compensation

The Safety, Training, and Workers Compensation Section ensures departmental compliance with all mandatory trainings, such as Defensive Driving, Blood Borne Pathogens, Ethics, Sexual Harassment Prevention, and all other internal policies and procedures. This section also manages the department's participation with the statewide Comprehensive Public Training Program (CPTP), manages all issues related to on the job injuries and illnesses, reviews all current and new statewide worker's compensation laws to ensure that ORM safety regulations, trainings, and reporting obligations are performed, and ensures compliance for the annual safety audit. Annual certifications of LADOJ employees' driving records are conducted to ensure adherence with ORM policies.

The training team facilitates an annual continuing legal education (CLE) conference for approximately 250 assistant attorneys general, paralegals, legal administrators, and law clerks employed at LADOJ. This section also hosts several other annual conferences, such as a leadership conference for all employees holding manager titles, a domestic violence awareness and prevention conference, and many division-specific conferences. The training team maintains the active LADOJ directory with the National Association of Attorneys General and Practising Law Institute, and coordinates trainings and conferences in conjunction with programs offered by these entities.

The training team anticipates beginning to offer Accident Prevention training to employees. A training plan for current supervisory employees, and those looking to merge onto the supervisor track, is also currently being developed.

## Property Control/Central Receiving /Fleet Management/Mail Operation

The Property Control, Central Receiving, Fleet Management, and Mail Operation Section is responsible for managing and providing statewide oversight and assistance for LADOJ's property, processing Risk Management insurance claims, managing a fleet inventory of approximately 140 state vehicles, the related vehicle assignments and maintenance, and any new vehicle purchases and surplus processing, managing a tagged inventory of over \$10 million in property assets located in the Livingston Building in Baton Rouge and in the eight satellite office locations across the state, as well as managing the fuel card program for the department. The duties of this section includes certifying and maintaining inventory of all movable property purchased by the department, conducting an annual physical inventory and audit at the nine offices located statewide, recording, processing, and approving requests for personal assignment or home storage of state vehicles, daily pool vehicle usage, vehicle maintenance and title, registration, and licenses for the LADOJ's entire fleet inventory and other tagged equipment. This section ensures all incoming and outgoing mail, commodities, and packages for the entire department are timely and accurately delivered.

## **Governmental Services**

The Governmental Services Section assists local officials and facilitates effective communication between public entities and the LADOJ, which supports the Administrative Program's strategic goal of providing superior legal and professional services to Louisiana citizens, private sector organizations, and all governmental entities.

This section maintains the training portal and content for approximately 850 justices of the peace and constables statewide, providing education and support to those elected officials. The section is comprised of a team of highly skilled individuals who develop program training criteria, including an annual arrest warrants course for the justices of the peace, online courses, and inperson training conferences that are held bi-annually. Additional trainings are offered regionally. Daily legal assistance is provided to the justices of the peace and constables as needed.

Resources developed and provided by the LADOJ to the justices of the peace and constables are the Louisiana Justice Court Training Portal (www.lajpctraining.com), Justice Court Training Manual, Justice Court legal forms, numerous online and in-person training courses, and legal assistance. This section maintains the justices of the peace and constables training attendance and term information database, the training website, the justices of the peace and constables' phone line, and they provide information regarding justices of the peace and constables on the department's website. All citizens, governmental entities, and the judicial system benefit because this section provides superior legal and professional services to justices of the peace and constables across Louisiana.

## Information Technology Systems

The IT Section is responsible for coordinating all information technology services for the department. This includes assisting divisions in analyzing their computer equipment and technology needs, designing custom applications, training department employees in the use of hardware and software, responding to requests for computer service through the operation of a Help Desk, providing litigation support, maintaining a wide area network linking all computers in nine buildings statewide, and purchasing and coordinating the installation of all telecommunications equipment.

## **Constituent Services**

The Constituent Services Section serves as the first point of contact for the LADOJ. This section answers phone calls, voicemails, emails, and mail, directing constituents to the appropriate department or external resource. The Constituent Services representatives track each inquiry using a ticketing system and they generate monthly reports to track the volume of inquiries they receive.

## **Communications**

The Communications Section is the principal liaison between the Office of the Attorney General, the media, and the public. It promotes awareness of the duties and responsibilities associated with the attorney general and the LADOJ. The section oversees all communications to ensure that information is distributed accurately, quickly, and effectively. The Public Information Office has

expanded communications channels by combining traditional outreach methods with new social networking and web-based tools.

# Outreach

The Outreach Section monitors local and state issues and updates leadership accordingly. Each outreach representative serves as a liaison for the attorney general within their region of responsibility and supports the LADOJ's community outreach efforts. Outreach representatives disseminate resources and information on a number of consumer topics aimed at educating citizens and small businesses on issues such as elder fraud, home repair scams, landlord and tenant laws, veterans resources, tips for natural disaster victims, internet safety, and tobacco and vaping prevention for students in middle school and high school. The Outreach Section partners with sheriffs, chiefs of police, district attorneys, victim advocates and others to host regional and statewide trainings for law enforcement officers on domestic violence, human trafficking, and sexual assault. Reaching out to Louisiana's youth is a top priority. Outreach representatives give presentations in elementary, middle and high schools about the harmful effects of vaping and tobacco products, as well as educate students on how to "be smart" and stay safe on the internet. In addition to presentations and trainings, Outreach offers information booths at senior expos, community fairs, trade shows, and conferences. Representatives participate in several awareness programs year-round, including Financial Literacy Month in January, Crime Victims' Rights Week in April, Older American's Month in May, Internet Safety Month in June, Military Consumer Month in July, Drug Take Back Day, Take Back the Night, and National Domestic Violence Awareness Month in October and Veteran's Day in November.

# Collections

The Collections Section represents 27 of Louisiana's public colleges, universities, technical and community colleges, the Louisiana Department of Education, the Board of Regents, and the Office of Student Financial Assistance in the collection and litigation of defaulted educational loans/benefits. Over 95,000 educational accounts valued in excess of \$200 million are currently placed for collection. Additionally, this section represents 29 state agencies, including the Louisiana Department of Revenue, in the pursuit of debts owed to the State of Louisiana for various reasons. This section is totally funded by self-generated revenues deposited in the statutorily dedicated Department of Justice Debt Collection Fund.

## Authorization for Goal(s)

Louisiana Constitution, Article IV, Sections 8 and 13 and Louisiana Revised Statute 36:704(c).

# **Program Goals**

- I. The LADOJ will provide professional services to Louisiana citizens, private sector organizations, and all governmental entities.
- II. The LADOJ will improve the process of recovering monies owed the State of Louisiana and limit the liabilities of the state.

GOAL I The LADOJ will provide superior legal and professional services to Louisiana citizens, private sector organizations, and all governmental entities.

#### **Department Wide Objective**

**Sub-Goal** Provide quality technical support and training for the LADOJ.

Objective I.1Ensure that 95% of new, full-time employees shall attend an administrative<br/>orientation within 60 days after hire each fiscal year by June 30, 2031.Strategy I.1aUpdate the administrative orientation program as office policies,<br/>procedures, and employee programs change.Strategy I.1bOrientation programs shall be scheduled on a monthly basis by HR.<br/>New employees shall be notified during in-processing of their<br/>scheduled orientation date. Reminders will be sent by HR to new<br/>employee and supervisor.

## **Performance Indicators**

Input	Number of new, full-time employees hired
Output	Number of new, full-time employees that have attended an administrative orientation
Outcome	Percentage of new, full-time employees hired that received orientation within 60 days of hire
Efficiency	Average number of new, full-time employees that have attended an administrative orientation

#### Justification

Efficiency and productivity can only be achieved when employees are properly trained in their duties and responsibilities. The LADOJ has changed and increased in size over the past several years. As a result, the HR Section has had to accommodate the growth in employees while maintaining a static number of section employees. However, the continued objective of the HR Section is to provide support services to all LADOJ employees that include routine personnel services, as well as employee and management training. New Hire Orientation guarantees all new employees are given the same information with respect to policy, procedures and expectations, which ensure consistency and accuracy. It also provides new employees the opportunity to meet one another and share in the onboarding experience.

## Benchmarking

Research of offices of other state attorneys general concluded that training in the states of Texas and California is much more comprehensive than in Louisiana. In particular, the attorney general's office in California conducts an extensive legal support-training program. A survey was conducted among the professional employees to determine weaknesses in the skill sets of their employees. They customized their training to address those needs and developed a comprehensive, high quality curriculum. As a result, their legal secretarial training is a two-week program consisting of

modules covering every aspect of a secretary's job in their office and employment expectations of new state employees. Benchmarking examples within Louisiana include the Central Louisiana State Hospital in Rapides Parish, which uses a three-month evaluation of new employees to ensure they are being successful in their new positions, and the Leonard J. Chabert Medical Center in Terrebonne Parish, which uses a system that incorporates Performance Planning and Review tickler notices as well as series of reminder emails and telephone calls to monitor the performance of new employees and to make sure the supervisor plays an active role in helping the new employee learn and adjust to the new environment. If a Performance Planning and Review rating is not timely, a representative from HR completes a one-on-one remediation session with the supervisor on the Performance Planning and Review policy and confirms that the supervisor understands his/her role in the process. All new employees at the Department of Energy and Natural Resources receive website training as part of the new employee orientation. The website training provides the Department of Energy and Natural Resources employees the knowledge to access the Department of Energy and Natural Resources policies and procedures, civil service rules, job search options, and Integrated Statewide Information System - Human Resources (ISIS-HR) employee selfservice options. This section continues to research to find out more information on these operations in order to ascertain potential means of improvement in this department. Inquiries with other states' attorneys general offices will continue in order to seek ways to perform similar functions, and determine if their objectives and strategies can be applied at the LADOJ. This process will ensure the department improves performance.

#### **Primary Persons Benefiting**

The primary persons that would benefit from this objective are the LADOJ employees, the citizens of Louisiana, public officials, and other state agencies.

GOAL II		will improve the process of recovering monies owed the State of d limit the liabilities of the state.
Objective II.		t at least \$5,000,000 in outstanding student loans and \$8,000,000 total tions each fiscal year by June 30, 2031.
Strate	gy II.1a	Improve the collector vs. account ratio in order for all accounts to be worked more effectively by increasing the number of collectors.
Strate	gy II.1b	Continue to work with IT to convert current collections software to automate manual processes where possible, develop additional means of communicating with debtors including possible text messaging services and online chat help, and establish standardized communication channels with the entities we represent.
Strate	gy II.1c	Identify training opportunities for collectors and collection attorneys and incorporate these into employee training plans.

#### **Performance Indicators**

Input	Number of collectors Average number of accounts issued per year to number of collectors
Efficiency	Average amount collected per collector
Outcome	Total collections Total collections from outstanding student loan cases

#### Justification

By increasing the number of debts placed with the Collections Section, this section will continue to provide a service at no cost to the taxpayer, whereas, when debts are placed with private collection agencies, those collection agencies retain a portion of the funds recovered as a fee. Increasing the number of debts placed with the Collections Section insures that this section will continue to provide a superior service to the State of Louisiana. Every day debts are paid through this office, thus the number of accounts potentially decreases.

#### Benchmarking

Research has so far determined there is only one other state's attorney general's office in the country that is potentially doing the same type of litigation/collection of defaulted education debts as the LADOJ. Research will continue in order to find out more information on the operation in those offices in order to ascertain potential means of improvement in this department. Additionally, inquiries of other state attorneys general offices will continue in order to find out if they perform a similar function.

## **Primary Person Benefiting**

The primary persons that would benefit from this objective are the Collections Section's present and future clients, as well as the State of Louisiana.

#### SITUATION INVENTORY

#### **Principal Clients and Users**

The principal clients and users of the Administrative Program are the citizens of Louisiana, LADOJ employees, elected officials on the local, state, and federal levels, along with their constituents, the Louisiana Legislature, professional service contractors, students, the Division of Administration, state agencies, the Louisiana Legislative Auditor, the state retirement systems, the Louisiana Public Employees Deferred Compensation Plan, and grantors.

#### **External Factors**

The conversion of the financial system to the LaGov module, which replaced the ISIS system, produced greater transparency for the citizens of Louisiana. Numerous hours were devoted to training and preparation of financial information to ensure a successful and essential crosswalk. This was 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 which improves the transparency of the agency.

The department has made a significant investment in updating technology and the IT infrastructure. Support, maintenance, and security of these systems is a priority. The LADOJ has improved, and is still progressing toward replacing the existing IT infrastructure, e.g. servers, networks, hardware, and software that are 10-15 years old. These updates benefit the state as the LADOJ, who is the chief legal officer of the state, must have the tools needed to meet the many challenges placed on an aging infrastructure. These technological advances are instrumental. Progress has been made which affects all of the Administrative Program. 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. IT 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 represents the following educational institutions/agencies: the Office of Student Financial Assistance, which is formerly the Governor's Special Commission on Education Services, the Louisiana Department of Education, the Board of Regents, the Louisiana State University campuses located in Baton Rouge, Shreveport, Eunice, and New Orleans, the Louisiana State University Medical Center, the Southern University campuses located in Baton Rouge, New Orleans, and Shreveport, Grambling University, University of Southwestern Louisiana, McNeese State University, Northwestern University, Louisiana Tech University, Northeast University, Southeastern University of New Orleans, Nicholls State University, and the Charity Hospital School of Nursing. The Collections Section not only collects a variety of types of debts for these entities, but it occasionally advises and directs them in order to avoid the possibility/potential for incurring future uncollectible debts.

#### **Internal and External Considerations**

The IT Section has been successful in automating most of the functions in the department, including the development and maintenance of 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 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.

The HR Section continues experiencing a rebirth and is planning many changes and improvement over the next years. Employee changes have recently been made, and an internal HR database will be established to automate the human resource 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 Collections Section is a critical function in ensuring fiscal accountability and supporting the state agencies and higher education institutions we represent. While the section has built a solid operational foundation, it faces increasing internal and external pressures. Addressing employee shortages, investing in technology, and modernizing statutory tools are essential to enhance effectiveness. Additionally, the culture regarding higher education debt has shifted in the last few years, both on a state and federal level. Act 334 of the 2020 Regular Session of the Louisiana Legislature states each public post-secondary education management board may adopt a policy to prohibit the institutions under its supervision and management from refusing to provide a transcript for a current or former student on the grounds that the student owes a debt. Further, on the federal level, the United States Department of Education announced new regulations for colleges and universities going in effect on July 1, 2024. The new conditions prevent institutions from withholding student transcripts for credits financed with Title IV student loan funds. These changes have removed a significant collection tool.

The challenges faced in the Administrative Program are employees embracing change, transfers, remote work management, and expanding the program, in addition to workloads significantly increasing every year. In spite of these challenges, management continues to recruit and retain top talent in a competitive job market.

The Administrative Program is defined by its strengths, which are having professional, educated, and trained employees, advanced technology available to employees, and strong leadership a from new administration. All of these factors have allowed for higher level of efficiency in the department.

Program:	Administrative
Objective:	I.1
Indicator Name:	Number of new, full-time employees hired

- 1. Type and Level: Input/General
- 2. **Rationale:** This indicator provides an overall feel for how well the department is meeting its objectives. It is necessary to track to support the outcome measures.
- 3. Use: This indicator will be monitored by the division and department management. It will be used for internal management purposes and for performance-based budgeting as an indicator of workload.
- 4. Clarity: This indicator is clearly identified.
- 5. Validity, Reliability, and Accuracy: This is a valid indicator that is reliable and accurate. Performance indicators are reported to the Office of Planning and Budget, available to the public and the media via the internet, and are subject to audit.
- 6. **Data Source, Collection, and Reporting:** The data source is an analysis of all of the department's objectives and performance indicators. It is tracked and gathered quarterly.
- 7. Calculation Methodology: The indicator is calculated by adding the number of employees hired every month.
- 8. Scope: This indicator is aggregated.
- 9. Caveats: This indicator is not a surrogate. It has no weaknesses. The source of the data does not have a bias. There is not a caveat.
- 10. **Responsible Person:** The people responsible for this indicator are the Administrative Director and the HR Deputy Director.

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:** This indicator provides an overall feel for how well the department is meeting its objectives. It is necessary to track to support the outcome measures.
- 3. Use: This indicator will be monitored by the division and department management. It will be used for internal management purposes and performance-based budgeting as an indicator of workload.
- 4. Clarity: This indicator is clearly identified.
- 5. Validity, Reliability, and Accuracy: This is a valid indicator that is reliable and accurate. Performance indicators are reported to the Office of Planning and Budget, available to the public and the media via the internet, and are subject to audit.
- 6. **Data Source, Collection, and Reporting:** The data source is an analysis of all of the department's objectives and performance indicators. It is tracked and gathered quarterly.
- 7. **Calculation Methodology:** The administrative orientation will be performed every month. The indicator is calculated by adding up all new employees that have attended an administrative orientation.
- 8. **Scope:** This indicator is aggregated.
- 9. Caveats: This indicator is not a surrogate. It has no weaknesses. The source of the data does not have a bias. There is not a caveat.
- 10. **Responsible Person:** The people responsible for this indicator are the Administrative Director and the HR Deputy Director.

Program:	Administrative
Objective:	I.1
Indicator Name:	Percentage of new, full-time employees hired that received orientation within 60 days of hire

- 1. Type and Level: Outcome/Key
- 2. **Rationale:** This indicator provides an overall feel for how well the department is meeting its objectives. It is necessary to track key indicators.
- 3. Use: This indicator will be monitored by the division and department management. It will be used for internal management purposes and performance-based budgeting as an indicator of workload.
- 4. Clarity: This indicator is clearly identified.
- 5. Validity, Reliability, and Accuracy: This is a valid indicator that is reliable and accurate. Performance indicators are reported to the Office of Planning and Budget, available to the public and the media via the internet, and are subject to audit.
- 6. **Data Source, Collection, and Reporting:** The data source is an analysis of all of the department's objectives and performance indicators. It is tracked and gathered quarterly.
- 7. Calculation Methodology: The administrative orientation will be performed every month. The indicator is calculated by adding up all new employees that have attended an administrative orientation within two months, or 60 days, after their first day of work and divide that number by the number of new employees who have attended an administrative orientation.
- 8. Scope: This indicator is aggregated.
- 9. Caveats: This indicator is not a surrogate. It has no weaknesses. The source of the data does not have a bias. There is not a caveat.
- 10. **Responsible Person:** The people responsible for this indicator are the Administrative Director and the HR Deputy Director.

Program:	Administrative
Objective:	I.1
Indicator Name:	Average number of new, full-time employees hired that have attended an administrative orientation

- 1. Type and Level: Efficiency/General
- 2. **Rationale:** This indicator provides an overall feel for how well the department is meeting its objectives. It is necessary to track supporting indicators.
- 3. Use: This indicator will be monitored by the division and department management. It will be used for internal management purposes and performance-based budgeting as an indicator of workload.
- 4. Clarity: This indicator is clearly identified.
- 5. Validity, Reliability, and Accuracy: This is a valid indicator that is reliable and accurate. Performance indicators are reported to the Office of Planning and Budget, available to the public and the media via the internet, and are subject to audit.
- 6. **Data Source, Collection, and Reporting:** The data source is an analysis of all of the department's objectives and performance indicators. It is tracked and gathered quarterly.
- 7. Calculation Methodology: The indicator is calculated by adding up the monthly totals all new employees that have attended an administrative orientation within two months, or 60 days, after their first day of work for the past months of the fiscal year, and divide that number by the number months that have passed in the fiscal year.
- 8. Scope: This indicator is aggregated.
- 9. Caveats: This indicator is not a surrogate. It has no weaknesses. The source of the data does not have a bias. There is not a caveat.
- 10. **Responsible Person:** The people responsible for this indicator are the Administrative Director and the HR Deputy Director.

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:** This indicator provides an overall feel for how well the department is meeting its objectives. It is necessary to track to support the outcome measures.
- 3. Use: This indicator will be monitored by the division and department management. It will be used for internal management purposes and performance-based budgeting as an indicator of workload.
- 4. Clarity: This indicator is clearly identified.
- 5. Validity, Reliability, and Accuracy: This is a valid indicator that is reliable and accurate. Performance indicators are reported to the Office of Planning and Budget, available to the public and the media via the internet, and are subject to audit.
- 6. **Data Source, Collection, and Reporting:** The data source is an analysis of all of the department's objectives and performance indicators. It is tracked and gathered quarterly.
- 7. Calculation Methodology: The indicator is calculated by dividing the total number of collections accounts by the number of collectors.
- 8. Scope: This indicator is aggregated.
- 9. Caveats: This indicator is not a surrogate. It has no weaknesses. The source of the data does not have a bias. There is not a caveat.
- 10. **Responsible Person:** The person responsible for this indicator is the Collections Section Chief.

Program:	Administrative
Objective:	II.1
Indicator Name:	Number of collectors

- 1. Type and Level: Input/General
- 2. **Rationale:** This indicator provides an overall feel for how well the department is meeting its objectives. It is necessary to track to support the outcome measures.
- 3. Use: This indicator will be monitored by the division and department management. It will be used for internal management purposes and performance-based budgeting as an indicator of workload.
- 4. Clarity: This indicator is clearly identified.
- 5. Validity, Reliability, and Accuracy: This is a valid indicator that is reliable and accurate. Performance indicators are reported to the Office of Planning and Budget, available to the public and the media via the internet, and are subject to audit.
- 6. **Data Source, Collection, and Reporting:** The data source is an analysis of the department's Table of Organization. The indicator will be tracked and gathered quarterly.
- 7. Calculation Methodology: The indicator is calculated by reviewing the Table of Organization and counting the filled collector positions.
- 8. Scope: This indicator is aggregated.
- 9. Caveats: This indicator is not a surrogate. It has no weaknesses. The source of the data does not have a bias. There is not a caveat.
- 10. **Responsible Person:** The person responsible for this indicator is the Collections Section Chief.

Program:	Administrative
<b>Objective:</b>	II.1
Indicator Name:	Amount collected per collectors

- 1. Type and Level: Efficiency/General
- 2. **Rationale:** This indicator provides an overall feel for how well the department is meeting its objectives. It is necessary to track to support the outcome measures.
- 3. Use: This indicator will be monitored by the division and department management. It will be used for internal management purposes and performance-based budgeting as an indicator of workload.
- 4. Clarity: This indicator is clearly identified.
- 5. Validity, Reliability, and Accuracy: This is a valid indicator that is reliable and accurate. Performance indicators are reported to the Office of Planning and Budget, available to the public and the media via the internet, and are subject to audit.
- 6. **Data Source, Collection, and Reporting:** The data source is an analysis of all of the department's objectives and performance indicators. It is tracked and gathered quarterly.
- 7. Calculation Methodology: The indicator is calculated by dividing the total collections by the number of collectors.
- 8. Scope: This indicator is aggregated.
- 9. Caveats: This indicator is not a surrogate. It has no weaknesses. The source of the data does not have a bias. There is not a caveat.
- 10. **Responsible Person:** The person responsible for this indicator is the Collections Section Chief.

Program:	Administrative
Objective:	II.1
Indicator Name:	Monetary total collections from outstanding student load cases

- 1. Type and Level: Outcome/Key
- 2. **Rationale:** This indicator provides an overall feel for how well the department is meeting its objectives. It is necessary to track key indicators.
- 3. Use: This indicator will be monitored by the division and department management. It will be used for internal management purposes and performance-based budgeting as an indicator of workload.
- 4. Clarity: This indicator is clearly identified.
- 5. Validity, Reliability, and Accuracy: This is a valid indicator that is reliable and accurate. Performance indicators are reported to the Office of Planning and Budget, available to the public and the media via the internet, and are subject to audit.
- 6. **Data Source, Collection, and Reporting:** The data source is an analysis of all of the department's objectives and performance indicators. It is tracked and gathered quarterly.
- 7. Calculation Methodology: The indicator is calculated by totaling all of the collections produced from student loan accounts.
- 8. Scope: This indicator is aggregated.
- 9. Caveats: This indicator is not a surrogate. It has no weaknesses. The source of the data does not have a bias. There is not a caveat.
- 10. **Responsible Person:** The person responsible for this indicator is the Collections Section Chief.

Program:	Administrative
Objective:	II.1
Indicator Name:	Monetary total of all collections

- 1. Type and Level: Outcome/Key
- 2. **Rationale:** This indicator provides an overall feel for how well the department is meeting its objectives. It is necessary to track key indicators.
- 3. Use: This indicator will be monitored by the division and department management. It will be used for internal management purposes and performance-based budgeting as an indicator of workload.
- 4. Clarity: This indicator is clearly identified.
- 5. Validity, Reliability, and Accuracy: This is a valid indicator that is reliable and accurate. Performance indicators are reported to the Office of Planning and Budget, available to the public and the media via the internet, and are subject to audit.
- 6. **Data Source, Collection, and Reporting:** The data source is an analysis of all of the department's objectives and performance indicators. It is tracked and gathered quarterly.
- 7. **Calculation Methodology:** The indicator is calculated by adding up all of the collections made from all sources.
- 8. Scope: This indicator is aggregated.
- 9. Caveats: This indicator is not a surrogate. It has no weaknesses. The source of the data does not have a bias. There is not a caveat.
- 10. **Responsible Person:** The person responsible for this indicator is the Collections Section Chief.

# **CIVIL LAW PROGRAM**

The Civil Law Program is divided into three divisions: Federalism, Civil, and Public Protection.

# **Federalism Division**

## Mission

The mission of the Federalism Division is to defend the State of Louisiana through strategic offensive and defensive litigation. This division represents the state and its executives, officials, and agencies. It also handles both state and federal constitutional challenges and select appeals, primarily at the Louisiana Supreme Court, the United States Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and the Supreme Court of the United States.

# **Division Activities**

The Federalism Division has specialized knowledge in statutory interpretation, constitutional law, and appeals. This small team is comprised of attorneys who have clerked for multiple courts, and all have clerked for the United States Court of Appeals. The team excels at strategizing, researching, writing briefs, and presenting oral arguments. Unlike other groups, the Federalism Division focuses on the appellate process, and not a specific subject matter.

The majority of the Federalism Division's work stems from cases run by other LADOJ divisions, both civil and litigation. The division works with the other divisions within the department and takes over on appeal when there are important state interests at stake. The Federalism Division fully briefs and argues in the appeals, and at any given time, this division is handling ten or more appellate cases. The goal with these cases is to protect the state's interests, to defend the state's constitution and laws, and to create favorable precedent.

The Federalism Division also litigates in trial courts when the case concerns issues of constitutional magnitude or issues critical to the state's interests. For example, the Federalism Division will handle challenges to the First Amendment to the United States Constitution brought in trial court, as well as issues regarding the oil and gas industry. The goal is to protect the state's interest, to defend the state's constitution and laws, and to preserve issues for appellate review. This division also handles the appeals of these cases.

The Federalism Division frequently represents state officials in their individual and official capacities, including secretaries of agencies, wardens, and district attorneys. It also represents state agencies who inquire and request help. The Federalism Division authors briefs on their behalf and presents oral arguments in court. Within the past year, the Federalism Division has represented the Office of the Governor, the Department of Energy and Natural Resources, the Department of Environmental Quality, the Board of Ethics, the Department of Public Safety and Corrections, the Alcohol and Tobacco Control, the Department of Health, the Department of State, the Louisiana Legislature, the Department of Wildlife and Fisheries, the Orleans Parish Sheriffs' Office, and the Board of Education. The goal for these proceedings is to ensure the state, its agencies, and its officials are properly granted sovereign and qualified immunity.

The division offers its expertise in litigation strategy and appellate processes to state and local government entities within Louisiana. The goal is to protect against adverse case law and precedent, and to help create coherent doctrines of law.

The Federalism Division also actively participates and monitors litigation of nation-wide importance run by other states. This division will enroll as counsel to represent the State of Louisiana and will provide information, feedback, editing, and strategic suggestions to the other states. In the same vein, the Federalism Division coordinates the involvement of other states in Louisiana-based litigation. At any given time, the Federalism Division participates or monitors 20 or more cases led by other states. The goal with these cases is to ensure the state's interests are protected across the country and to create favorable precedent.

The Federalism Division frequently drafts amicus briefs at the United States Courts of Appeals and the Supreme Court of the United States. Other states, or interest groups, solicit these briefs. Often, the issues affect Louisiana, and the Federalism Division's brief provides the court with pertinent information regarding the state's interests. Again, the goal is to ensure the state's interests are protected across the country and to protect against adverse precedent.

# **Civil Division**

# Mission

The mission of the Civil Law Program is to defend 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.

## **Division Activities**

The Civil Division provides training necessary for lawyers within the division to develop specialization in the areas of law in which they work. However, cross-training among employees is critical. The division fosters a policy wherein attorneys are required to learn the general job description and responsibilities of other attorneys within their section and division.

The Civil Division defends the constitution and laws of the State of Louisiana, defends actions and proceedings on behalf of the state, and provides information and legal services, e.g. opinions, counsel, and representation, in the areas of general civil law, public finance and contract law, education law, environmental law, and land and natural resource law.

The Civil Division receives approximately 175 requests for formal Attorney General Opinions annually from state and local entities and elected officials. These requests are assigned to, authored by, and reviewed by attorneys in the Civil Division.

The Civil Division maintains an average of 700 active litigation cases and averages 225 new cases per year. The Civil Division devotes an average of 12,500 hours per year on litigation cases at a rate of approximately a quarter of the cost of outsourcing to private counsel.

The Civil Division represents 110 state boards or commissions and devotes an average of 4,250 hours of attorney time in representation each year to those entities. Many boards and commissions are small and cannot afford their own legal department or a full-time attorney. Therefore, these boards and commissions rely on the attorney general's office for legal representation. Attorneys from the Civil Division serve in varying capacities for the boards and commissions as needed. These attorneys may act as "general counsel," prepare and prosecute allegations against licensees accused of violating the various practice acts, or serve as a hearing officer over administrative proceedings.

The Civil Division participates in the Attorney General Duty Call Program which provides the general public with daily access to an attorney. The department averages 6,500 duty calls per year. The Civil Division also handles an additional 2,000 specialized inquiries, on average.

The Civil Division provides presentations and trainings to public entities, employees, officials, and government member associations on topics such as the Louisiana Public Bid Law, the Louisiana Public Records Law, the Louisiana Open Meetings Law, the Attorney General Opinions, and Administrative Law issues. Attorneys average 150 presentations per year that reach over 5,000 attendees.

The Civil Division reviews and approves all state agency, and certain local political subdivision, contracts and/or resolutions related to procuring professional legal services. Every year the division receives, processes, and considers an average of 550 contracts and/or resolutions. It also receives approximately 150 public bond resolutions and Tax Equity and Fiscal Responsibility Acts (TEFRA) for approval each year.

The Civil Division also reviews and approves proposed settlement agreements between the Department of Environmental Quality and private entities.

The Civil Division is divided into six sections: Government Litigation, Lands and Natural Resources, Public Finance and Contracts, Environmental, Education/Interagency Transfer, and Appellate.

## Governmental/Litigation Section

The Governmental/Litigation 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 either rendering advisory opinions, 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 assists a number of state boards and commissions, including, but not limited to, the Child Death Review Panel, the Psychology Board, the Professional Counselor's

Board, the Massage Therapy Board, the Auctioneer's Board, the State Board of Examiners in Dietetics and Nutrition, the Sexual Assault Oversight Commission, and the Louisiana State Licensing Board for Contractors.

Furthermore, this section handles reapportionment and election cases, both independently and in conjunction with other state officials, and approves forms used by the Louisiana Secretary of State.

## Lands & Natural Resources Section

The Lands & Natural Resources 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, and related activities. In addition, this section administers the LADOJ's responsibilities for disaster response matters related to cemeteries.

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 licensing proceedings throughout the year to ensure that the cemeteries of this state are being operated pursuant to law. In part, this work also consists of the recovery of 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 Lands & Natural Resources Section brings actions against mineral companies that owe the state for royalty underpayments, and defends the constitutionality of statutes within its sphere of expertise. It 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 Authority, the Department of Energy and Natural Resources, the Louisiana Department of Transportation and Development, the LDW, 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.

#### **Public Finance and Contracts Section**

The Public Finance and Contracts 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. It 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 employees on all areas of finance law. It initiates legal proceedings necessary for appointment of a fiscal administrator for political subdivisions, as well as provides an attorney general representative to the procurement support team.

The Public Finance and Contracts Section also reviews and approves hospital acquisitions.

Opinions rendered by this section center around areas of taxation, violations of Louisiana Constitution, Article VII, Section 14, public finance, public bid law, and contracts.

This section also provides legal representation, renders advice, and prepares educational publications and, in conjunction with the Administrative Program, provides trainings for approximately 850 elected justices of the peace and constables.

#### **Environmental Section**

The Environmental Section assists the attorney general in the discharge of her 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 Louisiana Coastal Protection and Restoration Authority, the State Land Office, the Department of Energy and Natural Resources, the Department of Environmental Quality, the Department of Public Safety and Corrections, the Department of Wildlife and Fisheries, the Department of Culture, Recreation and Tourism, the Office of Public Works, the Louisiana Department of Agriculture and Forestry, the Capital Area Groundwater Conservation District, the Louisiana Professional Engineering and Land Surveying Board, the 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 has employees who are members of the Public Access Task Force and the Surface Water Sales Study Group. Employees 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, the Clean Air Act, the Endangered Species Act, and fisheries management.

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

This section attends hearings throughout the state, visits problem sites, and meets with representatives of both government and industry to seek resolution of environmental problems. Employee personnel also respond to inquiries and complaints from city-state coastal zone regulations in connection with offshore leasing by the United States Department of the Interior, and numerous administrative enforcement actions involving hundreds of thousands of dollars of assessed penalties against environmental violators in Louisiana.

# Education/Interagency Transfer Section

The Education/Interagency Transfer Section represents the Board of Elementary and Secondary Education, the Board of Regents, the Louisiana Department of Education, and various other public agencies on education related litigation. This section represents public officials in various litigation involving education law. It also responds to requests for Attorney General Opinions from the various state and local education boards on issues related to elementary, secondary, and higher education.

This section includes the administration of attorneys in other state departments, including the Work Force Commission. Education/Interagency Transfer Section attorneys 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.

## Appellate Section

The Appellate Section provides oversight, monitoring, and tracking of appeals for the Civil Division. This section handles appeals in state and federal courts, either as the primary attorney, assisting the handling attorney, or filing an amicus brief.

Notably, in conjunction with the Solicitor General Section, the Appellate Section coordinates the attorney general's involvement in state and federal appeals and is taking a more active role in all Civil Division appeals. In addition to civil appeals, the Appellate Section frequently briefs federalism issues at the trial and district court level.

The Appellate Section benefits Louisiana through monetary savings and maintaining a high level of successful appellate practice in both the state and federal level. The monetary savings are accomplished by reducing the cost of adverse judgments against the state and by reducing the amounts paid to outside appellate counsel.

# **Public Protection Division**

## Mission

The mission of the Public Protection Division is to defend 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.

# **Division Activities**

The Public Protection Division administers, enforces, and fulfills civil laws for the State of Louisiana in areas including consumer protection, unfair and deceptive trade practices, unfair competition, antitrust, housing discrimination, insurance receivership, occupational licensing, and tobacco. This section conducts investigations in the interest of the public, brings enforcement actions in the name of the state, regulates and registers certain businesses and charities, provides education and training, conducts outreach, and reviews proposed regulations.

The Public Protection Division is divided into six sections: Complex Litigation, Consumer Protection, Equal Housing Opportunity, Insurance, Occupational Licensing Review Program, and Tobacco.

# **Complex Litigation Section**

The Complex Litigation Section handles multidistrict, multistate litigation and anti-trust enforcement. These cases are often large cases with multiple states involved as plaintiffs to enforce anti-trust and consumer protection issues. The attorneys in the Complex Litigation Section operate in both Louisiana state courts and federal courts throughout the country.

The Complex Litigation Section protects the citizens of Louisiana by investigating potential violations and filing suits, where deemed necessary, by seeking either monetary or injunctive relief via the Louisiana Unfair Trade Practices and Consumer Protection Law, i.e. Louisiana Revised Statute 51:1401, et seq., and Antitrust Laws, i.e. Louisiana Revised Statute 13:5081, et seq.

## **Consumer Protection Section**

The Consumer Protection Section protects the interests of the State of Louisiana by providing consumer education and resources to the public. This section conducts investigations on behalf of the public and brings civil enforcement actions in the name of the state for violations of unfair or deceptive trade practices and other consumer protection laws. Lawyers from the section participate in investigations with local, state, and federal authorities, including other states' attorneys general in matters involving unfair or deceptive trade practices, data security, and other consumer matters. Through its investigative and enforcement authority, the section obtains injunctive relief,

consumer restitution, and other relief in the interest of the public.

The section accepts and processes consumer disputes through written consumer dispute forms and provides a consumer protection hotline to consumers to report consumer issues and obtain assistance. A voluntary mediation process is provided to complainants and companies to help facilitate open communication between consumers and businesses to obtain resolutions of their disputes.

The Consumer Protection Section promotes consumer education to make consumers aware of their consumer rights and common scams. This section provides information about consumer protection laws through the publishing of pamphlets and brochures on product safety and common scams, consumer alerts, participation in community events, and other communications.

In addition, the section regulates and registers certain charities, credit repair services, business opportunity sellers and agents, going out of business sales, promoters of going out of business sales, athlete agents, multi-level marketers, and other entities.

The Consumer Protection Section also administers various statutory notices and other obligations such as Database Security Breach Notices.

# **Equal Housing Opportunity Section**

The Equal Housing Opportunity Section, also referred to as Fair Housing, is responsible for the administration and enforcement of the Louisiana Equal Housing Opportunity Act, which prohibits discrimination in the sale and rental of housing based on an individual's race, color, religion, sex, disability, familial status, national origin, or natural, protective, or cultural hairstyle. As such, the section is required to investigate, conciliate, and judicially enforce fair housing complaints. It also provides fair housing training and conducts outreach in an effort to increase awareness about fair housing laws and the rights and responsibilities of property owners, tenants, property managers, and others under such laws.

## **Insurance Section**

The Insurance 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 Louisiana Department of Insurance. Employee 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 Louisiana Department of Insurance case management plans for each liquidation.

## **Occupational Licensing Review Program**

In order to provide active state supervision to provide Louisiana Occupational Regulatory Boards with state action immunity, the Occupational Licensing Review Program (OLRP) provides a substantive review of all proposed regulations and disciplinary actions submitted to the program. Additionally, the OLRP reviews final disciplinary actions submitted to LADOJ and provides a summary of criminal activity for Louisiana Bureau of Investigation review.

## **Tobacco Section**

On November 23, 1998, attorneys general from 46 states signed the historic Master Settlement Agreement (MSA). In 1999, the attorney general created the Tobacco Settlement Enforcement Unit, also referred to the Tobacco Unit, to enforce the terms of the MSA and related Louisiana laws. As a result of joining the MSA, Louisiana receives annual MSA payments from certain tobacco companies. The Tobacco Unit is tasked with handling litigation arising from or relating to the MSA, monitoring compliance with the MSA, monitoring the payment stream from the MSA, and monitoring the statutory compliance of Non-Participating Manufacturers, which are manufacturers that did not sign the MSA. Field agents routinely travel around the state to inspect tobacco retailers and tobacco sponsored events for violations of the advertising restrictions within the MSA.

The Tobacco Unit is also responsible for enforcing various state laws with regard to tobacco manufacturers and wholesalers. All tobacco product manufacturers must annually submit certifications capturing cigarette(s) and roll-your-own tobacco brands intended for sale into the state. The Tobacco Unit reviews these certifications and determines whether the brands and manufacturers meet certain requirement(s). Only those cigarette and roll-your-own tobacco brands listed as approved on the state directory maintained by the LADOJ may be lawfully sold in the state. The Tobacco Unit may issue unfair trade practice notifications if unapproved cigarette and roll-your-own tobacco product is sold in or into Louisiana.

The Tobacco Unit is responsible for reviewing monthly reports submitted by Louisiana licensed wholesalers that affix tax stamps to certain products for sale. By utilizing information captured within such reports, the Tobacco Unit tracks the volume of sales as well as the quarterly escrow payments owed by Non-Participating Manufacturers based on those sales. The Tobacco Unit may institute litigation for non-payment or late payment of escrow obligations by Non-Participating Manufacturers.

## Authorization for Goal(s)

Louisiana Constitution, Article IV, Section 8; Louisiana Revised Statutes 8:69; 8:663; 13:2593; 13:4448; 13:5107; 13:5108.1; 13:5108.4; 17:41; 17:1818; 18:18; 18:64; 18:423; 18:1300.2; 18:1472; 25:349; 25:938; 25:955; 30:132; 30:2015; 30:2525; 30:2033; 30:2050.7; 30:2458; 33:1181; 36:701; 36:702; 37:154; 37:711.24; 37:2153; 37:2663; 37:2717; 37:3721; 38:2193; 38:2838; 38:2083; 38:3087.83; 39:98.4; 39:1352; 39:1404; 39:1496; 39:1565; 39:1626; 39:1672.2; 39:2165.1; 40:2019; 40:2115.13; 41:1701.1; 42:65; 42:262; 44:31.2; 46:439.3; 49:251; 49:251.1; 49:253; 49:256; 49:257; 49:258; 49:259; and 49:314.

## **Program Goal**

I. The LADOJ will provide superior legal and professional services to the State of Louisiana and its citizens. As necessary for the assertion or protection of any right or interest of the state, this division will institute, prosecute, or intervene in any civil action or proceeding.

GOAL I The LADOJ will provide superior legal and professional services to the State of Louisiana and its citizens. As necessary for the assertion or protection of any right or interest of the state, this division will institute, prosecute, or intervene in any civil action or proceeding.

#### **Civil Division Objectives**

- **Sub-Goal** Provide superior and professional services on behalf of the state through the Civil Program.
- **Objective I.1** Maintain an average of 60-day response time for research and writing opinions by June 30, 2031.
- **Objective I.2** Through the Civil Division, to retain in-house 98% of the litigation cases received each fiscal year by June 30, 2031.
- **Objective I.3** Provide legal services to at least 50 state boards and commissions.
- **Objective I.4** Through the Public Finance and Contracts Section of the Civil Division, to continue to process contracts within an average of 15 days, resolutions within an average of ten days, public bond approvals within an average of ten days, and garnishments within an average of ten days by June 30, 2031.
- **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 in a timely manner.
- **Objective I.6** To review for approval 100% of the Department of Environmental Quality penalty settlements strictly in compliance with time limits each fiscal year by June 30, 2031.

## **Public Protection Division Objectives**

Sub-Goal

Complex Litigation Provide superior and professional services on behalf of the state through the Civil Program.

- **Objective I.7** All Complex Litigation attorneys should attend 95% of their case and working group meetings each month.
- Sub-Goal Consumer Protection Protect the interest and ensure fair and safe commercial transactions of Louisiana citizens, consumers, and businesses by enforcing the Unfair Trade Practices and Consumer Protection Law and all other consumer related laws within the attorney general's jurisdiction.

# **Objective I.8** Respond to 100% of verified consumer disputes within 15 days of receipt by June 30, 2031.

Objective I.9		Close 85% of verified consumer complaints within 90 days of receipt by June 30, 2031.	
Sub-Goal	-	Il Housing Opportunity are fair and equal housing throughout the state for Louisiana citizens.	
Objective I.1	0	Close a minimum of 50 inquiries each fiscal year by June 30, 2031.	
Objective I.1	1	Process fair housing complaints by completing investigations, issuing determinations, and making final administrative dispositions in a timely manner.	
Objective I.12	2	Close a minimum of 25 fair housing complaints each fiscal year by June 30, 2031.	
Objective I.1.	3	Provide fair housing education and outreach efforts as well as provide fair housing outreach materials.	
Sub-Goal	protect	rance re a high level of billing productivity in the Insurance Section, and strive to ect the integrity of the insurance industry, as well as to protect the state and its ens from persons or businesses that engage in insurance fraud.	
<b>Objective I.1</b> 4	4	In the Insurance Section, file 100% of motions of payment with the court, within ten days following the end of each monthly billing cycle by June 30, 2031.	
Sub-Goal	in orde	ovide active state supervision to participating occupational licensing boards er to ensure the boards and their members maintain immunity from federal ast lawsuits.	
Objective I.1		To provide superior and professional service to participating boards by a thorough, substantive, and timely review of proposed regulations, amendments, and disciplinary actions.	
Sub-Goal	Ensure enforce	Tobacco Unit Ensure that the Tobacco Unit exercises an appropriate level of due diligence in the enforcement of the MSA and other tobacco-related Louisiana laws against Participating Manufacturers and Non-Participating Manufacturers.	
Objective I.1	6	Enforce the terms of the MSA 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 six months each fiscal year by June 30, 2031.	
<b>Objective I.1</b>	Maintain an average of 60 day response time for research and writing		
----------------------	--		
	opinions by June 30, 2031.		

**Strategy I.1** Use opinion tracking system to manage opinion timelines.

## **Performance Indicators**

Input	Number of opinions requested Number of opinions withdrawn Number of hours devoted to opinions
Output	Number of opinions released
Outcome	Average response time for attorney to research and write an opinion Average time from receipt to release of an opinion
Efficiency	Percentage of opinions released

# Justification

The attorney general's office is statutorily mandated to provide opinions upon request.

# Benchmarking

This objective is a standard and will not need benchmarking.

#### **Primary Persons Benefiting**

The primary persons that would benefit from this objective are the citizens of Louisiana.

<b>Objective I.2</b>	Through the Civil Division, to retain in-house 98% of the litigation cases received each fiscal year by June 30, 2031.
Strategy I.2	Ensure sufficient range of knowledge and expertise to justify assignment of LADOJ attorneys.
Performance Indica	tors
Input	Number of cases received Number of cases being handled in-house Number of hours devoted to litigation
Output	Number of cases contracted to outside firms

Outcome Percentage of cases handled in-house each fiscal year

# Efficiency Percentage of cases contracted to outside firms

### Justification

The attorney general's office is statutorily mandated to provide legal representation in many of the cases handled by this division and has the power and authority to handle other litigation. Increased in-house legal representation will be more cost effective for the citizens of the state.

#### Benchmarking

The National Association of Attorneys General and the National Association of Insurance Commissioners provides training and resources to support attorneys general in protecting the rule of law and the United States Constitution.

#### **Primary Persons Benefiting**

The primary persons that would benefit from this objective are the citizens of Louisiana and the clients of the LADOJ.

<b>Objective I.3</b>	Provide legal services to at least 50 state boards and commissions.
Strategy I.3a	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.
Strategy I.3b	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.
Strategy I.3c	After consultation with the first assistant, the appropriate section chief shall approach selected boards and commission decision makers about possible representation.
Performance Indicat	ors

Input	Number of hours devoted to current boards and commissions Number of hours devoted to boards and commissions last fiscal year Number of boards and commissions currently represented
Output	Number of new boards and commissions represented
Efficiency	Average number of hours devoted to each board and commission

#### Justification

The attorney general's office is statutorily mandated to represent some of these boards and commissions. Other boards and commissions choose to procure attorneys with the attorney general's office due to our expertise in this area of the law.

#### Benchmarking

By increasing the number of hours the attorney general's office devotes to boards and commissions, there will also be an increase in the number of boards and commissions represented.

#### **Primary Persons Benefiting**

The primary persons that would benefit from this objective are the citizens of Louisiana, participating boards and commissions, and the LADOJ.

<b>Objective I.4</b>	Through the Public Finance and Contracts Section of the Civil Division, to
	continue to process contracts within an average of 15 days, resolutions
	within an average of ten days, public bond approvals within an average of
	ten days, and garnishments within an average of ten days - all will be
	evident by June 30, 2031.

Strategy I.4	Use tracking system to manage	timelines.
	ese muening system to munuge	

### **Performance Indicators**

Input	Number of contracts processed Number of resolutions processed Number of public bond approvals TEFRAs processed
Outcome	Average processing time for contracts Average processing time for resolutions Average processing time for public bond approvals and TEFRA Average processing time for garnishment
Efficiency	Percentage of documents processed within the objective range

### Justification

The attorney general's office is statutorily mandated to approve contracts and resolutions for professional legal services.

# Benchmarking

This is a standard and will not need benchmarking.

# **Primary Persons Benefiting**

The primary persons that would benefit from this objective are the citizens of Louisiana and the LADOJ.

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

# **Performance Indicators**

Input	Number of specialized inquiries received from state, local, or private entities
Output	Total number of presentations made to public and private entities Total number of attendees at presentations made to public and private entities
	Total number of constituent services tickets Number of non-duty attorney tickets resolved Number of duty attorney tickets resolved
Outcome	Total number of constituent tickets resolved Total number of constituent tickets unresolved
Efficiency	Percentage of tickets resolved

# Justification

The attorney general's office has an established policy to receive and respond to constituent calls.

#### Benchmarking

This is a standard and will not need benchmarking.

# **Primary Persons Benefiting**

The primary persons that would benefit from this objective are the citizens of Louisiana and the LADOJ.

<b>Objective I.6</b>	To review for approval 100% of the Department of Environmental Quality
	penalty settlements strictly in compliance with time limits each fiscal year
	by June 30, 2031.

Strategy I.6	Use tracking system to manage settlement timelines.
--------------	---

# **Performance Indicators**

Input	Total dollar amount of settlements approved
Output	Number of settlements received for review Number of settlements approved Number of settlements approved within statutory time limits
Outcome	Number of settlements disapproved
Efficiency	Percentage of settlements approved within statutory time limits

# Justification

The attorney general's office is mandated to receive and approve the Department of Environmental Quality penalty assessments upon request.

### Benchmarking

This is a standard and will not need benchmarking.

# **Primary Persons Benefiting**

The primary persons that would benefit from this objective are the citizens of Louisiana and the LADOJ.

<b>Objective I.7</b>	All Complex Litigation attorneys should attend 95% of their case and
	working group meetings each month

**Strategy I.7** Maintain and monitor assigned cases in litigation and be vigilant of how the suits are progressing.

## **Performance Indicators**

Input	Number of meetings per month
Output	Number of meetings per month attended
Efficiency	Percentage of meetings attended

### Justification

This objective will improve the efficiency and effectiveness of monitoring assigned litigation cases.

### Benchmarking

No benchmarking is necessary for this objective.

# **Primary Persons Benefiting**

The primary persons that would benefit from this objective are the State of Louisiana, the state agencies, and the citizens of Louisiana.

Objective I.8	Consumer Protection Section shall respond to 100% of verified consumer disputes within 15 days of receipt by June 30, 2031.	
Strategy I.8a	Maintain and monitor computer applications to support consumer dispute processing and resolution.	
Strategy I.8b	Management shall run and review consumer dispute reports every ninety days.	
Strategy I.8c	Management shall monitor employees to ensure that constituent tickets assigned to employees are handled efficiently.	
Strategy I.8d	Management shall monitor employee's workload and progress to ensure that the Consumer Protection Hotline, calls, and consumer disputes are monitored and handled efficiently.	
Performance Indicat	tor	
Input	Number verified consumer disputes received	

Output	Number of verified consumer disputes responded to within 15 days of receipt
<b>T</b> 001 1	

**Efficiency** Percentage of verified consumer disputes that are responded to within 15 days of receipt.

### Justification

This objective will improve the efficiency and effectiveness of the consumer dispute process.

#### Benchmarking

Communication with the southern regional attorneys general offices allows the department to see what practices are in place in other states. This allows the department to ensure the best practices are being practiced.

#### **Primary Person Benefiting**

The primary persons that would benefit from this objective are the citizens of Louisiana, consumers, and businesses in Louisiana.

U	Close 85% of verified consumer complaints within 90 days of receipt by June 30, 2031.
Strategy I.9a	Maintain and monitor computer application to support consumer complaint processing and closure.
Strategy I.9b	Management shall create and review consume complaint reports every ninety days.
Strategy I.9c	Management shall, in its hiring practices, attempt to ensure as wide a range of specialization and experience as possible.
Strategy I.9d	Management shall monitor employee's workload and progress to ensure the Consumer Protection Hotline and consumer disputes are monitored and handled efficiently.
Performance Indicat	or

Input	Number of verified consumer complaints received
Output	Number of verified consumer complaints closed within 90 days of receipt
Efficiency	Percentage of verified consumer complaints that are closed within 90 days of receipt.

#### Justification

This objective will improve the efficiency and effectiveness of the consumer dispute process.

#### Benchmarking

Communication with the southern regional attorneys general offices allows the department to see what practices are in place in other states. This allows the department to ensure the best practices are being practiced.

## **Primary Person Benefiting**

The primary persons that would benefit from this objective are the citizens of Louisiana, consumers, and businesses in Louisiana.

**Objective I.10** Close a minimum of 50 inquiries each fiscal year by June 30, 2031.

Strategy I.10 Process inquiries and send inquiry letters in a timely manner.

## **Performance Indicator**

Input	Number of inquiries received
Output	Number of inquiries closed
Efficiency	Percentage of inquiries closed

#### Justification

It is imperative that the attorney general enforce the Louisiana Equal Housing Opportunity Act as it has been declared to be the policy of Louisiana that there is a legitimate governmental interest in protecting the welfare of the people of Louisiana by enacting equal housing opportunity legislation to discourage discriminatory housing practices, and further, it is the policy of the State of Louisiana to provide, within state and federal constitutional limitations, for fair and equal housing opportunity throughout the state.

### Benchmarking

No benchmarking is necessary for this objective.

### **Primary Person Benefiting**

The primary persons that would benefit from this objective are the public who will benefit from knowing their rights and responsibilities under the Fair Housing law of Louisiana.

Objective I.11:	Processing fair housing complaints by completing investigations, issuing determinations, and making final administrative dispositions in a timely manner.
Strategy I.11	<b>a</b> Have notification letters sent to all parties within five days of receipt of signed complaint.
Strategy I.11	<b>b</b> Complete investigation within 100 days from filing of complaint. If impractical to do so, 100-day letters sent out to all parties indicating the reason for the delay.
Strategy I.11	<b>c</b> Complete cause and no cause cases findings within 100 days. If impractical to do so, 100-day letters sent out to all parties indicating the reason for the delay.
Strategy I.11	<b>d</b> If a cause determination is made, a suit shall be filed within 60 days of the case closure date in the parish in which the action occurred.

### **Performance Indicator**

Input	Number of fair housing complaints received
Output	Number of cases processed and notification letters sent within five days of receipt of signed complaint
	Number of investigations completed within 100 days or 100-day letters sent to all parties with reason for delay
	Number of cause cases and no cause cases completed within 100 days or 100-day letters sent to all parties with reason for delay
	Number of suits filed within 60 days of a cause case closure date
Outcome	Number of cases processed
Efficiency	Percentage of cases processed

# Justification

It is imperative that the attorney general enforce the Louisiana Equal Housing Opportunity Act as it has been declared to be the policy of Louisiana that there is a legitimate governmental interest in protecting the welfare of the people of Louisiana by enacting equal housing opportunity legislation to discourage discriminatory housing practices; and further, it is the policy of the State of Louisiana to provide, within state and federal constitutional limitations, for fair and equal housing opportunity throughout the state.

#### Benchmarking

This objective is meeting statutory requirements.

# **Primary Person Benefiting**

The primary persons that would benefit from this objective are the State of Louisiana and its citizens. They will benefit from the reduction of housing discrimination throughout the state.

<b>Objective I.12</b>	Close a minimum of 25 fair housing complaints each fiscal year by June 30,
	2031.

Strategy I.12	Close a minimum of 25 fair housing complaints each fiscal year by
	June 30, 2031.

### **Performance Indicator**

Input	Number of fair housing complaints received through LADOJ intake
Output	Number of complaints closed administratively Number of complaints closed by conciliation Number of complaints closed in which cause or no cause
Efficiency	Number of cases open with no activity within ten days
Outcome	Number of complaints closed

## Justification

It is imperative that the attorney general enforce the Louisiana Equal Housing Opportunity Act as it has been declared to be the policy of Louisiana that there is a legitimate governmental interest in protecting the welfare of the people of Louisiana by enacting equal housing opportunity legislation to discourage discriminatory housing practices; and further, it is the policy of the State of Louisiana to provide, within state and federal constitutional limitations, for fair and equal housing opportunity throughout the state.

#### Benchmarking

This objective is meeting statutory requirements.

#### **Primary Person Benefiting**

The primary persons that would benefit from this objective are the State of Louisiana and its citizens. They will benefit from the reduction of housing discrimination throughout the state.

<b>Objective I.13</b>	Provide fair housing education and outreach efforts as well as provide fair nousing outreach materials.	
Strategy I.13	a Conduct a minimum of four 2-hour fair housing trainings each fiscal year by June 30, 2031.	
Strategy I.13	<b>b</b> Distribute fair housing materials during training and upon request.	
Performance Indica	tor	
Output	Number of fair housing trainings scheduled Number of fair housing materials distributed	

## Justification

Efficiency

The efforts to provide fair housing training and outreach to the public assist the attorney general in increasing awareness about fair housing laws and the rights and responsibilities under such laws. These outreach services further the policy of the State of Louisiana to provide, within state and federal constitutional limitations, for fair and equal housing opportunity throughout the state.

Percentage of fair housing materials distributed

#### Benchmarking

No benchmarking necessary for this objective.

#### **Primary Person Benefiting**

The primary persons that would benefit from this objective are the citizens of Louisiana, as they will benefit from knowing their rights and responsibilities under the Fair Housing laws of Louisiana.

- **Objective I.14** In the Insurance Section, file 100% of motions of payment with the court, within ten days following the end of each monthly billing cycle by June 30, 2031.
  - **Strategy I.14** Use Case Tracking/Work Management to ensure timely billing and payment.

### **Performance Indicator**

Output	Number of motions filed	
	Number of motions filed within 10 days following the end of each monthly billing cycle	
Efficiency	Percentage of billing invoices submitted within 10 days following the end of each monthly billing cycle	

### Justification

This objective will continue to provide competent and quality legal representation in an area of law.

### Benchmarking

Louisiana is leading the nation in the development and implementation of insurance receivership practices and laws. Louisiana's receivership management practices and legal analyses of related law can serve as a benchmark for other states.

#### **Primary Person Benefiting**

The primary persons that would benefit from this objective are the creditors and policy holders of the insolvent insurance companies and citizens of Louisiana.

<b>Objective I.15</b> To provide superior and professional service to participating boards by a thorough, substantive, and timely review of proposed regulations, amendments, and disciplinary actions.	
Strategy I.15a	Use project management techniques to ensure timely review and analysis of proposed regulations, amendments, and disciplinary actions.
Strategy I.15b	Use tracking/work management systems to track turnaround time for issuance of determination letters to boards following submission of proposed regulations, amendments, and disciplinary actions.
Strategy I.15c*	Issue annual surveys to participating boards regarding satisfaction with the OLRP.
Performance Indicator	r
Input	Number of occupational licensing boards participating annually Number of Proposed Regulations submitted to the OLRP Number of Proposed Disciplinary Actions submitted to the OLRP
Output	Date of Determination Letter Date of Submission to OLRP
Quality	Number of Days for issuance of determination letter for proposed

Efficiency	Average number of days for issuance of determining letters per each
	participating board

regulations, amendments and disciplinary actions

# Justification

The OLRP is authorized by Louisiana Revised Statute 49:260 to provide active state supervision for participating boards to provide immunity against federal antitrust lawsuits. The OLRP funding is self-generated through enrollment fees paid by participating boards.

#### Benchmarking

The LADOJ OLRP is the only state program providing active state supervision to state occupational licensing boards.

#### **Primary Person Benefiting**

The primary persons that would benefit from this objective are the participating state occupational licensing boards, their directors, and their members.

\*Not implemented; only proposed.

<b>Objective I.16</b>	Through the Tobacco Unit, enforce the terms of the MSA 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 six months each fiscal year by June	
	30, 2031.	

Strategy I.16a	Hold quarterly internal Tobacco Unit meetings to monitor the
	progress of completing at least 50 inspections per quarter.

### **Performance Indicator**

Input	Number of tobacco retail establishments in Louisiana Number of random site checks, i.e. inspections, conducted at retail tobacco outlets each quarter
Output	Number of inspections finding a violation
Quality	Number of re-inspections within six months of the original inspection when a violation has occurred
	Percentage of re-inspections within six months of original inspection finding a violation
Outcome	Number of violation notices sent within 15 days of an inspection finding a violation
	Percentage of violation notices sent within 15 days of an inspection finding a violation
Efficiency	Percentage of random site checks conducted at retail tobacco outlets each quarter

#### Justification

It is imperative that the attorney general enforce the MSA and related Louisiana laws, against tobacco product manufacturers in order to reduce youth exposure to tobacco products and ensure that the State of Louisiana continues to receive the appropriate amount of funds due under the MSA.

#### Benchmarking

No benchmark necessary for this objective.

#### **Primary Person Benefiting**

The primary persons that would benefit from this objective are the citizens of Louisiana and the State of Louisiana.

## SUPPORTING INTERNAL/EXTERNAL DOCUMENTATION

## **Principal Clients and Users**

The principal clients and users of the divisions that comprise the Civil Program are the State of Louisiana; the citizens and taxpayers of Louisiana; the Louisiana Legislature and their employees; elected justices of the peace and constables; state and local public officials; the judiciary and their employees; other sections of the LADOJ; the press; court reporters; private attorneys; ministers and church organizations; all of the registrars of voters; private associations; the Division of Administration; the Louisiana Coastal Protection and Restoration Authority; the Department of Energy and Natural Resources; the Louisiana Cemetery Board; the State Land Office; parishes and governmental entities; the Department of Culture, Recreation and Tourism; the United States Minerals Management Service and Tourism; the United States Fish and Wildlife Division of State Parks; the National Marine Fisheries Services; the Louisiana State Museum; the United States Army Corps of Engineers; the Louisiana Department of Revenue; the gulf and south Atlantic fisheries; the Department of Transportation and Commission Development; the United States Geological Service Department of Wildlife and Fisheries; the United States Soil Conservation Service; the Natural Resources Conservation Agency; the Board of Trustees for Colleges and Universities; other states; the Louisiana Military Department; the National Association of Attorneys General; school boards; police jurors; all state universities; levee boards; the Louisiana Offshore Oil Port; the State Bond Commission, the Tobacco Settlement Financing Corporation; the Deferred Compensation Commission; the Department of Environmental Quality; the Department of Public Safety and Corrections; the Department of Wildlife and Fisheries; the Office of Public Works; the Louisiana Department of Agriculture and Forestry; the Capital Area Groundwater Conservation District; the Louisiana Professional Engineering and Land Surveying Board; the Louisiana State Board of Embalmers and Funeral Directors; other state agencies or subdivisions; the executive director of the Board of Elementary and Secondary Education; the Board of Elementary and Secondary Education Board; the Superintendent of the Department of Education; the Commissioner of Higher Education; the Board of Regents; local school boards; the Secretary of Labor; the 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; licensed boards; the Board of Trustees; consumers who purchase a product or service for personal, household, or family use within Louisiana or from Louisiana businesses; property owners; property management companies; tenants; real estate agencies; the commissioner of insurance; receivers appointed by the commissioner of insurance and other receivership staff; insurance companies' policyholders and creditors; participating OLRP Boards, their directors, and members; tobacco product wholesalers and manufacturers; and the Department of Revenue and Alcohol and Tobacco Control.

#### **External Factors**

The external factors of the divisions that comprise the Civil Program are the people served by those divisions. The public has high expectations of the program which includes, but is not limited to, superior legal representation, sometimes a "false" expectation for private legal representation; for off-the-cuff legal advice; specialized knowledge and advice delivered promptly and courteously; completing contracts, opinions, and garnishments expeditiously and professionally; free legal aid; LADOJ to do the work that the district attorney or sheriff will not do; to be able to

request anything legal to be done by our office; for our office to enforce the law, including private matters; to investigate federal civil rights violations; and for private opinions to be issued. Consumers need and expect protection from unfair or deceptive trade practices, and a place to turn when they have a complaint. They also expect the program to provide them with the necessary resources to assist them with their complaint, which includes directing consumers to the proper agency of jurisdiction. The citizens of the state expect their duty calls to be handled with concern.

### **Internal and External Considerations**

The Governmental Litigation Section represents a number of state officials, boards, and commissions, including the legislature, the governor, and various cabinet agencies. It has specialized legal knowledge, experience, and talent in a variety of governmental issues, including election law, constitutional law, and other legal issues involving the State and its officials. This Section is comprised of attorneys with expertise in writing legal opinions on issues such as dual officeholding, open meetings, public records, the Lawrason Act, and other governmental issues. It also shoulders the load of other divisions without complaint as it can assist other divisions in litigation. This Section provides presentations on specialty areas of the law, and it provides excellent legal representation to boards and commissions, registrars of voters, and other specialty groups. This Section has the ability to garner special relationships with government figures and departments. It acts as general counsel, prosecutor, and hearing officer for numerous state boards and commissions, and in doing so, gains valuable litigation and judicial experience. Threats to this Section include the loss of institutional knowledge due to personnel leaving for higher paid positions within the private sector or positions that are more specialized within state government. The Section is also threatened with the potential for larger caseloads due to assignment of numerous constitutional challenges from Risk Litigation, which typically does not handle the constitutional challenges in a case. Additional threats to the section include the Legislature not appropriating funds for expert witnesses to properly defend cases.

The Lands and Natural Resources 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 employees, 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. It also assists with the work of other sections within the Civil Division, as well as other divisions, when necessary. As a general matter, it provides legal representation to all program clients and program users, as well as the public-at- large. Attorney duty calls dilute the ability of the section's employees to respond to specific official legal work, opinions, and litigation. The time of the secretarial staff is also diluted with any attorney duty calls and participating in public interest projects unrelated to the work of the section. Secretarial support is limited because of the above factors. 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 staff also has the opportunity to avail itself of computer training classes, and to

participate in professional classes from CPTP. The section has experienced retention and attrition losses in the past several years. A variety of legal advice and litigation services are still provided to client agencies and entities even though the Lands and Natural Resources Section is in a rebuilding mode following those attrition losses.

The Public Finance and Contracts Section provides competent and professional representation to statewide elected officials such as the Treasurer, through its work with the State Bond Commission, as well to other state boards and commissions, including, Louisiana Deferred Compensation Commission, the Tobacco Settlement Financing Corporation, the Architects Selection Board, the Engineers Selection Board, the Landscape Architects Selection Board, the Office of State Procurement, and the Office Facilities Corporation. Employees within this section possess specialized knowledge in public finance law and public contracts based on years of experience and team work among our professional and support staff. The staff also 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. While this section possesses and has access to institutional knowledge in the field of public finance, part of the staff consists of new legal professionals who are becoming acclimated to state government and the legal profession as a whole. This requires additional time to address various learning opportunities to ensure proper development and growth. However, this time constraint is steadily diminishing as newer staff within the section gain experience in their duties and become experts in public finance law. Because the section handles multiple areas within the public finance realm and deals with multiple boards, commissions, agencies, etc., staff currently has assignments within certain areas and may lack understanding or knowledge of other areas. Cross-training can ensure full acclimation within our section's responsibilities and help prevent gaps in coverage in the event of absences or turnover. The threat to this section is losing experienced staff to the private sector or other governmental agencies. The Public Finance and Contracts Section has historically been counsel and/or served as a representative to various boards and commissions that have oversight into the use of public funds or the awarding of public contracts. This section's role has been to ensure that public funds throughout the state are managed in a way that protects the public's interest and aligns with the statutory and constitutional framework of said use. The section also provides legal opinions to elected officials, boards, and commissions on the same. Additionally, we provide training to the public on constitutional misuse of public funds, the public bid law, and other methods of procurement for local governments. The Public Finance and Contracts Section continues its role by providing legal advice to public financerelated boards or commissions such as the Louisiana State Bond Commission, the Louisiana Deferred Compensation Commission, and various state selection boards. It responds to legal inquiries from these entities on a daily basis, provides opinions when requested, and handles litigation when the need arises. The staff expects the agency to provide the tools and resources necessary to accomplish our duties and responsibilities, as well as expects the agency to maintain a high level of professionalism and work environment that invites qualified professionals to join our ranks. The world of public finance is constantly evolving and the legislature has signaled their intent to amend the use of/restrictions on the use of public funds. Therefore, this section will need to remain adaptable and maintain efficiency in providing accurate and sound legal advice or representation given no matter how the law may change. This potentially means, for example, a substantial increase in opinion requests related to changes in public finance law. Additionally, this section has seen an uptick in fiscal administration litigation due to the increased number of failing municipalities statewide that require state intervention. Increased litigation within a section that ordinarily only handles such matters sparingly potentially stretches out available resources. The

environment will undoubtedly change as legislation brings in or removes certain barriers on the expenditure of public funds and various entities/agencies will be looking to our office, specifically this section, for guidance on such matters. However, the actual change or difference within the public finance world is unknown at this time.

The experience and training of employees in the Environmental Section allows the division to perform all the duties the section is called upon to perform in a competent and professional manner. Attorneys are faced with limited resources and continuing funding challenges in the performance of the legal duties required. Additional training is needed in Microsoft Word, Westlaw, computer use, CPTP, and local bar association CLE. The threats to this section are employees leaving for the private sector and the uncertainty of legislative appropriation and salary adjustments. The section has continued to provide a variety of legal advice and litigation services to client agencies and public entities.

The strength of the Education/Interagency Transfer Section is the experience and training of employees that allows us to perform all the duties they are called upon to perform in a competent and professional manner. However, the section's weakness is having limited resources in dealing with complex education law matters. Opportunities that exist for this section include additional training in Microsoft Word, Westlaw, computer use, CPTP, and local bar association CLE. Also, other opportunities include representation of additional boards for compensation and expansions of the number of Interagency Transfer attorneys, as additional positions are requested and made available. The threats to this section are employees leaving for the private sector and the uncertainty of legislative appropriation and salary adjustments. The Education Section has historically served as a legal advisor and representative for Louisiana's education-related agencies, boards, and departments. Its role is to support the development of public education policy, ensuring compliance with state and federal education laws, and offering legal opinions to guide public education institutions. Over the years, it has helped shape the legal framework for elementary, secondary, and higher education governance in Louisiana. The Education Section continues its role by providing legal representation and advice to state education bodies like the Board of Elementary and Secondary Education, and the Advisory Commission on Proprietary Schools within the Board of Regents. It responds to legal inquiries from the Board of Elementary and Secondary Education and represents it in litigation. The staff likely expect the agency to maintain a high standard of legal excellence, stay current on changes in education law, and provide timely, represent clients in litigation, and provide accurate legal advice to its clients. Education law is continually evolving due to new federal and state legislation, shifting political priorities, social movements, funding challenges, and growing public scrutiny of educational policies. Topics such as school choice, charter schools, equity in education, curriculum content, student rights, and public health are prominent issues impacting the legal environment for education. The environment is likely to become more complex. Anticipated changes include increased regulation regarding technology use in education, e.g. Artificial Intelligence and student data privacy, significant shifts in funding mechanisms, and more movement toward charter based schools.

The Complex Litigation Section has extensive experience with opioid/pharmaceutical litigation as well as litigation against large technological companies. Created in 2018, it is continuing its mission of large antitrust and consumer protection litigation. Extensive opportunities for large scale enforcement of antitrust and consumer protection laws exist for this section. This is a litigation section capable of being a party in large multi-state and multi-district suits and having the ability to work together as a section. However, a weakness of the section is having additional

limited resources in terms of taking on larger rolls in the multi-state cases. The employees' expectations are to continue to provide the opportunity for antitrust and consumer protection lawsuits for the protection of the state and its citizens. The external environment for this section is defined by the federal government and its take on the executive branch's positions on antitrust enforcement. Currently, the environment is good as the federal government is continuing to utilize its role as an antitrust enforcer for the betterment of the citizens of the country. In the future, the nature of multi-state/multi-district litigation could change away from the current model as case law progresses. The types of suits and the rules covering them is still in its infancy. Potential extreme views by the federal government negatively affecting future ability to enforce antitrust or antimonopoly issues is a threat to this section.

The Consumer Protection Section 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 are being developed and personnel are better informed on how to use them. New personnel has made it possible to better track the activity of businesses operating. The quality of staff has improved so that enforcement actions are taken with some assurance of success. Consumers in the state benefit when the section is able to provide better protection in consumer transactions. The number of enforcement actions filed against businesses has and will continue to increase. The success rate of mediation of consumer complaints can improve with better education and training of the mediators. This is dependent on the number and quality of in-house education programs for the attorneys and para-professionals. There is an increased number of educational opportunities for attorneys from outside of the workplace. However, attorneys and support staff can benefit from increased in-house educational opportunities. There is an increase in the number of opportunities to participate in multi-state enforcement actions. This increases the number of assurance of voluntary compliance with national companies, which is a consent that they will abide by the law. With the increase in the number of actions both in-house and multi-state, the section increases the amount of dollars collected for consumer enforcement and education. This increase in monetary resources can provide much needed litigation support, assist with staff increase, and improve the quality and number of educational and outreach activities. The Consumer Protection Section can also participate with other consumer advocates and groups to strengthen their efforts in protecting the public against unfair or deceptive business practices. This section has the advantage of communicating with the public at large. When consumers file complaints 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 a source of information that assists the section's attorneys with identifying problematic transactions and are often the first indication that a business is operating illegally in Louisiana. The section needs to continue reaching the public at large to educate them regarding signs of unfair or deceptive business practices. The Consumer Section must also be more proactive in enforcement of its regulations. The section needs more support staff to assist with mediation, litigation, and community education efforts such as investigators, additional mediators, and paralegals. The section needs more in-house attorney education to assist with litigation efforts to enforce the consumer protection laws. Consumer Protection could benefit from having greater abilities to conduct research into offenders' backgrounds and locations including an investigator with extensive knowledge, expertise, and access to technology designed to conduct thorough investigations. The section also experiences issues with executing monetary judgments on individual defendants including the recordation of judgments in mortgage and conveyance records.

Additionally, the state can benefit from updated technology for intra-office communications and document sharing such as Microsoft Teams. The external environment that affects the Consumer Section the most is the way in which business transactions are conducted. With advances in technology and increased costs of real estate, more companies transact business online or through other means of communication technology, such as electronic tablets and electronic signature programs like Docusign. Such transactions makes it difficult to track and locate the offenders. When businesses are located in cyberspace, it is more difficult to obtain jurisdiction, service of process, or 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. Television advertising invites fraudulent offers to consumers. Technology and media advancements are facilitating scams to a wider and less suspecting audience. Stated advances in technology make it more difficult to find the source of an unfair or deceptive trade practice. Business transactions take place anywhere across the globe, but present like they are credible and local to an unsuspecting consumer. The Consumer Protection Section will need to develop the tools for tracking down unfair or deceptive practices and the expertise to use the new tools and technology. The biggest threat to the Consumer Protection Section is the lack of funding and resources to ensure the section is fully staffed with experienced investigators and the tools to enable the section to diligently investigate and enforce consumer protection laws to obtain relief for consumers. Additionally, Consumer Protection faces significant challenges with service of civil investigative demands, fact and evidence gathering, locating witnesses, and the lack of resources to pursue litigation and enforce judgments. Increasing challenges by targets of the state's cause of action and right of action under the Unfair Trade Practices and Consumer Protection Law and consumer protection laws, and questions and challenges of the investigatory process including the section attorneys' involvement in investigations threaten the section's present and future enforcement actions.

In 1991, the Louisiana Legislature passed the Louisiana Equal Housing Opportunity Act in response to the concern that the citizens of Louisiana were being unfairly denied housing. The Equal Housing Opportunity Section was created as a result of that legislation. In previous years, the section collaborated with the United States Department of Housing and Urban Development on fair housing complaints. The section has worked to resolve fair housing complaints through investigation, conciliation, and litigation means. In addition, the section has provided training and outreach in an effort to increase awareness about fair housing laws. The Equal Housing Opportunity Section is continuing to enforce the state fair housing laws by addressing complaints of housing discrimination through the investigation, conciliation, and litigation processes. Additionally, the Section continues to provide education to citizens of the state regarding the nondiscriminatory sale or rental of housing. Additional opportunities to educate the public generally on the rights and responsibilities of the Louisiana Equal Housing Opportunity Act and the functions of the Equal Housing Opportunity Section of the LADOJ may continue to assist in decreasing incidences of housing discrimination throughout the state. The strengths of the section are the competent and knowledgeable employees, their ability to work together as a section, and a genuine interest by employees in the work this section is doing and a desire to be efficient, productive, and competent. Weaknesses of the section are the need for additional resources and training annually to stay abreast of fair housing issues would always be beneficial. The employees 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. All other staff members are to maintain equal quality of knowledge regarding fair housing in a professional manner. Discrimination continues to occur in fair housing often due to a lack of knowledge of the law and the enforcement process of the Louisiana Equal Housing Opportunity Act. There is a need to continue educating the public regarding the impact of housing discrimination in the state. Additional outreach resources needed to increase awareness and understanding of housing laws, as well as sufficient funding to investigate and litigate allegations of housing discrimination would be considered threats to the section.

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 climate in Louisiana. The legislature, in an effort to streamline costs 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. It 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. 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 the 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. The strengths of the section include competent, productive employees, section teamwork, the ability to meet deadlines, and work well under pressure while being self- supporting and accommodating. The weaknesses of the section include the employees' need of continual training opportunities which deal exclusively with receivership and insurance law, which will also assist in achieving the opportunities listed above, and the failure of individuals to recognize the uniqueness of the receivership law and that it requires specialized knowledge. The section is dealing with receiverships, which are more complex than previous receivership cases. There are more multistate 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. Some external factors which may influence the section include the number of companies placed in receivership, the relationship between the commissioner of insurance and the Insurance Section, funding, and state uniformity. If the cost of healthcare increases and the costs of doing business continues 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. A positive relationship with the Louisiana 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. 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. 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. 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 LADOJ 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 Louisiana Department of Insurance.

The OLRP was created by Act 399 of the 2021 Regular Legislative Session and is codified in Louisiana Revised Statute 49:260, effective August 1, 2021. The OLRP was created to ensure that participating boards and their members maintain immunity from federal antitrust lawsuits through active state supervision by the attorney general and the LADOJ. It is the policy of the state that where the state finds it necessary to displace competition, an occupational licensing board shall use the least restrictive regulation to protect the public from present, significant and substantiated harms that threaten public health, safety, or welfare. Active state supervision is a method of ensuring adherence to this policy and involves an independent review and evaluation of the substance of the proposed occupational regulation or disciplinary action by the OLRP. The OLRP has the ability to approve, reverse, veto, or modify a proposed occupational regulation or proposed disciplinary action to ensure it complies with state policy as clearly articulated by the Legislature. Following the repeal of the Occupational License Review Committee, effective January 1, 2025, the OLRP is the only state program providing active state supervision to participating boards, their members, and directors. Currently, the OLRP provides active state supervision to 27 participating boards. There is an on-going opportunity for this section to create and make presentations to participating boards regarding the OLRP, to create and make presentations to potential boards to promote participation in the OLRP, and to create training opportunities for OLRP staff in state action immunity with the potential to present to similar programs of other states exists in the future. The strengths of the section include having a competent and productive staff, having teamwork among the entire public protection division, having the ability to provide a substantive review within a prescribed timeframe, and having the ability to develop a close working relationship with participating boards. However, the weaknesses of the program is that it is a new program which is seeing increased participation for the small staff. Resources and training is not widely available to assist staff. OLRP is governed by Louisiana Revised Statute 49:260 and prior jurisprudence that govern active state supervision. OLRP must provide a substantive and thorough review within the jurisprudential framework to meet the state action immunity doctrine requirements. Due to the nature of the duties of the OLRP, anti-trust litigation against occupational licensing boards has the most direct impact on the section. Future litigation may change how active state supervision is met in order to fulfill the requirements for state action immunity. Litigation similar to TESLA v. Louisiana Motor Vehicle Commission, et al, may alter the framework of active state supervision due to the potential due process claims that may affect market competition. Litigation similar to TESLA and FTC v. North Carolina Dental arguing that state regulatory boards, composed of active market participants, might be biased in favor of that industry may alter the framework and requirements for active state supervision.

The Tobacco Unit 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 unit staff positions initially included attorneys, field agents, and secretarial support. The unit 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 unit 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 unit has done numerous site inspections, consumer awareness presentations, and audits of tobacco wholesalers. Unit members also participate in numerous telephone conferences with the National Association of Attorneys General and other states, which are invaluable in providing current status of various activities concerning the MSA. The unit is in constant contact with other states regarding recent developments in these matters, such as escrow payments, suits, and considerations to proceed against manufacturers not in compliance with the MSA. The unit has participated with other states in numerous efforts regarding public health violations, youth advertisement, and other related matters under the MSA. The unit has expanded in recent years and currently maintains six staff positions, including an auditor. The organization actively audits tobacco wholesalers, has implemented a new tobacco software system through a private vendor which captures various data monitored by the unit, and holds an annual meeting with Department of Revenue and Alcohol and Tobacco Control to discuss tobacco related issues. The unit has collected penalty money from non-compliant manufacturers. It has increased training opportunities for staff. The unit has expanded its focus and enforcement efforts and continues to improve its relationship with the Department of Revenue, Alcohol and Tobacco Control, 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 unit and passed by the legislature. Further, during the 2013 Regular Session, legislation was passed to strengthen the enforcement capabilities of the Tobacco Unit and the state as a whole, in order to protect the future annual MSA revenue stream. This legislation expanded tobacco reporting requirements by Louisiana licensed wholesalers and added monthly reporting for manufacturers, importers, and sales entity affiliates. The unit continues its duties as outlined in the previous section. With the passage of the 2013 legislation, the unit has become more active in the enforcement of tobacco laws as it affects both manufacturers and wholesalers. As a result, the unit hired an auditor to audit tobacco wholesalers doing business in the state. The unit continues to improve on its efforts to receive correct and up-to-date information from manufacturers and wholesalers regarding tobacco products sold in Louisiana. The unit compares favorably on average to most states by size and function, and is meeting the performance indicators and targets that have been set. Overall, the unit is in an excellent position to enhance its work productivity and response to clients, stakeholders, and expectation groups. The unit is poised to make changes as a result of technological initiatives, legislation, and improved relationships with stakeholders. These changes also assist us in meeting the concerns of our clients and stakeholders. As part of the requirement that the unit notify wholesalers of changes in the approval list of manufacturers, the unit maintains e-mail addresses from 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. Legislation has given the unit authority to gather information in order to do a thorough investigation of all manufacturers who sell or wish to sell tobacco products in the state of Louisiana. Because of the unit's relationship with stakeholders and the community, public health and youth smoking prevention matters, which are of concern to our citizens and whose enforcement is provided for under the MSA, are able to be addressed. The strengths of the unit are having competent and knowledgeable employees who have the ability to work as a unit; having a working relationship with the Louisiana Department of Revenue, the

National Association of Attorneys General, other state attorneys general offices, and people in the tobacco industry; having a genuine interest from employees in the work we are doing and a desire to be efficient, productive, and competent; and having resources and training provided to accomplish duties. The weaknesses of the unit are having an increased participation in public health matters; and verifying sales figures with the Louisiana Department of Revenue or other related parties. Because of the nature of the unit's duties, in addition to funding resources and the administration of the attorney general's office, the state legislature has the most direct impact on the unit's ability to do its job because it passes the laws which assist the unit in carrying out its responsibilities. 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. As of 2025, the state has met its bondholder obligations and will receive 100% of the tobacco MSA payment stream. If issues are resolved in favor of the states, the primary environmental factors will not change. If the issues are not resolved favorably, the unit could be in a position of needing additional legislation to regulate manufacturers and resources to meet the increased need of such regulation. Insufficient funding and/or the lack of resources needed to fully staff the unit, impacting its ability to diligently enforce the MSA and related tobacco laws are a threat to this unit. Further, a secondary threat is the potential for challenges to the state's tobacco enforcement efforts now and moving forward.

Program:	Civil
Objective:	I.1
Indicator Name:	Number of opinions requested

- 1. Type and Level: Input/General
- 2. **Rationale:** The indicator provides an overall feel for how well the department is meeting its objectives. It is necessary to track the requested opinions to support the outcome measures.
- 3. Use: This indicator will be monitored by the division and department management. It will be used for internal management purposes and performance-based budgeting as an indicator of workload.
- 4. Clarity: This indicator is clearly identified.
- 5. Validity, Reliability and Accuracy: This is a valid indicator that is reliable and accurate. Performance indicators are reported to the Office of Planning and Budget, available to the public and the media via the internet, and are subject to audit.
- 6. **Data Source, Collection and Reporting:** The data source is an analysis of all of the department's objectives and performance indicators. It is tracked and reported quarterly.
- 7. Calculation Methodology: The indicator is calculated by adding together all opinions requested.
- 8. Scope: This indicator is aggregated.
- 9. Caveats: This indicator is not a surrogate. It has no weaknesses. The source of the data does not have a bias. There is not a caveat.
- 10. **Responsible Person:** The person responsible for this indicator is the Civil Division Deputy Director.

Program:	Civil
Objective:	I.1
Indicator Name:	Number of opinions withdrawn

- 1. Type and Level: Input/General
- 2. **Rationale:** The indicator provides an overall feel for how well the department is meeting its objectives. It is necessary to support the outcome measures.
- 3. Use: This indicator will be monitored by the division and department management. It will be used for internal management purposes and performance-based budgeting as an indicator of workload.
- 4. Clarity: This indicator is clearly identified.
- 5. Validity, Reliability and Accuracy: This is a valid indicator that is reliable and accurate. Performance indicators are reported to the Office of Planning and Budget, available to the public and the media via the internet, and are subject to audit.
- 6. **Data Source, Collection and Reporting:** The data source is an analysis of all of the department's objectives and performance indicators. It is tracked and reported quarterly.
- 7. Calculation Methodology: The indicator is calculated by adding together all opinions that are withdrawn.
- 8. Scope: This indicator is aggregated.
- 9. Caveats: This indicator is not a surrogate. It has no weaknesses. The source of the data does not have a bias. There is not a caveat.
- 10. **Responsible Person:** The person responsible for this indicator is the Civil Division Deputy Director.

Program:	Civil
Objective:	I.1
Indicator Name:	Number of hours devoted to opinions

- 1. Type and Level: Input/General
- 2. **Rationale:** The indicator provides an overall feel for how well the department is meeting its objectives. It is necessary to support the outcome measures.
- 3. Use: This indicator will be monitored by the division and department management. It will be used for internal management purposes and performance-based budgeting as an indicator of workload.
- 4. Clarity: This indicator is clearly identified.
- 5. Validity, Reliability and Accuracy: This is a valid indicator that is reliable and accurate. Performance indicators are reported to the Office of Planning and Budget, available to the public and the media via the internet, and are subject to audit.
- 6. **Data Source, Collection and Reporting:** The data source is an analysis of all of the department's objectives and performance indicators. It is tracked and reported quarterly.
- 7. Calculation Methodology: The indicator is calculated by adding together all of the hours for the opinions released.
- 8. Scope: This indicator is aggregated.
- 9. Caveats: This indicator is not a surrogate. It has no weaknesses. The source of the data does not have a bias. There is not a caveat.
- 10. **Responsible Person:** The person responsible for this indicator is the Civil Division Deputy Director.

Program:	Civil
Objective:	I.1
Indicator Name:	Number of opinions released

- 1. Type and Level: Output/General
- 2. **Rationale:** The indicator provides an overall feel for how well the department is meeting its objectives. It is necessary to support the outcome measures.
- 3. Use: This indicator will be monitored by the division and department management. It will be used for internal management purposes and performance-based budgeting as an indicator of workload.
- 4. Clarity: This indicator is clearly identified.
- 5. Validity, Reliability and Accuracy: This is a valid indicator that is reliable and accurate. Performance indicators are reported to the Office of Planning and Budget, available to the public and the media via the internet, and are subject to audit.
- 6. **Data Source, Collection and Reporting:** The data source is an analysis of all of the department's objectives and performance indicators. It is tracked and reported quarterly.
- 7. Calculation Methodology: The indicator is calculated by adding together all opinions released.
- 8. Scope: This indicator is aggregated.
- 9. Caveats: This indicator is not a surrogate. It has no weaknesses. The source of the data does not have a bias. There is not a caveat.
- 10. **Responsible Person:** The person responsible for this indicator is the Civil Division Deputy Director.

Program:	Civil
Objective:	I.1
Indicator Name:	Average response time for attorney to research and write an opinion

- 1. Type and Level: Outcome/Key
- 2. **Rationale:** The indicator provides an overall feel for how well the department is meeting its objectives. It is necessary to track key indicators.
- 3. Use: This indicator will be monitored by the division and department management. It will be used for internal management purposes and performance-based budgeting as an indicator of workload.
- 4. Clarity: This indicator is clearly identified.
- 5. Validity, Reliability and Accuracy: This is a valid indicator that is reliable and accurate. Performance indicators are reported to the Office of Planning and Budget, available to the public and the media via the internet, and are subject to audit.
- 6. **Data Source, Collection and Reporting:** The data source is an analysis of all of the department's objectives and performance indicators. It is tracked and reported quarterly.
- 7. **Calculation Methodology:** The indicator is calculated by adding 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. The indicator is presented in number of days.
- 8. Scope: This indicator is aggregated.
- 9. **Caveats:** This indicator is not a surrogate. It has no weaknesses. The source of the data does not have a bias. There is not a caveat.
- 10. **Responsible Person:** The person responsible for this indicator is the Civil Division Deputy Director.

Program:	Civil
Objective:	I.1
Indicator Name:	Average total time from receipt to release of an opinion

- 1. Type and Level: Outcome/General
- 2. **Rationale:** The indicator provides an overall feel for how well the department is meeting its objectives. It is necessary to support outcome indicators.
- 3. Use: This indicator will be monitored by the division and department management. It will be used for internal management purposes and performance-based budgeting as an indicator of workload.
- 4. Clarity: This indicator is clearly identified.
- 5. Validity, Reliability and Accuracy: This is a valid indicator that is reliable and accurate. Performance indicators are reported to the Office of Planning and Budget, available to the public and the media via the internet, and are subject to audit.
- 6. **Data Source, Collection and Reporting:** The data source is an analysis of all of the department's objectives and performance indicators. It is tracked and reported quarterly.
- 7. **Calculation Methodology:** The indicator is calculated by adding together the total number of days from receipt to release of opinions. That number will be divided by the number of opinions released. The indicator is presented in number of days.
- 8. Scope: This indicator is aggregated.
- 9. Caveats: This indicator is not a surrogate. It has no weaknesses. The source of the data does not have a bias. There is not a caveat.
- 10. **Responsible Person:** The person responsible for this indicator is the Civil Division Deputy Director.

Program:	Civil
Objective:	I.1
Indicator Name:	Percentage of opinions released

- 1. Type and Level: Efficiency/General
- 2. **Rationale:** The indicator provides an overall feel for how well the department is meeting its objectives. It is necessary to support outcome indicators.
- 3. Use: This indicator will be monitored by the division and department management. It will be used for internal management purposes and performance-based budgeting as an indicator of workload.
- 4. Clarity: This indicator is clearly identified.
- 5. Validity, Reliability and Accuracy: This is a valid indicator that is reliable and accurate. Performance indicators are reported to the Office of Planning and Budget, available to the public and the media via the internet, and are subject to audit.
- 6. **Data Source, Collection and Reporting:** The data source is an analysis of all of the department's objectives and performance indicators. It is tracked and reported quarterly.
- 7. Calculation Methodology: The indicator is calculated by dividing the number of opinions released by the number of opinions requested.
- 8. Scope: This indicator is aggregated.
- 9. Caveats: This indicator is not a surrogate. It has no weaknesses. The source of the data does not have a bias. There is not a caveat.
- 10. **Responsible Person:** The person responsible for this indicator is the Civil Division Deputy Director.

Program:	Civil
Objective:	I.2
Indicator Name:	Number of cases received

- 1. Type and Level: Input/General
- 2. **Rationale:** The indicator provides an overall feel for how well the department is meeting its objectives. It is necessary to support the outcome measures.
- 3. Use: This indicator will be monitored by the division and department management. It will be used for internal management purposes and performance-based budgeting as an indicator of workload.
- 4. Clarity: This indicator is clearly identified.
- 5. Validity, Reliability and Accuracy: This is a valid indicator that is reliable and accurate. Performance indicators are reported to the Office of Planning and Budget, available to the public and the media via the internet, and are subject to audit.
- 6. **Data Source, Collection and Reporting:** The data source is an analysis of all of the department's objectives and performance indicators. It is tracked and reported quarterly.
- 7. Calculation Methodology: The indicator is calculated by adding together all cases received per month.
- 8. Scope: This indicator is aggregated.
- 9. Caveats: This indicator is not a surrogate. It has no weaknesses. The source of the data does not have a bias. There is not a caveat.
- 10. **Responsible Person:** The person responsible for this indicator is the Civil Division Deputy Director.

Program:	Civil
Objective:	I.2
Indicator Name:	Number of cases being handled in-house

- 1. Type and Level: Input/General
- 2. **Rationale:** The indicator provides an overall feel for how well the department is meeting its objectives. It is necessary to support the outcome measures.
- 3. Use: This indicator will be monitored by the division and department management. It will be used for internal management purposes and performance-based budgeting as an indicator of workload.
- 4. Clarity: This indicator is clearly identified.
- 5. Validity, Reliability and Accuracy: This is a valid indicator that is reliable and accurate. Performance indicators are reported to the Office of Planning and Budget, available to the public and the media via the internet, and are subject to audit.
- 6. **Data Source, Collection and Reporting:** The data source is an analysis of all of the department's objectives and performance indicators. It is tracked and reported quarterly.
- 7. Calculation Methodology: The indicator is calculated by adding together all cases being handled in-house.
- 8. Scope: This indicator is aggregated.
- 9. Caveats: This indicator is not a surrogate. It has no weaknesses. The source of the data does not have a bias. There is not a caveat.
- 10. **Responsible Person:** The person responsible for this indicator is the Civil Division Deputy Director.
| Program:        | Civil                                 |
|-----------------|---------------------------------------|
| Objective:      | I.2                                   |
| Indicator Name: | Number of hours devoted to litigation |

- 1. Type and Level: Input/General
- 2. **Rationale:** The indicator provides an overall feel for how well the department is meeting its objectives. It is necessary to support the outcome measures.
- 3. Use: This indicator will be monitored by the division and department management. It will be used for internal management purposes and performance-based budgeting as an indicator of workload.
- 4. Clarity: This indicator is clearly identified.
- 5. Validity, Reliability and Accuracy: This is a valid indicator that is reliable and accurate. Performance indicators are reported to the Office of Planning and Budget, available to the public and the media via the internet, and are subject to audit.
- 6. **Data Source, Collection and Reporting:** The data source is an analysis of all of the department's objectives and performance indicators. It is tracked and reported quarterly.
- 7. Calculation Methodology: The indicator is calculated by adding together all hours devoted to litigation.
- 8. Scope: This indicator is aggregated.
- 9. Caveats: This indicator is not a surrogate. It has no weaknesses. The source of the data does not have a bias. There is not a caveat.
- 10. **Responsible Person:** The person responsible for this indicator is the Civil Division Deputy Director.

Program:	Civil
Objective:	I.2
Indicator Name:	Number of cases contracted to outside firms

- 1. Type and Level: Output/General
- 2. **Rationale:** The indicator provides an overall feel for how well the department is meeting its objectives. It is necessary to support the outcome measures.
- 3. Use: This indicator will be monitored by the division and department management. It will be used for internal management purposes and performance-based budgeting as an indicator of workload.
- 4. Clarity: This indicator is clearly identified.
- 5. Validity, Reliability and Accuracy: This is a valid indicator that is reliable and accurate. Performance indicators are reported to the Office of Planning and Budget, available to the public and the media via the internet, and are subject to audit.
- 6. **Data Source, Collection and Reporting:** The data source is an analysis of all of the department's objectives and performance indicators. It is tracked and reported quarterly.
- 7. Calculation Methodology: The indicator is calculated by adding together all cases contracted to outside firms.
- 8. Scope: This indicator is aggregated.
- 9. Caveats: This indicator is not a surrogate. It has no weaknesses. The source of the data does not have a bias. There is not a caveat.
- 10. **Responsible Person:** The person responsible for this indicator is the Civil Division Deputy Director.

Program:	Civil
Objective:	I.2
Indicator Name:	Percentage of cases handled in-house each fiscal year

- 1. Type and Level: Outcome/Key
- 2. **Rationale:** The indicator provides an overall feel for how well the department is meeting its objectives. It is necessary to track key indicators.
- 3. Use: This indicator will be monitored by the division and department management. It will be used for internal management purposes and performance-based budgeting as an indicator of workload.
- 4. Clarity: This indicator is clearly identified.
- 5. Validity, Reliability and Accuracy: This is a valid indicator that is reliable and accurate. Performance indicators are reported to the Office of Planning and Budget, available to the public and the media via the internet, and are subject to audit.
- 6. **Data Source, Collection and Reporting:** The data source is an analysis of all of the department's objectives and performance indicators. It is tracked and reported quarterly.
- 7. Calculation Methodology: The indicator is calculated by dividing the number of cases handled in-house by the total number of cases to obtain the percentage.
- 8. Scope: This indicator is aggregated.
- 9. Caveats: This indicator is not a surrogate. It has no weaknesses. The source of the data does not have a bias. There is not a caveat.
- 10. **Responsible Person:** The person responsible for this indicator is the Civil Division Deputy Director.

Program:	Civil
Objective:	I.2
Indicator Name:	Percentage of cases contracted to outside firms

- 1. Type and Level: Efficiency/General
- 2. **Rationale:** The indicator provides an overall feel for how well the department is meeting its objectives. It is necessary to track key indicators.
- 3. Use: This indicator will be monitored by the division and department management. It will be used for internal management purposes and performance-based budgeting as an indicator of workload.
- 4. Clarity: This indicator is clearly identified.
- 5. Validity, Reliability and Accuracy: This is a valid indicator that is reliable and accurate. Performance indicators are reported to the Office of Planning and Budget, available to the public and the media via the internet, and are subject to audit.
- 6. **Data Source, Collection and Reporting:** The data source is an analysis of all of the department's objectives and performance indicators. It is tracked and reported quarterly.
- 7. Calculation Methodology: The indicator is calculated by dividing the number of cases contracted to outside firms by the total number of cases to obtain the percentage.
- 8. Scope: This indicator is aggregated.
- 9. Caveats: This indicator is not a surrogate. It has no weaknesses. The source of the data does not have a bias. There is not a caveat.
- 10. **Responsible Person:** The person responsible for this indicator is the Civil Division Deputy Director.

Program:	Civil
Objective:	I.3
Indicator Name:	Number of hours devoted to current boards and commissions

- 1. Type and Level: Input/General
- 2. **Rationale:** The indicator provides an overall feel for how well the department is meeting its objectives. It is necessary to support the outcome measures.
- 3. Use: This indicator will be monitored by the division and department management. It will be used for internal management purposes and performance-based budgeting as an indicator of workload.
- 4. Clarity: This indicator is clearly identified.
- 5. Validity, Reliability and Accuracy: This is a valid indicator that is reliable and accurate. Performance indicators are reported to the Office of Planning and Budget, available to the public and the media via the internet, and are subject to audit.
- 6. **Data Source, Collection and Reporting:** The data source is an analysis of all of the department's objectives and performance indicators. It is tracked and reported quarterly.
- 7. Calculation Methodology: The indicator is calculated by adding together the number of hours devoted to current boards and commissions the attorneys input into the case tracking system.
- 8. Scope: This indicator is aggregated.
- 9. Caveats: This indicator is not a surrogate. It has no weaknesses. The source of the data does not have a bias. There is not a caveat.
- 10. **Responsible Person:** The person responsible for this indicator is the Civil Division Deputy Director.

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

- 1. Type and Level: Input/General
- 2. **Rationale:** The indicator provides an overall feel for how well the department is meeting its objectives. It is necessary to support the outcome measures.
- 3. Use: This indicator will be monitored by the division and department management. It will be used for internal management purposes and performance-based budgeting as an indicator of workload.
- 4. Clarity: This indicator is clearly identified.
- 5. Validity, Reliability and Accuracy: This is a valid indicator that is reliable and accurate. Performance indicators are reported to the Office of Planning and Budget, available to the public and the media via the internet, and are subject to audit.
- 6. **Data Source, Collection and Reporting:** The data source is the prior fiscal year monthly reports.
- 7. Calculation Methodology: The indicator is calculated by compiling a list of all boards and commissions, and then adding up the total number of hours devoted to them in the previous fiscal year.
- 8. Scope: This indicator is aggregated.
- 9. Caveats: This indicator is not a surrogate. It has no weaknesses. The source of the data does not have a bias. There is not a caveat.
- 10. **Responsible Person:** The person responsible for this indicator is the Civil Division Deputy Director.

Program:	Civil
Objective:	I.3
Indicator Name:	Number of boards and commissions currently represented

- 1. Type and Level: Input/General
- 2. **Rationale:** The indicator provides an overall feel for how well the department is meeting its objectives. It is necessary to support the outcome measures.
- 3. Use: This indicator will be monitored by the division and department management. It will be used for internal management purposes and performance-based budgeting as an indicator of workload.
- 4. Clarity: This indicator is clearly identified.
- 5. Validity, Reliability and Accuracy: This is a valid indicator that is reliable and accurate. Performance indicators are reported to the Office of Planning and Budget, available to the public and the media via the internet, and are subject to audit.
- 6. **Data Source, Collection and Reporting:** The data source is an analysis of all of the department's objectives and performance indicators. It is tracked and reported quarterly.
- 7. Calculation Methodology: The indicator is calculated by compiling a list of all boards and commissions and adding the number of those boards and commissions.
- 8. **Scope:** This indicator is aggregated.
- 9. Caveats: This indicator is not a surrogate. It has no weaknesses. The source of the data does not have a bias. There is not a caveat.
- 10. **Responsible Person:** The person responsible for this indicator is the Civil Division Deputy Director.

Program:	Civil
Objective:	I.3
Indicator Name:	Number of new Boards and Commissions represented

- 1. Type and Level: Output/General
- 2. **Rationale:** The indicator provides an overall feel for how well the department is meeting its objectives. It is necessary to support the outcome measures.
- 3. Use: This indicator will be monitored by the division and department management. It will be used for internal management purposes and performance-based budgeting as an indicator of workload.
- 4. Clarity: This indicator is clearly identified.
- 5. Validity, Reliability and Accuracy: This is a valid indicator that is reliable and accurate. Performance indicators are reported to the Office of Planning and Budget, available to the public and the media via the internet, and are subject to audit.
- 6. **Data Source, Collection and Reporting:** The data source is an analysis of all of the department's objectives and performance indicators. It is tracked and reported quarterly.
- 7. Calculation Methodology: The indicator is calculated by adding together all new boards and commissions represented.
- 8. Scope: This indicator is aggregated.
- 9. Caveats: This indicator is not a surrogate. It has no weaknesses. The source of the data does not have a bias. There is not a caveat.
- 10. **Responsible Person:** The person responsible for this indicator is the Civil Division Deputy Director.

Program:	Civil
Objective:	I.3
Indicator Name:	Average number of hours devoted to each board or commission

- 1. Type and Level: Efficiency/General
- 2. **Rationale:** The indicator provides an overall feel for how well the department is meeting its objectives. It is necessary to support the outcome measures.
- 3. Use: This indicator will be monitored by the division and department management. It will be used for internal management purposes and performance-based budgeting as an indicator of workload.
- 4. Clarity: This indicator is clearly identified.
- 5. Validity, Reliability and Accuracy: This is a valid indicator that is reliable and accurate. Performance indicators are reported to the Office of Planning and Budget, available to the public and the media via the internet, and are subject to audit.
- 6. **Data Source, Collection and Reporting:** The data source is an analysis of all of the department's objectives and performance indicators. It is tracked and reported quarterly.
- 7. Calculation Methodology: The indicator is calculated by adding together all hours devoted to boards and commissions represented and divide that amount by the number of boards and commissions represented.
- 8. Scope: This indicator is aggregated.
- 9. **Caveats:** This indicator is not a surrogate. It has no weaknesses. The source of the data does not have a bias. There is not a caveat.
- 10. **Responsible Person:** The person responsible for this indicator is the Civil Division Deputy Director.

Program:	Civil
Objective:	I.4
Indicator Name:	Number of contracts processed

- 1. Type and Level: Input/General
- 2. **Rationale:** The indicator provides an overall feel for how well the department is meeting its objectives. It is necessary to support the outcome measures.
- 3. Use: This indicator will be monitored by the division and department management. It will be used for internal management purposes and performance-based budgeting as an indicator of workload.
- 4. Clarity: This indicator is clearly identified.
- 5. Validity, Reliability and Accuracy: This is a valid indicator that is reliable and accurate. Performance indicators are reported to the Office of Planning and Budget, available to the public and the media via the internet, and are subject to audit.
- 6. **Data Source, Collection and Reporting:** The data source is an analysis of all of the department's objectives and performance indicators. It is tracked and reported quarterly.
- 7. Calculation Methodology: The indicator is calculated by adding together all contracts processed.
- 8. Scope: This indicator is aggregated.
- 9. Caveats: This indicator is not a surrogate. It has no weaknesses. The source of the data does not have a bias. There is not a caveat.
- 10. **Responsible Person:** The person responsible for this indicator is the Civil Division Deputy Director.

Program:	Civil
Objective:	I.4
Indicator Name:	Number of resolutions processed

- 1. Type and Level: Input/General
- 2. **Rationale:** The indicator provides an overall feel for how well the department is meeting its objectives. It is necessary to support the outcome measures.
- 3. Use: This indicator will be monitored by the division and department management. It will be used for internal management purposes and performance-based budgeting as an indicator of workload.
- 4. Clarity: This indicator is clearly identified.
- 5. Validity, Reliability and Accuracy: This is a valid indicator that is reliable and accurate. Performance indicators are reported to the Office of Planning and Budget, available to the public and the media via the internet, and are subject to audit.
- 6. **Data Source, Collection and Reporting:** The data source is an analysis of all of the department's objectives and performance indicators. It is tracked and reported quarterly.
- 7. Calculation Methodology: The indicator is calculated by adding together all resolutions processed.
- 8. Scope: This indicator is aggregated.
- 9. Caveats: This indicator is not a surrogate. It has no weaknesses. The source of the data does not have a bias. There is not a caveat.
- 10. **Responsible Person:** The person responsible for this indicator is the Civil Division Deputy Director.

Program:	Civil
Objective:	I.4
Indicator Name:	Number of public bond approvals (TEFRAs) processed

- 1. Type and Level: Input/General
- 2. **Rationale:** The indicator provides an overall feel for how well the department is meeting its objectives. It is necessary to support the outcome measures.
- 3. Use: This indicator will be monitored by the division and department management. It will be used for internal management purposes and performance-based budgeting as an indicator of workload.
- 4. Clarity: This indicator is clearly identified.
- 5. Validity, Reliability and Accuracy: This is a valid indicator that is reliable and accurate. Performance indicators are reported to the Office of Planning and Budget, available to the public and the media via the internet, and are subject to audit.
- 6. **Data Source, Collection and Reporting:** The data source is an analysis of all of the department's objectives and performance indicators. It is tracked and reported quarterly.
- 7. Calculation Methodology: The indicator is calculated by adding together all public bond approvals (TEFRAs) processed.
- 8. Scope: This indicator is aggregated.
- 9. Caveats: This indicator is not a surrogate. It has no weaknesses. The source of the data does not have a bias. There is not a caveat.
- 10. **Responsible Person:** The person responsible for this indicator is the Civil Division Deputy Director.

Program:	Civil
Objective:	I.4
Indicator Name:	Average processing time for completed contracts

- 1. Type and Level: Outcome/Supporting
- 2. **Rationale:** The indicator provides an overall feel for how well the department is meeting its objectives. It is necessary to track supporting indicators.
- 3. Use: This indicator will be monitored by the division and department management. It will be used for internal management purposes and performance-based budgeting as an indicator of workload.
- 4. Clarity: This indicator is clearly identified.
- 5. Validity, Reliability and Accuracy: This is a valid indicator that is reliable and accurate. Performance indicators are reported to the Office of Planning and Budget, available to the public and the media via the internet, and are subject to audit.
- 6. **Data Source, Collection and Reporting:** The data source is an analysis of all of the department's objectives and performance indicators. It is tracked and reported quarterly.
- 7. **Calculation Methodology:** The indicator is calculated by adding together the total number of days for all contracts completed, and then divide that amount by the number of contracts completed.
- 8. Scope: This indicator is aggregated.
- 9. Caveats: This indicator is not a surrogate. It has no weaknesses. The source of the data does not have a bias. There is not a caveat.
- 10. **Responsible Person:** The person responsible for this indicator is the Civil Division Deputy Director.

Program:	Civil
Objective:	I.4
Indicator Name:	Average processing time for resolutions

- 1. Type and Level: Outcome/Supporting
- 2. **Rationale:** The indicator provides an overall feel for how well the department is meeting its objectives. It is necessary to track supporting indicators.
- 3. Use: This indicator will be monitored by the division and department management. It will be used for internal management purposes and performance-based budgeting as an indicator of workload.
- 4. Clarity: This indicator is clearly identified.
- 5. Validity, Reliability and Accuracy: This is a valid indicator that is reliable and accurate. Performance indicators are reported to the Office of Planning and Budget, available to the public and the media via the internet, and are subject to audit.
- 6. **Data Source, Collection and Reporting:** The data source is an analysis of all of the department's objectives and performance indicators. It is tracked and reported quarterly.
- 7. Calculation Methodology: The indicator is calculated by adding together the total number of days for all resolutions completed, and then divide that amount by the number of resolutions completed.
- 8. Scope: This indicator is aggregated.
- 9. Caveats: This indicator is not a surrogate. It has no weaknesses. The source of the data does not have a bias. There is not a caveat.
- 10. **Responsible Person:** The person responsible for this indicator is the Civil Division Deputy Director.

Program:	Civil
Objective:	I.4
Indicator Name:	Average processing time for completed public bond approvals (TEFRA's)

- 1. Type and Level: Outcome/Supporting
- 2. **Rationale:** The indicator provides an overall feel for how well the department is meeting its objectives. It is necessary to track supporting indicators.
- 3. Use: This indicator will be monitored by the division and department management. It will be used for internal management purposes and performance-based budgeting as an indicator of workload.
- 4. Clarity: This indicator is clearly identified.
- 5. Validity, Reliability and Accuracy: This is a valid indicator that is reliable and accurate. Performance indicators are reported to the Office of Planning and Budget, available to the public and the media via the internet, and are subject to audit.
- 6. **Data Source, Collection and Reporting:** The data source is an analysis of all of the department's objectives and performance indicators. It is tracked and reported quarterly.
- 7. **Calculation Methodology:** The indicator is calculated by adding together the total number of days for all bond approvals completed, and then divide that amount by the number of bond approvals completed.
- 8. Scope: This indicator is aggregated.
- 9. Caveats: This indicator is not a surrogate. It has no weaknesses. The source of the data does not have a bias. There is not a caveat.
- 10. **Responsible Person:** The person responsible for this indicator is the Civil Division Deputy Director.

Program:	Civil
Objective:	I.4
Indicator Name:	Average processing time for completed garnishment

- 1. Type and Level: Outcome/Supporting
- 2. **Rationale:** The indicator provides an overall feel for how well the department is meeting its objectives. It is necessary to track supporting indicators.
- 3. Use: This indicator will be monitored by the division and department management. It will be used for internal management purposes and performance-based budgeting as an indicator of workload.
- 4. Clarity: This indicator is clearly identified.
- 5. Validity, Reliability and Accuracy: This is a valid indicator that is reliable and accurate. Performance indicators are reported to the Office of Planning and Budget, available to the public and the media via the internet, and are subject to audit.
- 6. **Data Source, Collection and Reporting:** The data source is an analysis of all of the department's objectives and performance indicators. It is tracked and reported quarterly.
- 7. Calculation Methodology: The indicator is calculated by adding together the total number of days for all garnishments completed, and then divide that amount by the number of garnishments completed.
- 8. Scope: This indicator is aggregated.
- 9. **Caveats:** This indicator is not a surrogate. It has no weaknesses. The source of the data does not have a bias. There is not a caveat.
- 10. **Responsible Person:** The person responsible for this indicator is the Civil Division Deputy Director.

Program:	Civil
Objective:	I.4
Indicator Name:	Percentage of documents processed within the objective range

- 1. Type and Level: Efficiency/General
- 2. **Rationale:** The indicator provides an overall feel for how well the department is meeting its objectives. It is necessary to track supporting indicators.
- 3. Use: This indicator will be monitored by the division and department management. It will be used for internal management purposes and performance-based budgeting as an indicator of workload.
- 4. Clarity: This indicator is clearly identified.
- 5. Validity, Reliability and Accuracy: This is a valid indicator that is reliable and accurate. Performance indicators are reported to the Office of Planning and Budget, available to the public and the media via the internet, and are subject to audit.
- 6. **Data Source, Collection and Reporting:** The data source is an analysis of all of the department's objectives and performance indicators. It is tracked and reported quarterly.
- 7. Calculation Methodology: The indicator is calculated by comparing the average processing time for each document type to the objective range, and then divide that amount by the number of those documents.
- 8. Scope: This indicator is aggregated.
- 9. Caveats: This indicator is not a surrogate. It has no weaknesses. The source of the data does not have a bias. There is not a caveat.
- 10. **Responsible Person:** The person responsible for this indicator is the Civil Division Deputy Director.

Program:	Civil
Objective:	I.5
Indicator Name:	Number of specialized inquiries received from state, local, or private entities

- 1. Type and Level: Input/General
- 2. **Rationale:** The indicator provides an overall feel for how well the department is meeting its objectives. It is necessary to support the outcome measures.
- 3. Use: This indicator will be monitored by the division and department management. It will be used for internal management purposes and performance-based budgeting as an indicator of workload.
- 4. Clarity: This indicator is clearly identified.
- 5. Validity, Reliability and Accuracy: This is a valid indicator that is reliable and accurate. Performance indicators are reported to the Office of Planning and Budget, available to the public and the media via the internet, and are subject to audit.
- 6. **Data Source, Collection and Reporting:** The data source is an analysis of all of the department's objectives and performance indicators. It is tracked and reported quarterly.
- 7. Calculation Methodology: The indicator is calculated by adding together the number of specialized inquiries received from public and private entities.
- 8. Scope: This indicator is aggregated.
- 9. **Caveats:** This indicator is not a surrogate. It has no weaknesses. The source of the data does not have a bias. There is not a caveat.
- 10. **Responsible Person:** The person responsible for this indicator is the Civil Division Deputy Director.

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:** The indicator provides an overall feel for how well the department is meeting its objectives. It is necessary to track key indicators.
- 3. Use: This indicator will be monitored by the division and department management. It will be used for internal management purposes and performance-based budgeting as an indicator of workload.
- 4. Clarity: This indicator is clearly identified.
- 5. Validity, Reliability and Accuracy: This is a valid indicator that is reliable and accurate. Performance indicators are reported to the Office of Planning and Budget, available to the public and the media via the internet, and are subject to audit.
- 6. **Data Source, Collection and Reporting:** The data source is an analysis of all of the department's objectives and performance indicators. It is tracked and reported quarterly.
- 7. Calculation Methodology: The indicator is calculated by adding together the number of presentations made to public and private entities.
- 8. Scope: This indicator is aggregated.
- 9. Caveats: This indicator is not a surrogate. It has no weaknesses. The source of the data does not have a bias. There is not a caveat.
- 10. **Responsible Person:** The person responsible for this indicator is the Civil Division Deputy Director.

Program:	Civil
Objective:	I.5
Indicator Name:	Total number of attendees at presentations made to public and private entities

- 1. Type and Level: Output/Key
- 2. **Rationale:** The indicator provides an overall feel for how well the department is meeting its objectives. It is necessary to track supporting indicators.
- 3. Use: This indicator will be monitored by the division and department management. It will be used for internal management purposes and performance-based budgeting as an indicator of workload.
- 4. Clarity: This indicator is clearly identified.
- 5. Validity, Reliability and Accuracy: This is a valid indicator that is reliable and accurate. Performance indicators are reported to the Office of Planning and Budget, available to the public and the media via the internet, and are subject to audit.
- 6. **Data Source, Collection and Reporting:** The data source is an analysis of all of the department's objectives and performance indicators. It is tracked and reported quarterly.
- 7. Calculation Methodology: The indicator is calculated by adding together the number of attendees at presentations made to public and private entities.
- 8. Scope: This indicator is aggregated.
- 9. Caveats: This indicator is not a surrogate. It has no weaknesses. The source of the data does not have a bias. There is not a caveat.
- 10. **Responsible Person:** The person responsible for this indicator is the Civil Division Deputy Director.

Program:	Civil
Objective:	I.5
Indicator Name:	Total number of constituent services tickets

- 1. Type and Level: Output/Key
- 2. **Rationale:** The indicator provides an overall feel for how well the department is meeting its objectives. It is necessary to track key indicators.
- 3. Use: This indicator will be monitored by the division and department management. It will be used for internal management purposes and performance-based budgeting as an indicator of workload.
- 4. Clarity: This indicator is clearly identified.
- 5. Validity, Reliability and Accuracy: This is a valid indicator that is reliable and accurate. Performance indicators are reported to the Office of Planning and Budget, available to the public and the media via the internet, and are subject to audit.
- 6. **Data Source, Collection and Reporting:** The data source is an analysis of all of the department's objectives and performance indicators. It is tracked and reported quarterly.
- 7. Calculation Methodology: The indicator is calculated by adding together the number of constituent services tickets.
- 8. Scope: This indicator is aggregated.
- 9. Caveats: This indicator is not a surrogate. It has no weaknesses. The source of the data does not have a bias. There is not a caveat.
- 10. **Responsible Person:** The person responsible for this indicator is the Civil Division Deputy Director.

Program:	Civil
Objective:	I.5
Indicator Name:	Number of non-duty attorney tickets resolved

- 1. Type and Level: Output/Key
- 2. **Rationale:** The indicator provides an overall feel for how well the department is meeting its objectives. It is necessary to track key indicators.
- 3. Use: This indicator will be monitored by the division and department management. It will be used for internal management purposes and performance-based budgeting as an indicator of workload.
- 4. Clarity: This indicator is clearly identified.
- 5. Validity, Reliability and Accuracy: This is a valid indicator that is reliable and accurate. Performance indicators are reported to the Office of Planning and Budget, available to the public and the media via the internet, and are subject to audit.
- 6. **Data Source, Collection and Reporting:** The data source is an analysis of all of the department's objectives and performance indicators. It is tracked and reported quarterly.
- 7. Calculation Methodology: The indicator is calculated by adding together the number of non-duty attorney tickets resolved.
- 8. Scope: This indicator is aggregated.
- 9. Caveats: This indicator is not a surrogate. It has no weaknesses. The source of the data does not have a bias. There is not a caveat.
- 10. **Responsible Person:** The person responsible for this indicator is the Civil Division Deputy Director.

Program:	Civil
Objective:	I.5
Indicator Name:	Number of duty attorney tickets resolved

- 1. Type and Level: Output/Key
- 2. **Rationale:** The indicator provides an overall feel for how well the department is meeting its objectives. It is necessary to track key indicators.
- 3. Use: This indicator will be monitored by the division and department management. It will be used for internal management purposes and performance-based budgeting as an indicator of workload.
- 4. Clarity: This indicator is clearly identified.
- 5. Validity, Reliability and Accuracy: This is a valid indicator that is reliable and accurate. Performance indicators are reported to the Office of Planning and Budget, available to the public and the media via the internet, and are subject to audit.
- 6. **Data Source, Collection and Reporting:** The data source is an analysis of all of the department's objectives and performance indicators. It is tracked and reported quarterly.
- 7. Calculation Methodology: The indicator is calculated by adding together the number of duty attorney tickets resolved.
- 8. Scope: This indicator is aggregated.
- 9. Caveats: This indicator is not a surrogate. It has no weaknesses. The source of the data does not have a bias. There is not a caveat.
- 10. **Responsible Person:** The person responsible for this indicator is the Civil Division Deputy Director.

Program:	Civil
Objective:	I.5
Indicator Name:	Total number of constituent tickets resolved

- 1. Type and Level: Output/Key
- 2. **Rationale:** The indicator provides an overall feel for how well the department is meeting its objectives. It is necessary to track key indicators.
- 3. Use: This indicator will be monitored by the division and department management. It will be used for internal management purposes and performance-based budgeting as an indicator of workload.
- 4. Clarity: This indicator is clearly identified.
- 5. Validity, Reliability and Accuracy: This is a valid indicator that is reliable and accurate. Performance indicators are reported to the Office of Planning and Budget, available to the public and the media via the internet, and are subject to audit.
- 6. **Data Source, Collection and Reporting:** The data source is an analysis of all of the department's objectives and performance indicators. It is tracked and reported quarterly.
- 7. Calculation Methodology: The indicator is calculated by adding together the total number of constituent tickets resolved.
- 8. Scope: This indicator is aggregated.
- 9. Caveats: This indicator is not a surrogate. It has no weaknesses. The source of the data does not have a bias. There is not a caveat.
- 10. **Responsible Person:** The person responsible for this indicator is the Civil Division Deputy Director.

Program:	Civil
Objective:	I.5
Indicator Name:	Total number of constituent tickets unresolved

- 1. Type and Level: Output/Key
- 2. **Rationale:** The indicator provides an overall feel for how well the department is meeting its objectives. It is necessary to track key indicators.
- 3. Use: This indicator will be monitored by the division and department management. It will be used for internal management purposes and performance-based budgeting as an indicator of workload.
- 4. Clarity: This indicator is clearly identified.
- 5. Validity, Reliability and Accuracy: This is a valid indicator that is reliable and accurate. Performance indicators are reported to the Office of Planning and Budget, available to the public and the media via the internet, and are subject to audit.
- 6. **Data Source, Collection and Reporting:** The data source is an analysis of all of the department's objectives and performance indicators. It is tracked and reported quarterly.
- 7. Calculation Methodology: The indicator is calculated by adding together the total number of constituent tickets unresolved.
- 8. Scope: This indicator is aggregated.
- 9. Caveats: This indicator is not a surrogate. It has no weaknesses. The source of the data does not have a bias. There is not a caveat.
- 10. **Responsible Person:** The person responsible for this indicator is the Civil Division Deputy Director.

Program:	Civil
Objective:	I.5
Indicator Name:	Percentage of tickets resolved

- 1. Type and Level: Efficiency/General
- 2. **Rationale:** The indicator provides an overall feel for how well the department is meeting its objectives. It is necessary to track key indicators.
- 3. Use: This indicator will be monitored by the division and department management. It will be used for internal management purposes and performance-based budgeting as an indicator of workload.
- 4. Clarity: This indicator is clearly identified.
- 5. Validity, Reliability and Accuracy: This is a valid indicator that is reliable and accurate. Performance indicators are reported to the Office of Planning and Budget, available to the public and the media via the internet, and are subject to audit.
- 6. **Data Source, Collection and Reporting:** The data source is an analysis of all of the department's objectives and performance indicators. It is tracked and reported quarterly.
- 7. Calculation Methodology: The indicator is calculated by dividing the number of tickets resolved by the total number of constituent services tickets.
- 8. Scope: This indicator is aggregated.
- 9. Caveats: This indicator is not a surrogate. It has no weaknesses. The source of the data does not have a bias. There is not a caveat.
- 10. **Responsible Person:** The person responsible for this indicator is the Civil Division Deputy Director.

Program:	Civil
Objective:	I.6
Indicator Name:	Total dollar amount of settlements approved

- 1. Type and Level: Input/Supporting
- 2. **Rationale:** The indicator provides an overall feel for how well the department is meeting its objectives. It is necessary to track supporting indicators.
- 3. Use: This indicator will be monitored by the division and department management. It will be used for internal management purposes and performance-based budgeting as an indicator of workload.
- 4. Clarity: This indicator is clearly identified.
- 5. Validity, Reliability and Accuracy: This is a valid indicator that is reliable and accurate. Performance indicators are reported to the Office of Planning and Budget, available to the public and the media via the internet, and are subject to audit.
- 6. **Data Source, Collection and Reporting:** The data source is an analysis of all of the department's objectives and performance indicators. It is tracked and reported quarterly.
- 7. Calculation Methodology: The indicator is calculated by adding together the total dollar amounts of settlements approved.
- 8. Scope: This indicator is aggregated.
- 9. Caveats: This indicator is not a surrogate. It has no weaknesses. The source of the data does not have a bias. There is not a caveat.
- 10. **Responsible Person:** The person responsible for this indicator is the Civil Division Deputy Director.

Program:	Civil
Objective:	I.6
Indicator Name:	Number of settlements received for review

- 1. Type and Level: Output/Key
- 2. **Rationale:** The indicator provides an overall feel for how well the department is meeting its objectives. It is necessary to track key indicators.
- 3. Use: This indicator will be monitored by the division and department management. It will be used for internal management purposes and performance-based budgeting as an indicator of workload.
- 4. Clarity: This indicator is clearly identified.
- 5. Validity, Reliability and Accuracy: This is a valid indicator that is reliable and accurate. Performance indicators are reported to the Office of Planning and Budget, available to the public and the media via the internet, and are subject to audit.
- 6. **Data Source, Collection and Reporting:** The data source is an analysis of all of the department's objectives and performance indicators. It is tracked and reported quarterly.
- 7. Calculation Methodology: The indicator is calculated by adding together the number of settlements received for review.
- 8. Scope: This indicator is aggregated.
- 9. Caveats: This indicator is not a surrogate. It has no weaknesses. The source of the data does not have a bias. There is not a caveat.
- 10. **Responsible Person:** The person responsible for this indicator is the Civil Division Deputy Director.

Program:	Civil
Objective:	I.6
Indicator Name:	Number of settlements approved

- 1. Type and Level: Output/Supporting
- 2. **Rationale:** The indicator provides an overall feel for how well the department is meeting its objectives. It is necessary to track supporting indicators.
- 3. Use: This indicator will be monitored by the division and department management. It will be used for internal management purposes and performance-based budgeting as an indicator of workload.
- 4. Clarity: This indicator is clearly identified.
- 5. Validity, Reliability and Accuracy: This is a valid indicator that is reliable and accurate. Performance indicators are reported to the Office of Planning and Budget, available to the public and the media via the internet, and are subject to audit.
- 6. **Data Source, Collection and Reporting:** The data source is an analysis of all of the department's objectives and performance indicators. It is tracked and reported quarterly.
- 7. Calculation Methodology: The indicator is calculated by adding together the number of settlements approved.
- 8. Scope: This indicator is aggregated.
- 9. Caveats: This indicator is not a surrogate. It has no weaknesses. The source of the data does not have a bias. There is not a caveat.
- 10. **Responsible Person:** The person responsible for this indicator is the Civil Division Deputy Director.

Program:	Civil
Objective:	I.6
Indicator Name:	Number of settlements approved within statutory time limits

- 1. Type and Level: Output/Supporting
- 2. **Rationale:** The indicator provides an overall feel for how well the department is meeting its objectives. It is necessary to track supporting indicators.
- 3. Use: This indicator will be monitored by the division and department management. It will be used for internal management purposes and performance-based budgeting as an indicator of workload.
- 4. Clarity: This indicator is clearly identified.
- 5. Validity, Reliability and Accuracy: This is a valid indicator that is reliable and accurate. Performance indicators are reported to the Office of Planning and Budget, available to the public and the media via the internet, and are subject to audit.
- 6. **Data Source, Collection and Reporting:** The data source is an analysis of all of the department's objectives and performance indicators. It is tracked and reported quarterly.
- 7. Calculation Methodology: The indicator is calculated by adding together the number of settlements approved within statutory time limits.
- 8. Scope: This indicator is aggregated.
- 9. Caveats: This indicator is not a surrogate. It has no weaknesses. The source of the data does not have a bias. There is not a caveat.
- 10. **Responsible Person:** The person responsible for this indicator is the Civil Division Deputy Director.

Program:	Civil
Objective:	I.6
Indicator Name:	Number of settlements disapproved

- 1. Type and Level: Outcome/General
- 2. **Rationale:** The indicator provides an overall feel for how well the department is meeting its objectives. It is necessary to track general indicators.
- 3. Use: This indicator will be monitored by the division and department management. It will be used for internal management purposes and performance-based budgeting as an indicator of workload.
- 4. Clarity: This indicator is clearly identified.
- 5. Validity, Reliability and Accuracy: This is a valid indicator that is reliable and accurate. Performance indicators are reported to the Office of Planning and Budget, available to the public and the media via the internet, and are subject to audit.
- 6. **Data Source, Collection and Reporting:** The data source is an analysis of all of the department's objectives and performance indicators. It is tracked and reported quarterly.
- 7. **Calculation Methodology:** The indicator is calculated by adding together the total number of settlements disapproved.
- 8. Scope: This indicator is aggregated.
- 9. Caveats: This indicator is not a surrogate. It has no weaknesses. The source of the data does not have a bias. There is not a caveat.
- 10. **Responsible Person:** The person responsible for this indicator is the Civil Division Deputy Director.

Program:	Civil
Objective:	I.6
Indicator Name:	Percentage of settlements approved within the statutory time limits
Indicator LaPAS PI Code:	New

- 1. Type and Level: Efficiency/General
- 2. **Rationale:** The indicator provides an overall feel for how well the department is meeting its objectives. It is necessary to track general indicators.
- 3. Use: This indicator will be monitored by the division and department management. It will be used for internal management purposes and performance-based budgeting as an indicator of workload.
- 4. Clarity: This indicator is clearly identified.
- 5. Validity, Reliability and Accuracy: This is a valid indicator that is reliable and accurate. Performance indicators are reported to the Office of Planning and Budget, available to the public and the media via the internet, and are subject to audit.
- 6. **Data Source, Collection and Reporting:** The data source is an analysis of all of the department's objectives and performance indicators. It is tracked and reported quarterly.
- 7. Calculation Methodology: The indicator is calculated by dividing the number of settlements approved within the statutory time limits by the number of settlements received for review.
- 8. Scope: This indicator is aggregated.
- 9. Caveats: This indicator is not a surrogate. It has no weaknesses. The source of the data does not have a bias. There is not a caveat.
- 10. **Responsible Person:** The person responsible for this indicator is the Civil Division Deputy Director.

Program:	Civil
Objective:	I.7
Indicator Name:	Number of meetings per month

- 1. Type and Level: Input/General
- 2. **Rationale:** The indicator provides an overall feel for how well the department is meeting its objectives. It is necessary to support the outcome measures.
- 3. Use: This indicator will be monitored by the division and department management. It will be used for internal management purposes and performance-based budgeting as an indicator of workload.
- 4. Clarity: This indicator is clearly identified.
- 5. Validity, Reliability and Accuracy: This is a valid indicator that is reliable and accurate. Performance indicators are reported to the Office of Planning and Budget, available to the public and the media via the internet, and are subject to audit.
- 6. **Data Source, Collection and Reporting:** The data source is an analysis of all of the department's objectives and performance indicators. It is tracked and reported quarterly.
- 7. Calculation Methodology: The indicator is calculated by adding the number of meetings per month.
- 8. Scope: This indicator is aggregated.
- 9. Caveats: This indicator is not a surrogate. It has no weaknesses. The source of the data does not have a bias. There is not a caveat.
- 10. **Responsible Person:** The person responsible for this indicator is the Complex Litigation Section Chief.

Program:	Civil
Objective:	I.7
Indicator Name:	Number of meetings attended per month

- 1. Type and Level: Input/General
- 2. **Rationale:** The indicator provides an overall feel for how well the department is meeting its objectives. It is necessary to support the outcome measures.
- 3. Use: This indicator will be monitored by the division and department management. It will be used for internal management purposes and performance-based budgeting as an indicator of workload.
- 4. Clarity: This indicator is clearly identified.
- 5. Validity, Reliability and Accuracy: This is a valid indicator that is reliable and accurate. Performance indicators are reported to the Office of Planning and Budget, available to the public and the media via the internet, and are subject to audit.
- 6. **Data Source, Collection and Reporting:** The data source is an analysis of all of the department's objectives and performance indicators. It is tracked and reported quarterly.
- 7. Calculation Methodology: The indicator is calculated by adding the number of meetings attended.
- 8. Scope: This indicator is aggregated.
- 9. Caveats: This indicator is not a surrogate. It has no weaknesses. The source of the data does not have a bias. There is not a caveat.
- 10. **Responsible Person:** The person responsible for this indicator is the Complex Litigation Section Chief.

Program:	Civil
Objective:	I.7
Indicator Name:	Percentage of meetings attended by attorneys

- 1. Type and Level: Efficiency/General
- 2. **Rationale:** The indicator provides an overall feel for how well the department is meeting its objectives. It is necessary to support the outcome measures.
- 3. Use: This indicator will be monitored by the division and department management. It will be used for internal management purposes and performance-based budgeting as an indicator of workload.
- 4. Clarity: This indicator is clearly identified.
- 5. Validity, Reliability and Accuracy: This is a valid indicator that is reliable and accurate. Performance indicators are reported to the Office of Planning and Budget, available to the public and the media via the internet, and are subject to audit.
- 6. **Data Source, Collection and Reporting:** The data source is an analysis of all of the department's objectives and performance indicators. It is tracked and reported quarterly.
- 7. Calculation Methodology: The indicator is calculated by dividing the amount of meetings attended by attorneys by the number of meetings per month.
- 8. Scope: This indicator is aggregated.
- 9. Caveats: This indicator is not a surrogate. It has no weaknesses. The source of the data does not have a bias. There is not a caveat.
- 10. **Responsible Person:** The person responsible for this indicator is the Complex Litigation Section Chief.

Program:	Civil
Objective:	I.8
Indicator Name:	Number of verified consumer disputes responded to within 15 days of receipt

- 1. Type and Level: Input/General
- 2. **Rationale:** The indicator provides an overall feel for how well the department is meeting its objectives. It is necessary to support the outcome measures.
- 3. Use: This indicator will be monitored by the division and department management. It will be used for internal management purposes and performance-based budgeting as an indicator of workload.
- 4. Clarity: This indicator is clearly identified.
- 5. Validity, Reliability and Accuracy: This is a valid indicator that is reliable and accurate. Performance indicators are reported to the Office of Planning and Budget, available to the public and the media via the internet, and are subject to audit.
- 6. **Data Source, Collection and Reporting:** The data source is an analysis of all of the department's objectives and performance indicators. It is tracked and reported quarterly.
- 7. Calculation Methodology: The indicator is calculated by adding up the number of verified consumer disputes responded to within 15 days of receipt.
- 8. Scope: This indicator is aggregated.
- 9. Caveats: This indicator is not a surrogate. It has no weaknesses. The source of the data does not have a bias. There is not a caveat.
- 10. **Responsible Person:** The person responsible for this indicator is the Consumer Section Chief; Office Manager.
| Program:        | Civil   |
|-----------------|---|
| Objective:      | I.8   |
| Indicator Name: | Number of verified consumer disputes received |

- 1. Type and Level: Input/General
- 2. **Rationale:** The indicator provides an overall feel for how well the department is meeting its objectives. It is necessary to support the outcome measures.
- 3. Use: This indicator will be monitored by the division and department management. It will be used for internal management purposes and performance-based budgeting as an indicator of workload.
- 4. Clarity: This indicator is clearly identified.
- 5. Validity, Reliability and Accuracy: This is a valid indicator that is reliable and accurate. Performance indicators are reported to the Office of Planning and Budget, available to the public and the media via the internet, and are subject to audit.
- 6. **Data Source, Collection and Reporting:** The data source is an analysis of all of the department's objectives and performance indicators. It is tracked and reported quarterly.
- 7. Calculation Methodology: The indicator is calculated by adding up the number of verified consumer disputes received.
- 8. Scope: This indicator is aggregated.
- 9. Caveats: This indicator is not a surrogate. It has no weaknesses. The source of the data does not have a bias. There is not a caveat.
- 10. **Responsible Person:** The person responsible for this indicator is the Consumer Section Chief; Office Manager.

Program:	Civil
Objective:	I.8
Indicator Name:	Percentage of verified consumer disputes that are responded to within 15 days of receipt

- 1. Type and Level: Efficiency/General
- 2. **Rationale:** The indicator provides an overall feel for how well the department is meeting its objectives. It is necessary to support the outcome measures.
- 3. Use: This indicator will be monitored by the division and department management. It will be used for internal management purposes and performance-based budgeting as an indicator of workload.
- 4. Clarity: This indicator is clearly identified.
- 5. Validity, Reliability and Accuracy: This is a valid indicator that is reliable and accurate. Performance indicators are reported to the Office of Planning and Budget, available to the public and the media via the internet, and are subject to audit.
- 6. **Data Source, Collection and Reporting:** The data source is an analysis of all of the department's objectives and performance indicators. It is tracked and reported quarterly.
- 7. Calculation Methodology: The indicator is calculated by dividing the number of verified consumer disputes responded to within 15 days of receipt by the number of verified consumer disputes received.
- 8. Scope: This indicator is aggregated.
- 9. Caveats: This indicator is not a surrogate. It has no weaknesses. The source of the data does not have a bias. There is not a caveat.
- 10. **Responsible Person:** The person responsible for this indicator is the Consumer Section Chief; Office Manager.

Program:	Civil
Objective:	I.9
Indicator Name:	Number of verified consumer complaints closed within 90 days of receipt

- 1. Type and Level: Input/General
- 2. **Rationale:** The indicator provides an overall feel for how well the department is meeting its objectives. It is necessary to support the outcome measures.
- 3. Use: This indicator will be monitored by the division and department management. It will be used for internal management purposes and performance-based budgeting as an indicator of workload.
- 4. Clarity: This indicator is clearly identified.
- 5. Validity, Reliability and Accuracy: This is a valid indicator that is reliable and accurate. Performance indicators are reported to the Office of Planning and Budget, available to the public and the media via the internet, and are subject to audit.
- 6. **Data Source, Collection and Reporting:** The data source is an analysis of all of the department's objectives and performance indicators. It is tracked and reported quarterly.
- 7. Calculation Methodology: The indicator is calculated by adding the number of verified consumer complaints closed within 90 days of receipt.
- 8. Scope: This indicator is aggregated.
- 9. Caveats: This indicator is not a surrogate. It has no weaknesses. The source of the data does not have a bias. There is not a caveat.
- 10. **Responsible Person:** The person responsible for this indicator is the Consumer Section Chief; Office Manager.

Program:	Civil
Objective:	I.9
Indicator Name:	Number of verified consumer complaints received

- 1. Type and Level: Input/General
- 2. **Rationale:** The indicator provides an overall feel for how well the department is meeting its objectives. It is necessary to support the outcome measures.
- 3. Use: This indicator will be monitored by the division and department management. It will be used for internal management purposes and performance-based budgeting as an indicator of workload.
- 4. Clarity: This indicator is clearly identified.
- 5. Validity, Reliability and Accuracy: This is a valid indicator that is reliable and accurate. Performance indicators are reported to the Office of Planning and Budget, available to the public and the media via the internet, and are subject to audit.
- 6. **Data Source, Collection and Reporting:** The data source is an analysis of all of the department's objectives and performance indicators. It is tracked and reported quarterly.
- 7. Calculation Methodology: The indicator is calculated by adding up the number of verified consumer complaints received.
- 8. Scope: This indicator is aggregated.
- 9. Caveats: This indicator is not a surrogate. It has no weaknesses. The source of the data does not have a bias. There is not a caveat.
- 10. **Responsible Person:** The person responsible for this indicator is the Consumer Section Chief; Office Manager.

Program:	Civil
Objective:	I.9
Indicator Name:	Percentage of verified consumer complaints closed within 90 days of receipt

- 1. Type and Level: Efficiency/General
- 2. **Rationale:** The indicator provides an overall feel for how well the department is meeting its objectives. It is necessary to support the outcome measures.
- 3. Use: This indicator will be monitored by the division and department management. It will be used for internal management purposes and performance-based budgeting as an indicator of workload.
- 4. Clarity: This indicator is clearly identified.
- 5. Validity, Reliability and Accuracy: This is a valid indicator that is reliable and accurate. Performance indicators are reported to the Office of Planning and Budget, available to the public and the media via the internet, and are subject to audit.
- 6. **Data Source, Collection and Reporting:** The data source is an analysis of all of the department's objectives and performance indicators. It is tracked and reported quarterly.
- 7. Calculation Methodology: The indicator is calculated by dividing the number of verified consumer complaints closed within 90 days of receipt by the number of verified consumer complaints received.
- 8. Scope: This indicator is aggregated.
- 9. Caveats: This indicator is not a surrogate. It has no weaknesses. The source of the data does not have a bias. There is not a caveat.
- 10. **Responsible Person:** The person responsible for this indicator is the Consumer Section Chief; Office Manager.

Program:	Civil
Objective:	I.10
Indicator Name:	Number of inquiries received

- 1. Type and Level: Input/General
- 2. **Rationale:** The indicator provides an overall feel for how well the department is meeting its objectives. It is necessary to support the outcome measures.
- 3. Use: This indicator will be monitored by the division and department management. It will be used for internal management purposes and performance-based budgeting as an indicator of workload.
- 4. Clarity: This indicator is clearly identified.
- 5. Validity, Reliability and Accuracy: This is a valid indicator that is reliable and accurate. Performance indicators are reported to the Office of Planning and Budget, available to the public and the media via the internet, and are subject to audit.
- 6. **Data Source, Collection and Reporting:** The data source is an analysis of all of the department's objectives and performance indicators. It is tracked and reported quarterly.
- 7. Calculation Methodology: The indicator is calculated by adding together all fair housing complaints received.
- 8. Scope: This indicator is aggregated.
- 9. Caveats: This indicator is not a surrogate. It has no weaknesses. The source of the data does not have a bias. There is not a caveat.
- 10. **Responsible Person:** The person responsible for this indicator is the Equal Housing Opportunity Intake Specialist.

Program:	Civil
Objective:	I.10
Indicator Name:	Number of inquiries closed

- 1. Type and Level: Input/General
- 2. **Rationale:** The indicator provides an overall feel for how well the department is meeting its objectives. It is necessary to support the outcome measures.
- 3. Use: This indicator will be monitored by the division and department management. It will be used for internal management purposes and performance-based budgeting as an indicator of workload.
- 4. Clarity: This indicator is clearly identified.
- 5. Validity, Reliability and Accuracy: This is a valid indicator that is reliable and accurate. Performance indicators are reported to the Office of Planning and Budget, available to the public and the media via the internet, and are subject to audit.
- 6. **Data Source, Collection and Reporting:** The data source is an analysis of all of the department's objectives and performance indicators. It is tracked and reported quarterly.
- 7. Calculation Methodology: The indicator is calculated by adding together the number of all fair housing inquiries closed.
- 8. Scope: This indicator is aggregated.
- 9. Caveats: This indicator is not a surrogate. It has no weaknesses. The source of the data does not have a bias. There is not a caveat.
- 10. **Responsible Person:** The person responsible for this indicator is the Equal Housing Opportunity Intake Specialist.

Program:	Civil
Objective:	I.10
Indicator Name:	Percentage of inquires closed

- 1. Type and Level: Efficiency/General
- 2. **Rationale:** The indicator provides an overall feel for how well the department is meeting its objectives. It is necessary to support the outcome measures.
- 3. Use: This indicator will be monitored by the division and department management. It will be used for internal management purposes and performance-based budgeting as an indicator of workload.
- 4. Clarity: This indicator is clearly identified.
- 5. Validity, Reliability and Accuracy: This is a valid indicator that is reliable and accurate. Performance indicators are reported to the Office of Planning and Budget, available to the public and the media via the internet, and are subject to audit.
- 6. **Data Source, Collection and Reporting:** The data source is an analysis of all of the department's objectives and performance indicators. It is tracked and reported quarterly.
- 7. Calculation Methodology: The indicator is calculated by dividing the number of inquiries closed by the number of inquiries received.
- 8. Scope: This indicator is aggregated.
- 9. Caveats: This indicator is not a surrogate. It has no weaknesses. The source of the data does not have a bias. There is not a caveat.
- 10. **Responsible Person:** The person responsible for this indicator is the Equal Housing Opportunity Intake Specialist.

Program:	Civil
Objective:	1.11
Indicator Name:	Number of cases processed and notification letters sent within five days of the receipt of the signed complaint

- 1. Type and Level: Output/General
- 2. **Rationale:** The indicator provides an overall feel for how well the department is meeting its objectives. It is necessary to support the outcome measures.
- 3. Use: This indicator will be monitored by the division and department management. It will be used for internal management purposes and performance-based budgeting as an indicator of workload.
- 4. Clarity: This indicator is clearly identified.
- 5. Validity, Reliability and Accuracy: This is a valid indicator that is reliable and accurate. Performance indicators are reported to the Office of Planning and Budget, available to the public and the media via the internet, and are subject to audit.
- 6. **Data Source, Collection and Reporting:** The data source is an analysis of all of the department's objectives and performance indicators. It is tracked and reported quarterly.
- 7. Calculation Methodology: The indicator is calculated by adding together all cases processed and notification letters sent within five days of the receipt of the signed complaint.
- 8. **Scope:** This indicator is aggregated.
- 9. Caveats: This indicator is not a surrogate. It has no weaknesses. The source of the data does not have a bias. There is not a caveat.
- 10. **Responsible Person:** The person responsible for this indicator is the Equal Housing Opportunity Section Chief.

Program:	Civil
Objective:	1.11
Indicator Name:	Number of investigations completed 100 days or 100-day letters sent to all parties within reason for delay

- 1. Type and Level: Output/General
- 2. **Rationale:** The indicator provides an overall feel for how well the department is meeting its objectives. It is necessary to support the outcome measures.
- 3. Use: This indicator will be monitored by the division and department management. It will be used for internal management purposes and performance-based budgeting as an indicator of workload.
- 4. Clarity: This indicator is clearly identified.
- 5. Validity, Reliability and Accuracy: This is a valid indicator that is reliable and accurate. Performance indicators are reported to the Office of Planning and Budget, available to the public and the media via the internet, and are subject to audit.
- 6. **Data Source, Collection and Reporting:** The data source is an analysis of all of the department's objectives and performance indicators. It is tracked and reported quarterly.
- 7. Calculation Methodology: The indicator is calculated by adding together the number of investigations completed 100 days or 100-day letters sent to all parties within reason for delay.
- 8. Scope: This indicator is aggregated.
- 9. **Caveats:** This indicator is not a surrogate. It has no weaknesses. The source of the data does not have a bias. There is not a caveat.
- 10. **Responsible Person:** The person responsible for this indicator is the Equal Housing Opportunity Compliance Officer.

Program:	Civil
Objective:	1.11
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

- 1. Type and Level: Output/General
- 2. **Rationale:** The indicator provides an overall feel for how well the department is meeting its objectives. It is necessary to support the outcome measures.
- 3. Use: This indicator will be monitored by the division and department management. It will be used for internal management purposes and performance-based budgeting as an indicator of workload.
- 4. Clarity: This indicator is clearly identified.
- 5. Validity, Reliability and Accuracy: This is a valid indicator that is reliable and accurate. Performance indicators are reported to the Office of Planning and Budget, available to the public and the media via the internet, and are subject to audit.
- 6. **Data Source, Collection and Reporting:** The data source is an analysis of all of the department's objectives and performance indicators. It is tracked and reported quarterly.
- 7. Calculation Methodology: The indicator is calculated by adding the 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 together all cases completed.
- 8. Scope: This indicator is aggregated.
- 9. Caveats: This indicator is not a surrogate. It has no weaknesses. The source of the data does not have a bias. There is not a caveat.
- 10. **Responsible Person:** The person responsible for this indicator is the Equal Housing Opportunity Compliance Officer.

Program:	Civil
Objective:	1.11
Indicator Name:	Number of cases processed

- 1. Type and Level: Outcome/General
- 2. **Rationale:** The indicator provides an overall feel for how well the department is meeting its objectives. It is necessary to support the outcome measures.
- 3. Use: This indicator will be monitored by the division and department management. It will be used for internal management purposes and performance-based budgeting as an indicator of workload.
- 4. Clarity: This indicator is clearly identified.
- 5. Validity, Reliability and Accuracy: This is a valid indicator that is reliable and accurate. Performance indicators are reported to the Office of Planning and Budget, available to the public and the media via the internet, and are subject to audit.
- 6. **Data Source, Collection and Reporting:** The data source is an analysis of all of the department's objectives and performance indicators. It is tracked and reported quarterly.
- 7. Calculation Methodology: The indicator is calculated by adding the number of cases processed.
- 8. Scope: This indicator is aggregated.
- 9. Caveats: This indicator is not a surrogate. It has no weaknesses. The source of the data does not have a bias. There is not a caveat.
- 10. **Responsible Person:** The person responsible for this indicator is the Equal Housing Opportunity Section Chief.

Program:	Civil
Objective:	1.11
Indicator Name:	Number of fair housing complaints received

- 1. Type and Level: Input/General
- 2. **Rationale:** The indicator provides an overall feel for how well the department is meeting its objectives. It is necessary to support the outcome measures.
- 3. Use: This indicator will be monitored by the division and department management. It will be used for internal management purposes and performance-based budgeting as an indicator of workload.
- 4. Clarity: This indicator is clearly identified.
- 5. Validity, Reliability and Accuracy: This is a valid indicator that is reliable and accurate. Performance indicators are reported to the Office of Planning and Budget, available to the public and the media via the internet, and are subject to audit.
- 6. **Data Source, Collection and Reporting:** The data source is an analysis of all of the department's objectives and performance indicators. It is tracked and reported quarterly.
- 7. Calculation Methodology: The indicator is calculated by adding together all suits filed within 60 days of cause case closure.
- 8. Scope: This indicator is aggregated.
- 9. Caveats: This indicator is not a surrogate. It has no weaknesses. The source of the data does not have a bias. There is not a caveat.
- 10. **Responsible Person:** The person responsible for this indicator is the Equal Housing Opportunity Section Chief.

Program:	Civil
Objective:	1.11
Indicator Name:	Percentage of cases processed

- 1. Type and Level: Efficiency/General
- 2. **Rationale:** The indicator provides an overall feel for how well the department is meeting its objectives. It is necessary to support the outcome measures.
- 3. Use: This indicator will be monitored by the division and department management. It will be used for internal management purposes and performance-based budgeting as an indicator of workload.
- 4. Clarity: This indicator is clearly identified.
- 5. Validity, Reliability and Accuracy: This is a valid indicator that is reliable and accurate. Performance indicators are reported to the Office of Planning and Budget, available to the public and the media via the internet, and are subject to audit.
- 6. **Data Source, Collection and Reporting:** The data source is an analysis of all of the department's objectives and performance indicators. It is tracked and reported quarterly.
- 7. Calculation Methodology: The indicator is calculated by dividing the number of cases processed by the number of fair housing complaints received.
- 8. **Scope:** This indicator is aggregated.
- 9. Caveats: This indicator is not a surrogate. It has no weaknesses. The source of the data does not have a bias. There is not a caveat.
- 10. **Responsible Person:** The person responsible for this indicator is the Equal Housing Opportunity Section Chief.

Program:	Civil
Objective:	1.12
Indicator Name:	Number of fair housing complaints received through LADOJ intake

- 1. Type and Level: Output/General
- 2. **Rationale:** The indicator provides an overall feel for how well the department is meeting its objectives. It is necessary to support the outcome measures.
- 3. Use: This indicator will be monitored by the division and department management. It will be used for internal management purposes and performance-based budgeting as an indicator of workload.
- 4. Clarity: This indicator is clearly identified.
- 5. Validity, Reliability and Accuracy: This is a valid indicator that is reliable and accurate. Performance indicators are reported to the Office of Planning and Budget, available to the public and the media via the internet, and are subject to audit.
- 6. **Data Source, Collection and Reporting:** The data source is an analysis of all of the department's objectives and performance indicators. It is tracked and reported quarterly.
- 7. Calculation Methodology: The indicator is calculated by adding together the number of all fair housing complaints received through LADOJ intake.
- 8. Scope: This indicator is aggregated.
- 9. Caveats: This indicator is not a surrogate. It has no weaknesses. The source of the data does not have a bias. There is not a caveat.
- 10. **Responsible Person:** The person responsible for this indicator is the Equal Housing Opportunity Section Chief.

Program:	Civil
Objective:	1.12
Indicator Name:	Number of cases closed administratively

- 1. Type and Level: Output/General
- 2. **Rationale:** The indicator provides an overall feel for how well the department is meeting its objectives. It is necessary to support the outcome measures.
- 3. Use: This indicator will be monitored by the division and department management. It will be used for internal management purposes and performance-based budgeting as an indicator of workload.
- 4. Clarity: This indicator is clearly identified.
- 5. Validity, Reliability and Accuracy: This is a valid indicator that is reliable and accurate. Performance indicators are reported to the Office of Planning and Budget, available to the public and the media via the internet, and are subject to audit.
- 6. **Data Source, Collection and Reporting:** The data source is an analysis of all of the department's objectives and performance indicators. It is tracked and reported quarterly.
- 7. Calculation Methodology: The indicator is calculated by adding together the number of all cases closed administratively.
- 8. Scope: This indicator is aggregated.
- 9. Caveats: This indicator is not a surrogate. It has no weaknesses. The source of the data does not have a bias. There is not a caveat.
- 10. **Responsible Person:** The person responsible for this indicator is the Equal Housing Opportunity Section Chief.

Program:	Civil
Objective:	1.12
Indicator Name:	Number of cases closed by conciliation

- 1. Type and Level: Output/General
- 2. **Rationale:** The indicator provides an overall feel for how well the department is meeting its objectives. It is necessary to support the outcome measures.
- 3. Use: This indicator will be monitored by the division and department management. It will be used for internal management purposes and performance-based budgeting as an indicator of workload.
- 4. Clarity: This indicator is clearly identified.
- 5. Validity, Reliability and Accuracy: This is a valid indicator that is reliable and accurate. Performance indicators are reported to the Office of Planning and Budget, available to the public and the media via the internet, and are subject to audit.
- 6. **Data Source, Collection and Reporting:** The data source is an analysis of all of the department's objectives and performance indicators. It is tracked and reported quarterly.
- 7. Calculation Methodology: The indicator is calculated by adding together the number of all cases closed by conciliation.
- 8. Scope: This indicator is aggregated.
- 9. Caveats: This indicator is not a surrogate. It has no weaknesses. The source of the data does not have a bias. There is not a caveat.
- 10. **Responsible Person:** The person responsible for this indicator is the Equal Housing Opportunity Section Chief.

Program:	Civil
Objective:	1.12
Indicator Name:	Number of cases closed in which cause or no cause

- 1. Type and Level: Output/General
- 2. **Rationale:** The indicator provides an overall feel for how well the department is meeting its objectives. It is necessary to support the outcome measures.
- 3. Use: This indicator will be monitored by the division and department management. It will be used for internal management purposes and performance-based budgeting as an indicator of workload.
- 4. Clarity: This indicator is clearly identified.
- 5. Validity, Reliability and Accuracy: This is a valid indicator that is reliable and accurate. Performance indicators are reported to the Office of Planning and Budget, available to the public and the media via the internet, and are subject to audit.
- 6. **Data Source, Collection and Reporting:** The data source is an analysis of all of the department's objectives and performance indicators. It is tracked and reported quarterly.
- 7. Calculation Methodology: The indicator is calculated by adding together the number of all cases closed in which cause or no cause.
- 8. Scope: This indicator is aggregated.
- 9. Caveats: This indicator is not a surrogate. It has no weaknesses. The source of the data does not have a bias. There is not a caveat.
- 10. **Responsible Person:** The person responsible for this indicator is the Equal Housing Opportunity Section Chief.

Program:	Civil
Objective:	1.12
Indicator Name:	Number of cases closed

- 1. Type and Level: Outcome/General
- 2. **Rationale:** The indicator provides an overall feel for how well the department is meeting its objectives. It is necessary to support the outcome measures.
- 3. Use: This indicator will be monitored by the division and department management. It will be used for internal management purposes and performance-based budgeting as an indicator of workload.
- 4. Clarity: This indicator is clearly identified.
- 5. Validity, Reliability and Accuracy: This is a valid indicator that is reliable and accurate. Performance indicators are reported to the Office of Planning and Budget, available to the public and the media via the internet, and are subject to audit.
- 6. **Data Source, Collection and Reporting:** The data source is an analysis of all of the department's objectives and performance indicators. It is tracked and reported quarterly.
- 7. Calculation Methodology: The indicator is calculated by adding together the number of all cases closed.
- 8. Scope: This indicator is aggregated.
- 9. Caveats: This indicator is not a surrogate. It has no weaknesses. The source of the data does not have a bias. There is not a caveat.
- 10. **Responsible Person:** The person responsible for this indicator is the Equal Housing Opportunity Section Chief.

Program:	Civil
Objective:	1.12
Indicator Name:	Number of cases open with no activity within ten days

- 1. Type and Level: Efficiency/General
- 2. **Rationale:** The indicator provides an overall feel for how well the department is meeting its objectives. It is necessary to support the outcome measures.
- 3. Use: This indicator will be monitored by the division and department management. It will be used for internal management purposes and performance-based budgeting as an indicator of workload.
- 4. Clarity: This indicator is clearly identified.
- 5. Validity, Reliability and Accuracy: This is a valid indicator that is reliable and accurate. Performance indicators are reported to the Office of Planning and Budget, available to the public and the media via the internet, and are subject to audit.
- 6. **Data Source, Collection and Reporting:** The data source is an analysis of all of the department's objectives and performance indicators. It is tracked and reported quarterly.
- 7. **Calculation Methodology**: The indicator is calculated by adding together the number of all cases open with no activity within ten days.
- 8. Scope: This indicator is aggregated.
- 9. Caveats: This indicator is not a surrogate. It has no weaknesses. The source of the data does not have a bias. There is not a caveat.
- 10. **Responsible Person:** The person responsible for this indicator is the Equal Housing Opportunity Section Chief.

Program:	Civil
Objective:	1.13
Indicator Name:	Number of fair housing trainings scheduled

- 1. Type and Level: Output/General
- 2. **Rationale:** The indicator provides an overall feel for how well the department is meeting its objectives. It is necessary to support the outcome measures.
- 3. Use: This indicator will be monitored by the division and department management. It will be used for internal management purposes and performance-based budgeting as an indicator of workload.
- 4. Clarity: This indicator is clearly identified.
- 5. Validity, Reliability and Accuracy: This is a valid indicator that is reliable and accurate. Performance indicators are reported to the Office of Planning and Budget, available to the public and the media via the internet, and are subject to audit.
- 6. **Data Source, Collection and Reporting:** The data source is an analysis of all of the department's objectives and performance indicators. It is tracked and reported quarterly.
- 7. Calculation Methodology: The indicator is calculated by adding together the number of all fair housing trainings scheduled.
- 8. Scope: This indicator is aggregated.
- 9. Caveats: This indicator is not a surrogate. It has no weaknesses. The source of the data does not have a bias. There is not a caveat.
- 10. **Responsible Person:** The person responsible for this indicator is the Equal Housing Opportunity Section Chief.

Program:	Civil
Objective:	1.13
Indicator Name:	Number of fair housing materials distributed

- 1. Type and Level: Output/General
- 2. **Rationale:** The indicator provides an overall feel for how well the department is meeting its objectives. It is necessary to support the outcome measures.
- 3. Use: This indicator will be monitored by the division and department management. It will be used for internal management purposes and performance-based budgeting as an indicator of workload.
- 4. Clarity: This indicator is clearly identified.
- 5. Validity, Reliability and Accuracy: This is a valid indicator that is reliable and accurate. Performance indicators are reported to the Office of Planning and Budget, available to the public and the media via the internet, and are subject to audit.
- 6. **Data Source, Collection and Reporting:** The data source is an analysis of all of the department's objectives and performance indicators. It is tracked and reported quarterly.
- 7. Calculation Methodology: The indicator is calculated by adding together the number of fair housing materials distributed.
- 8. Scope: This indicator is aggregated.
- 9. Caveats: This indicator is not a surrogate. It has no weaknesses. The source of the data does not have a bias. There is not a caveat.
- 10. **Responsible Person:** The person responsible for this indicator is the Equal Housing Opportunity Section Chief.

Program:	Civil
Objective:	1.13
Indicator Name:	Percentage of fair housing materials distributed

- 1. Type and Level: Efficiency/General
- 2. **Rationale:** The indicator provides an overall feel for how well the department is meeting its objectives. It is necessary to support the outcome measures.
- 3. Use: This indicator will be monitored by the division and department management. It will be used for internal management purposes and performance-based budgeting as an indicator of workload.
- 4. Clarity: This indicator is clearly identified.
- 5. Validity, Reliability and Accuracy: This is a valid indicator that is reliable and accurate. Performance indicators are reported to the Office of Planning and Budget, available to the public and the media via the internet, and are subject to audit.
- 6. **Data Source, Collection and Reporting:** The data source is an analysis of all of the department's objectives and performance indicators. It is tracked and reported quarterly.
- 7. Calculation Methodology: The indicator is calculated by dividing the number fair housing materials distributed by the number of fair housing trainings scheduled.
- 8. Scope: This indicator is aggregated.
- 9. Caveats: This indicator is not a surrogate. It has no weaknesses. The source of the data does not have a bias. There is not a caveat.
- 10. **Responsible Person:** The person responsible for this indicator is the Equal Housing Opportunity Section Chief.

Program:	Civil
Objective:	1.14
Indicator Name:	Number of motions filed

- 1. Type and Level: Output/General
- 2. **Rationale:** The indicator provides an overall feel for how well the department is meeting its objectives. It is necessary to support the outcome measures.
- 3. Use: This indicator will be monitored by the division and department management. It will be used for internal management purposes and performance-based budgeting as an indicator of workload.
- 4. Clarity: This indicator is clearly identified.
- 5. Validity, Reliability and Accuracy: This is a valid indicator that is reliable and accurate. Performance indicators are reported to the Office of Planning and Budget, available to the public and the media via the internet, and are subject to audit.
- 6. **Data Source, Collection and Reporting:** The data source is an analysis of all of the department's objectives and performance indicators. It is tracked and reported quarterly.
- 7. Calculation Methodology: The indicator is calculated by adding together the number of all motions filed.
- 8. Scope: This indicator is aggregated.
- 9. Caveats: This indicator is not a surrogate. It has no weaknesses. The source of the data does not have a bias. There is not a caveat.
- 10. **Responsible Person:** The person responsible for this indicator is the Insurance Section Chief.

Program:	Civil
Objective:	1.14
Indicator Name:	Number of motions filed within ten days following the end of each monthly billing cycle

- 1. Type and Level: Output/General
- 2. **Rationale:** The indicator provides an overall feel for how well the department is meeting its objectives. It is necessary to support the outcome measures.
- 3. Use: This indicator will be monitored by the division and department management. It will be used for internal management purposes and performance-based budgeting as an indicator of workload.
- 4. Clarity: This indicator is clearly identified.
- 5. Validity, Reliability and Accuracy: This is a valid indicator that is reliable and accurate. Performance indicators are reported to the Office of Planning and Budget, available to the public and the media via the internet, and are subject to audit.
- 6. **Data Source, Collection and Reporting:** The data source is an analysis of all of the department's objectives and performance indicators. It is tracked and reported quarterly.
- 7. Calculation Methodology: The indicator is calculated by adding together all of the motions filed within ten days following the end of each monthly billing cycle.
- 8. Scope: This indicator is aggregated.
- 9. Caveats: This indicator is not a surrogate. It has no weaknesses. The source of the data does not have a bias. There is not a caveat.
- 10. **Responsible Person:** The person responsible for this indicator is the Insurance Section Chief.

Program:	Civil
Objective:	1.14
Indicator Name:	Percentage of billing invoices submitted within ten days following the end of each monthly billing cycle

- 1. Type and Level: Efficiency/General
- 2. **Rationale:** The indicator provides an overall feel for how well the department is meeting its objectives. It is necessary to track supporting indicators.
- 3. Use: This indicator will be monitored by the division and department management. It will be used for internal management purposes and performance-based budgeting as an indicator of workload.
- 4. Clarity: This indicator is clearly identified.
- 5. Validity, Reliability and Accuracy: This is a valid indicator that is reliable and accurate. Performance indicators are reported to the Office of Planning and Budget, available to the public and the media via the internet, and are subject to audit.
- 6. **Data Source, Collection and Reporting:** The data source is an analysis of all of the department's objectives and performance indicators. It is tracked and reported quarterly.
- 7. Calculation Methodology: The indicator is calculated by dividing the number of billing invoices submitted for payment within ten days by the total number of billing invoices submitted.
- 8. **Scope:** This indicator is aggregated.
- 9. Caveats: This indicator is not a surrogate. It has no weaknesses. The source of the data does not have a bias. There is not a caveat.
- 10. **Responsible Person:** The person responsible for this indicator is the Insurance Section Chief.

Program:	Civil
Objective:	1.15
Indicator Name:	Number of occupational licensing boards participating annually

- 1. Type and Level: Input/General
- 2. **Rationale:** The indicator provides an overall feel for how well the department is meeting its objectives. It is necessary to support the outcome measures.
- 3. Use: This indicator will be monitored by the division and department management. It will be used for internal management purposes and performance-based budgeting as an indicator of workload.
- 4. Clarity: This indicator is clearly identified.
- 5. Validity, Reliability and Accuracy: This is a valid indicator that is reliable and accurate. Performance indicators are reported to the Office of Planning and Budget, available to the public and the media via the internet, and are subject to audit.
- 6. **Data Source, Collection and Reporting:** The data source is an analysis of all of the department's objectives and performance indicators. It is tracked and reported quarterly.
- 7. Calculation Methodology: The indicator is calculated by adding together the number of occupational licensing boards participating annually.
- 8. Scope: This indicator is aggregated.
- 9. Caveats: This indicator is not a surrogate. It has no weaknesses. The source of the data does not have a bias. There is not a caveat.
- 10. Responsible Person: The person responsible for this indicator is the OLRP Section Chief.

Program:	Civil
Objective:	1.15
Indicator Name:	Number of proposed regulations submitted to the OLRP

- 1. Type and Level: Input/General
- 2. **Rationale:** The indicator provides an overall feel for how well the department is meeting its objectives. It is necessary to support the outcome measures.
- 3. Use: This indicator will be monitored by the division and department management. It will be used for internal management purposes and performance-based budgeting as an indicator of workload.
- 4. Clarity: This indicator is clearly identified.
- 5. Validity, Reliability and Accuracy: This is a valid indicator that is reliable and accurate. Performance indicators are reported to the Office of Planning and Budget, available to the public and the media via the internet, and are subject to audit.
- 6. **Data Source, Collection and Reporting:** The data source is an analysis of all of the department's objectives and performance indicators. It is tracked and reported quarterly.
- 7. Calculation Methodology: The indicator is calculated by adding together the number of proposed regulations submitted to the OLRP.
- 8. Scope: This indicator is aggregated.
- 9. Caveats: This indicator is not a surrogate. It has no weaknesses. The source of the data does not have a bias. There is not a caveat.
- 10. Responsible Person: The person responsible for this indicator is the OLRP Section Chief.

Program:	Civil
Objective:	1.15
Indicator Name:	Number of proposed disciplinary actions submitted to the OLRP

- 1. Type and Level: Input/General
- 2. **Rationale:** The indicator provides an overall feel for how well the department is meeting its objectives. It is necessary to support the outcome measures.
- 3. Use: This indicator will be monitored by the division and department management. It will be used for internal management purposes and performance-based budgeting as an indicator of workload.
- 4. Clarity: This indicator is clearly identified.
- 5. Validity, Reliability and Accuracy: This is a valid indicator that is reliable and accurate. Performance indicators are reported to the Office of Planning and Budget, available to the public and the media via the internet, and are subject to audit.
- 6. **Data Source, Collection and Reporting:** The data source is an analysis of all of the department's objectives and performance indicators. It is tracked and reported quarterly.
- 7. Calculation Methodology: The indicator is calculated by adding together the number of proposed disciplinary actions submitted to the OLRP.
- 8. Scope: This indicator is aggregated.
- 9. Caveats: This indicator is not a surrogate. It has no weaknesses. The source of the data does not have a bias. There is not a caveat.
- 10. Responsible Person: The person responsible for this indicator is the OLRP Section Chief.

Program:	Civil
Objective:	1.15
Indicator Name:	Date of determination letter

- 1. Type and Level: Output/General
- 2. **Rationale:** The indicator provides an overall feel for how well the department is meeting its objectives. It is necessary to support the outcome measures.
- 3. Use: This indicator will be monitored by the division and department management. It will be used for internal management purposes and performance-based budgeting as an indicator of workload.
- 4. Clarity: This indicator is clearly identified.
- 5. Validity, Reliability and Accuracy: This is a valid indicator that is reliable and accurate. Performance indicators are reported to the Office of Planning and Budget, available to the public and the media via the internet, and are subject to audit.
- 6. **Data Source, Collection and Reporting:** The data source is an analysis of all of the department's objectives and performance indicators. It is tracked and reported quarterly.
- 7. Calculation Methodology: The indicator is calculated by adding up all of the proposed regulations and disciplinary actions submitted by the participating boards along with the number of rules proposed; track the date submitted to the OLRP and the date returned to the board by the OLRP; and calculate number of days each submission is held and reviewed by OLRP.
- 8. Scope: This indicator is aggregated.
- 9. **Caveats:** This indicator is not a surrogate. It has no weaknesses. The source of the data does not have a bias. There is not a caveat.
- 10. Responsible Person: The person responsible for this indicator is the OLRP Section Chief.

Program:	Civil
Objective:	1.15
Indicator Name:	Date of submission to OLRP

- 1. Type and Level: Output/General
- 2. **Rationale:** The indicator provides an overall feel for how well the department is meeting its objectives. It is necessary to support the outcome measures.
- 3. Use: This indicator will be monitored by the division and department management. It will be used for internal management purposes and performance-based budgeting as an indicator of workload.
- 4. Clarity: This indicator is clearly identified.
- 5. Validity, Reliability and Accuracy: This is a valid indicator that is reliable and accurate. Performance indicators are reported to the Office of Planning and Budget, available to the public and the media via the internet, and are subject to audit.
- 6. **Data Source, Collection and Reporting:** The data source is an analysis of all of the department's objectives and performance indicators. It is tracked and reported quarterly.
- 7. Calculation Methodology: The indicator is calculated by adding up all of the proposed regulations and disciplinary actions submitted by the participating boards along with the number of rules proposed; track the date submitted to the OLRP and the date returned to the board by the OLRP; and calculate number of days each submission is held and reviewed by OLRP.
- 8. Scope: This indicator is aggregated.
- 9. **Caveats:** This indicator is not a surrogate. It has no weaknesses. The source of the data does not have a bias. There is not a caveat.
- 10. Responsible Person: The person responsible for this indicator is the OLRP Section Chief.

Program:	Civil
Objective:	1.15
Indicator Name:	Number of days for issuance of determination letter for proposed regulations, amendments, and disciplinary actions

- 1. Type and Level: Quality/General
- 2. **Rationale:** The indicator provides an overall feel for how well the department is meeting its objectives. It is necessary to support the outcome measures.
- 3. Use: This indicator will be monitored by the division and department management. It will be used for internal management purposes and performance-based budgeting as an indicator of workload.
- 4. Clarity: This indicator is clearly identified.
- 5. Validity, Reliability and Accuracy: This is a valid indicator that is reliable and accurate. Performance indicators are reported to the Office of Planning and Budget, available to the public and the media via the internet, and are subject to audit.
- 6. **Data Source, Collection and Reporting:** The data source is an analysis of all of the department's objectives and performance indicators. It is tracked and reported quarterly.
- 7. Calculation Methodology: The indicator is calculated by adding together the number of days for issuance of determination letter for proposed regulations and disciplinary actions.
- 8. Scope: This indicator is aggregated.
- 9. Caveats: This indicator is not a surrogate. It has no weaknesses. The source of the data does not have a bias. There is not a caveat.
- 10. Responsible Person: The person responsible for this indicator is the OLRP Section Chief.

Program:	Civil
Objective:	1.15
Indicator Name:	Average number of days for issuance of determination letter per each of the participating boards

- 1. Type and Level: Efficiency/General
- 2. **Rationale:** The indicator provides an overall feel for how well the department is meeting its objectives. It is necessary to support the outcome measures.
- 3. Use: This indicator will be monitored by the division and department management. It will be used for internal management purposes and performance-based budgeting as an indicator of workload.
- 4. Clarity: This indicator is clearly identified.
- 5. Validity, Reliability and Accuracy: This is a valid indicator that is reliable and accurate. Performance indicators are reported to the Office of Planning and Budget, available to the public and the media via the internet, and are subject to audit.
- 6. **Data Source, Collection and Reporting:** The data source is an analysis of all of the department's objectives and performance indicators. It is tracked and reported quarterly.
- 7. Calculation Methodology: The indicator is calculated by dividing the number of days for issuance of determination letter per each of the participating boards by the number of participating boards.
- 8. Scope: This indicator is aggregated.
- 9. Caveats: This indicator is not a surrogate. It has no weaknesses. The source of the data does not have a bias. There is not a caveat.
- 10. Responsible Person: The person responsible for this indicator is the OLRP Section Chief.

Program:	Civil
Objective:	1.16
Indicator Name:	Number of tobacco retail establishments in Louisiana

- 1. Type and Level: Input/General
- 2. **Rationale:** The indicator provides an overall feel for how well the department is meeting its objectives. It is necessary to support the outcome measures.
- 3. Use: This indicator will be monitored by the division and department management. It will be used for internal management purposes and performance-based budgeting as an indicator of workload.
- 4. Clarity: This indicator is clearly identified.
- 5. Validity, Reliability and Accuracy: This is a valid indicator that is reliable and accurate. Performance indicators are reported to the Office of Planning and Budget, available to the public and the media via the internet, and are subject to audit.
- 6. **Data Source, Collection and Reporting:** The data source is an analysis of all of the department's objectives and performance indicators. It is tracked and reported quarterly.
- 7. Calculation Methodology: The indicator is calculated by adding together the number of all tobacco retail establishments in Louisiana.
- 8. Scope: This indicator is aggregated.
- 9. Caveats: This indicator is not a surrogate. It has no weaknesses. The source of the data does not have a bias. There is not a caveat.
- 10. **Responsible Person:** The person responsible for this indicator is the Tobacco Section Chief.

Program:	Civil
Objective:	1.16
Indicator Name:	Number of random site checks (inspections) conducted at retail tobacco outlets each quarter

- 1. Type and Level: Input/General
- 2. **Rationale:** The indicator provides an overall feel for how well the department is meeting its objectives. It is necessary to track to support the outcome measures.
- 3. Use: This indicator will be monitored by the division and department management. It will be used for internal management purposes and performance-based budgeting as an indicator of workload.
- 4. Clarity: This indicator is clearly identified.
- 5. Validity, Reliability and Accuracy: This is a valid indicator that is reliable and accurate. Performance indicators are reported to the Office of Planning and Budget, available to the public and the media via the internet, and are subject to audit.
- 6. **Data Source, Collection and Reporting:** The data source is an analysis of all of the department's objectives and performance indicators. It is tracked and reported quarterly.
- 7. Calculation Methodology: The indicator is calculated by adding together the number of random site checks (inspections) conducted at retail tobacco outlets.
- 8. Scope: This indicator is aggregated.
- 9. Caveats: This indicator is not a surrogate. It has no weaknesses. The source of the data does not have a bias. There is not a caveat.
- 10. **Responsible Person:** The person responsible for this indicator is the Tobacco Section Chief.

Program:	Civil
Objective:	1.16
Indicator Name:	Number of inspections finding a violation

- 1. Type and Level: Input/General
- 2. **Rationale:** The indicator provides an overall feel for how well the department is meeting its objectives. It is necessary to track to support the outcome measures.
- 3. Use: This indicator will be monitored by the division and department management. It will be used for internal management purposes and performance-based budgeting as an indicator of workload.
- 4. Clarity: This indicator is clearly identified.
- 5. Validity, Reliability and Accuracy: This is a valid indicator that is reliable and accurate. Performance indicators are reported to the Office of Planning and Budget, available to the public and the media via the internet, and are subject to audit.
- 6. **Data Source, Collection and Reporting:** The data source is an analysis of all of the department's objectives and performance indicators. It is tracked and reported quarterly.
- 7. Calculation Methodology: The indicator is calculated by adding together the number of inspections finding a violation.
- 8. Scope: This indicator is aggregated.
- 9. Caveats: This indicator is not a surrogate. It has no weaknesses. The source of the data does not have a bias. There is not a caveat.
- 10. **Responsible Person:** The person responsible for this indicator is the Tobacco Section Chief.
| Program:        | Civil   |
|-----------------|---|
| Objective:      | 1.16  |
| Indicator Name: | Number of re-inspections within six months of the original inspection when a violation has occurred |

- 1. Type and Level: Quality/Supporting
- 2. **Rationale:** The indicator provides an overall feel for how well the department is meeting its objectives. It is necessary to support the outcome measures.
- 3. Use: This indicator will be monitored by the division and department management. It will be used for internal management purposes and performance-based budgeting as an indicator of workload.
- 4. Clarity: This indicator is clearly identified.
- 5. Validity, Reliability and Accuracy: This is a valid indicator that is reliable and accurate. Performance indicators are reported to the Office of Planning and Budget, available to the public and the media via the internet, and are subject to audit.
- 6. **Data Source, Collection and Reporting:** The data source is an analysis of all of the department's objectives and performance indicators. It is tracked and reported quarterly.
- 7. Calculation Methodology: The indicator is calculated by adding together the number of re-inspections within six months of the original inspection when a violation has occurred.
- 8. Scope: This indicator is aggregated.
- 9. Caveats: This indicator is not a surrogate. It has no weaknesses. The source of the data does not have a bias. There is not a caveat.
- 10. **Responsible Person:** The person responsible for this indicator is the Tobacco Section Chief.

Program:	Civil
Objective:	1.16
Indicator Name:	Percentage of re-inspections within six months of original inspection finding a violation

- 1. Type and Level: Quality/Supporting
- 2. **Rationale:** The indicator provides an overall feel for how well the department is meeting its objectives. It is necessary to support the outcome measures.
- 3. Use: This indicator will be monitored by the division and department management. It will be used for internal management purposes and performance-based budgeting as an indicator of workload.
- 4. Clarity: This indicator is clearly identified.
- 5. Validity, Reliability and Accuracy: This is a valid indicator that is reliable and accurate. Performance indicators are reported to the Office of Planning and Budget, available to the public and the media via the internet, and are subject to audit.
- 6. **Data Source, Collection and Reporting:** The data source is an analysis of all of the department's objectives and performance indicators. It is tracked and reported quarterly.
- 7. Calculation Methodology: The indicator is calculated by dividing the number of reinspections within six months of the original inspection when a violation has occurred by the number of inspections finding a violation.
- 8. Scope: This indicator is aggregated.
- 9. Caveats: This indicator is not a surrogate. It has no weaknesses. The source of the data does not have a bias. There is not a caveat.
- 10. **Responsible Person:** The person responsible for this indicator is the Tobacco Section Chief.

Program:	Civil
Objective:	1.16
Indicator Name:	Number of violation notices sent within 15 days of an inspection finding a violation

- 1. Type and Level: Quality/Supporting
- 2. **Rationale:** The indicator provides an overall feel for how well the department is meeting its objectives. It is necessary to support the outcome measures.
- 3. Use: This indicator will be monitored by the division and department management. It will be used for internal management purposes and performance-based budgeting as an indicator of workload.
- 4. Clarity: This indicator is clearly identified.
- 5. Validity, Reliability and Accuracy: This is a valid indicator that is reliable and accurate. Performance indicators are reported to the Office of Planning and Budget, available to the public and the media via the internet, and are subject to audit.
- 6. **Data Source, Collection and Reporting:** The data source is an analysis of all of the department's objectives and performance indicators. It is tracked and reported quarterly.
- 7. Calculation Methodology: The indicator is calculated by adding together the number of violation notices sent within 15 days of an inspection finding a violation.
- 8. Scope: This indicator is aggregated.
- 9. Caveats: This indicator is not a surrogate. It has no weaknesses. The source of the data does not have a bias. There is not a caveat.
- 10. **Responsible Person:** The person responsible for this indicator is the Tobacco Section Chief.

Program:	Civil
Objective:	1.16
Indicator Name:	Percentage of violation notices sent within 15 days of an inspection finding a violation

- 1. Type and Level: Outcome/Key
- 2. **Rationale:** The indicator provides an overall feel for how well the department is meeting its objectives. It is necessary to track key indicators.
- 3. Use: This indicator will be monitored by the division and department management. It will be used for internal management purposes and performance-based budgeting as an indicator of workload.
- 4. Clarity: This indicator is clearly identified.
- 5. Validity, Reliability and Accuracy: This is a valid indicator that is reliable and accurate. Performance indicators are reported to the Office of Planning and Budget, available to the public and the media via the internet, and are subject to audit.
- 6. **Data Source, Collection and Reporting:** The data source is an analysis of all of the department's objectives and performance indicators. It is tracked and reported quarterly.
- 7. Calculation Methodology: The indicator is calculated by dividing the number of violation notices sent within 15 days of an inspection finding a violation by the number of inspections finding a violation.
- 8. Scope: This indicator is aggregated.
- 9. Caveats: This indicator is not a surrogate. It has no weaknesses. The source of the data does not have a bias. There is not a caveat.
- 10. **Responsible Person:** The person responsible for this indicator is the Tobacco Section Chief.

Program:	Civil
Objective:	1.16
Indicator Name:	Percentage of random site checks conducted at retail tobacco outlets each quarter

- 1. Type and Level: Efficiency/General
- 2. **Rationale:** The indicator provides an overall feel for how well the department is meeting its objectives. It is necessary to track key indicators.
- 3. Use: This indicator will be monitored by the division and department management. It will be used for internal management purposes and performance-based budgeting as an indicator of workload.
- 4. Clarity: This indicator is clearly identified.
- 5. Validity, Reliability and Accuracy: This is a valid indicator that is reliable and accurate. Performance indicators are reported to the Office of Planning and Budget, available to the public and the media via the internet, and are subject to audit.
- 6. **Data Source, Collection and Reporting:** The data source is an analysis of all of the department's objectives and performance indicators. It is tracked and reported quarterly.
- 7. Calculation Methodology: The indicator is calculated by dividing the number of random site checks conducted at retail tobacco outlets each quarter by the number of tobacco retail establishments in Louisiana.
- 8. **Scope:** This indicator is aggregated.
- 9. Caveats: This indicator is not a surrogate. It has no weaknesses. The source of the data does not have a bias. There is not a caveat.
- 10. **Responsible Person:** The person responsible for this indicator is the Tobacco Section Chief.

# CRIMINAL LAW AND MEDICAID FRAUD PROGRAM

# Mission

The Criminal Division of the LADOJ safeguards the rights of the citizens of the State of Louisiana by providing prompt, professional, and ethical prosecutions of criminal matters referred to this division. The Criminal Division also investigates violations of criminal laws, maintains governmental integrity, assists and advises local district attorneys in the analysis and prosecution of criminal cases, and protects and serves the public.

# **Program Divisions**

The Criminal Law and Medicaid Fraud Program is currently divided into two divisions: Criminal Division and the LBI.

# **Division Activities**

# **Criminal Division**

The Criminal Division conducts or assists in criminal prosecutions; acts as an advisor to district attorneys, the legislature, and law enforcement entities; assists in the investigation and prosecution of insurance fraud cases through participation in the Louisiana Insurance Fraud Task Force; supervises the statewide implementation and enforcement of Louisiana's sex offender and child predator registration and notification laws through the Sexual Predator Apprehension Team (SPAT); processes extraditions; represents the State of Louisiana in appellate cases; defends federal habeas corpus proceedings; defends criminal's post-conviction challenges; defends constitutional challenges; processes expungements; files amicus curiae on behalf of the State of Louisiana on issues of state-wide importance; and prepares attorney general opinions concerning criminal law.

The division is currently divided into five sections or units: General Prosecution, Appeals and Special Services, SPAT, Insurance Fraud Support Unit, and Medicaid Fraud Control Unit (MFCU).

# **General Prosecutions Section**

The General Prosecution Section prosecutes violations of all criminal laws of the state by conducting or assisting in criminal prosecutions pursuant to the recusal or request of district attorneys. This section prosecutes cases, including but not limited to, white collar crime, public corruption, narcotics violations, violent crimes, high tech and internet crimes against children, and violations of the state's environmental laws. This section also serves as an advisor to the district attorneys, law enforcement, and the legislature; a training agency for law enforcement; and a liaison between all levels of law enforcement within the state.

# Appeals and Special Services Section

The Appeals and Special Services Section provides legal services to the state in the areas of extraditions, federal habeas corpus and post- conviction relief, as amicus curiae in matters pending

before the United States Supreme Court, constitutional challenges, and Attorney General Opinions in matters of criminal law.

# Sexual Predator Apprehension Team

SPAT supervises the statewide implementation and enforcement of Louisiana's sex offender and child predator registration and notification laws applicable to over 13,000 registered sex offenders and child predators. SPAT works with federal, state, and local investigative resources, and the public, ensuring that offenders meet their registration requirements, are imposing the criminal consequences for failure to adhere to the statutory mandate. In addition, SPAT is responsible for ensuring substantial compliance with the federal Adam Walsh Act by advising the legislature when changes are proposed to Louisiana's registration and notification laws and reporting any changes to the United States Department of Justice. Furthermore, SPAT provides trainings and consultations to law enforcement, prosecutors, and other state and federal agencies related to sex offender and child predator registration and notification requirements. Lastly, SPAT manages all litigation related to the application of sex offender registration and notification laws and calculates official registration end dates for particular offenders who are not required to register for a lifetime.

# Insurance Fraud Support Unit

The Insurance Fraud Support Unit fulfills three primary responsibilities: providing legal advice and consultation to the other two task force agencies, e.g. the Louisiana State Police and the Louisiana Department of Insurance, in insurance fraud matters; prosecuting individuals charged with insurance fraud; and presenting insurance fraud information and training to the insurance industry, as well as other state and federal agencies.

The primary objective of the Insurance Fraud Support Unit is to provide superior legal representation to the LADOJ and the Louisiana State Police in insurance fraud investigations and prosecutions. Attorneys assigned to the LADOJ's Insurance Fraud Support Unit prosecute violations of Louisiana's criminal laws under Titles 14, 22, 23, and 47 of Louisiana's revised statutes, by conducting, or assisting in, criminal prosecutions, upon the recusal or request for assistance by local district attorneys, and providing legal support to law enforcement agencies investigating criminal insurance fraud.

# Medicaid Fraud Control Unit

In Louisiana, the MFCU is responsible for investigating and prosecuting Medicaid provider fraud.

The United States Department of Health and Human Services, the Department of Health, the Medicaid Fraud Tip Hotline, and other sources serve as the initial entry point for Medicaid fraud complaints.

The United States Department of Health and Human Services issues regulations requiring the MFCU to review complaints alleging abuse or neglect of Medicaid patients in health care facilities and board and care facilities, and to investigate those cases that indicate a substantial potential for criminal prosecution. The MFCU investigates and prosecutes individuals and entities defrauding the Medicaid Program or abusing residents in health care and board and care facilities.

# Louisiana Bureau of Investigation

The LBI is divided into four units: Special Investigation Unit, Trial Unit, Fugitive Apprehension Unit (FAU), and Cyber Crime Unit (CCU). These units are responsible for the investigation of alleged violations of the criminal laws of this state, including investigations of public corruption, complex frauds, identity theft, multi-jurisdictional crimes, Medicaid recipient fraud, state retirement program fraud, emergency disaster relief fraud, computer-related crimes, crypto currency investigations, elder financial exploitation, child exploitation, institutional and insurance fraud, intellectual property crimes, fugitive apprehension, and various other criminal matters. The LBI responds to numerous requests for investigative assistance from local, state and federal governmental agencies. In addition, the LBI has a special agent assigned to the Secret Service Financial Crimes Task Force.

# Special Investigation Unit

The Special Investigation Unit is responsible for the investigation of alleged violations of the criminal laws of this state. The Special Investigation Unit conducts criminal investigations involving public corruption, institutional fraud, Medicaid recipient fraud, and the violation of various other criminal laws. This unit also responds to the numerous requests for investigative assistance from local, state or federal governmental agencies.

The Special Investigation Unit is also responsible for coordinating access, safety and security within the LADOJ, including executive security and coordinates with the State Office of Buildings and Grounds with regard to matters within the Livingston Building and offices in the State Capitol. This section also includes the clerical support function, file room management, case tracking, analytical support, and the maintenance and operation of the division's computer network, as well as fleet management. In addition, this section includes investigators assigned to outside agency task forces, workers' compensation fraud investigations, and intelligence information.

# Trial Unit

The Trial Unit provides investigative services to the attorneys in the Criminal Division to include follow-up and support on criminal prosecution cases, locating witnesses, providing security for witnesses, witness management at court proceedings, testifying on behalf of the state, and trial evidence management.

# Fugitive Apprehension Unit

The FAU was created as the LADOJ recognized the need to devote manpower and assets to the apprehension of fugitives from justice. The unit was created for the purpose of assisting local law enforcement agencies in locating and apprehending fugitives from justice. The FAU is dedicated to assisting local law enforcement agencies in locating and arresting wanted individuals who either cannot be located by the local agency, or where the suspect is believed to be located in a jurisdiction other than where the arrest warrant is issued. The majority of the suspects are aware they are being sought by law enforcement and have taken measures to evade capture. Due to pending caseloads and other considerations, local law enforcement agencies may not have the time or resources available to locate them. Crossing jurisdictional lines can also be problematic for local law enforcement when searching for wanted individuals who reside in, or have fled to, a different city,

parish, or state. The FAU has statewide jurisdiction and can dedicate all the time and resources necessary to bring these fugitives to justice. The FAU has also worked successfully with law enforcement in surrounding states in locating and apprehending fugitives from Louisiana.

# Cyber Crime Unit

The CCU is a specialized unit with attorneys, investigators, and computer forensic experts all trained in the specific field of cyber-crime investigation and prosecution. This specialized unit concentrates on combating crimes involving digital technology. The CCU includes the first state computer forensic center and provides forensic examinations of digital evidence to the LADOJ, as well as other local, state, and federal government agencies. The section includes the Louisiana Internet Crimes Against Children Task Force (ICAC), which investigates crimes relating to child exploitation and abuse on the Internet. ICAC investigators conduct proactive online undercover operations and investigate child exploitation cases referred to the department from other agencies, as well as the National Center for Missing and Exploited Children. The CCU Forensic Lab also works cases involving online auction fraud, death investigations, domestic violence, economic fraud including online fraud and counterfeiting, email threats, harassment and stalking, extortion, identity theft, narcotics, prostitution, human trafficking, software piracy, and telecommunications fraud. CCU also provides training to local law enforcement and gives public service presentations in regard to technology based crimes and internet safety throughout the state of Louisiana.

Although evidence is received and processed for all criminal matters from within the Investigation Division and outside law enforcement agencies, the evidence room is managed and supervised by the CCU Forensic Lab manager. All evidence is documented and stored in secure evidence rooms located within the LADOJ, adhering to strict internal policies and procedures. As part of the internal controls, the evidence room is audited on a yearly basis.

# Authorization for Goal(s)

Louisiana Constitution, Article 4, Section 8; Louisiana Revised Statutes 13:4862; 13:5036; 15:544(E); 15:544.1; 15:544.2; 15:552; 36:701; 36:702; 36:703; 36:704; 36:706; 49:251; Louisiana Code of Criminal Procedure Articles 61, 62, 63, 64, 65, 66, 264, 734; and 42 Code of Federal Regulations 1007.1-1007.21.

# **Program Goal**

I. The LADOJ will provide superior legal and professional services to Louisiana citizens, private sector organizations, and all governmental entities.

GOAL I The LADOJ will provide superior legal and professional services to Louisiana citizens, private sector organizations, and all governmental entities.

## **Criminal Division Objectives**

- **Sub-Goal** To provide superior legal and professional services and justice to the State of Louisiana in the area of criminal law in a just and ethical manner.
- **Objective I.1** The Criminal Division will prosecute, in-house, 95% of cases received through recusal by June 30, 2031.

Sub-GoalInsurance Fraud Support Unit<br/>To continue operating as a productive and essential part of the Louisiana Insurance<br/>Fraud Task Force.

- **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 and attending 90% of monthly intelligence sharing meetings hosted by the Louisiana State Police Insurance Fraud Unit by June 30, 2031.
- Sub-Goal MFCU To effectively investigate and prosecute provider fraud, fraud in the administration of the program, the abuse of residents in Medicaid funded facilities, and recover any identified overpayments, penalties and prosecution costs where appropriate.
- **Objective I.3** The MFCU of the Criminal Division will open 250 investigations of provider fraud and patient abuse annually by June 30, 2031.
- Sub-Goal SPAT To oversee the statewide implementation and enforcement of Louisiana's sex offender and child predator registration and notification laws.
- **Objective I.4** The SPAT of the Criminal Division will provide written notice to offenders within 30 days from the date on which the LADOJ posts its determination of the registration and notification period end date to the offender's file in the Sex Offender and Child Predator Registry by June 30, 2031.
- **Objective I.5** The SPAT of the Criminal Division will respond to 95% of petitions filed by offenders seeking relief from registration within 30 days of receipt of the petition by June 30, 2031.
- **Objective I.6** The SPAT of the Criminal Division will provide in-service trainings to law enforcement and other agencies possessing a role in sex offender and child predator registration within 60 days of a request for training by June 30, 2031.

<b>Objective I.7</b>	The SPAT of the Criminal Division will respond to requests for consultation
	within 45 days of receipt of the request or receipt of all information
	necessary to respond to the request, whichever is later by June 30, 2031.

# LBI Division Objectives

<b>Objective I.8</b>	Generate 240 ICAC cases by June 30, 2031.
<b>Objective I.9</b>	Complete 1,500 Forensic Lab examinations by June 30, 2031.
<b>Objective I.10</b>	Investigate 1,000 non-ICAC CCU complaints by June 30, 2031.
<b>Objective I.11</b>	Initiate or assist in 500 investigations per fiscal year by June 30, 2031.
Objective I.12	Initiate or assist in 50 fugitive apprehensions per fiscal year by June 30, 2031.

<b>Objective I.1</b>	The Criminal Division will prosecute 95% of cases received through recusal
	by June 30, 2031.

**Strategy I.1** The director shall review all cases received to determine if recusal is needed.

#### **Performance Indicator**

Input	Number of cases opened Number of cases closed Number of recusals received Number of requests for assistance Number of parishes served
Efficiency	Number of cases received by recusal and retained and handled in- house
	Number of cases refused due to conflict
Outcome	Percentage of new cases received by recusal that are retained and handled in-house

#### Justification

Timely response to cases received is necessary to show the attorney general's office is efficient and effective in prosecuting cases for the State of Louisiana, furthering our stance of running a thriving governmental entity by prosecuting cases in-house and only referring cases to outside agencies when ethically bound to do so.

#### Benchmarking

This is a standard and will not need benchmarking. The timely response to cases received is part of the work product of the legal professional.

#### **Primary Person Benefiting**

The primary persons that would benefit from this objective are the citizens of Louisiana, the general public, and the LADOJ.

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, 2031.	
Strategy I.2	<b>a</b> Use management system to log and track requests for legal assistance.	
Strategy I.2	<b>b</b> Supervisor will assure attendance at all State Police Insurance Fraud meetings.	
Performance Indicator		
Input	Number of requests for legal consultation Number of scheduled intelligence sharing meetings	
Output	Number of requests for legal consultation responded to within two working days	
	Number of scheduled intelligence sharing meetings attended by LADOJ	
Outcome	Percentage of scheduled intelligence sharing meetings attended by LADOJ	
Efficiency	Percentage of requests for legal consultation responded to within two working days	

Timely response to informal complaints is necessary to show the attorney general's office is efficient and effective in handling cases for the State of Louisiana, furthering our stance that more cases should be handled in-house to save money and increase staff knowledge and expertise.

# Benchmarking

This is a standard and will not need benchmarking. The timely response to informal complaints is part of the work product of the legal professional.

# **Primary Persons Benefiting**

Objective I.3	The MFCU of the Criminal Division will open 250 investigations of provider fraud and patient abuse annually by June 30, 2031.
Strategy 1.3	The MFCU will perform outreach to law enforcement, healthcare providers, professional organizations and community organizations to encourage reporting of provider fraud and patient abuse.
Performance Indica	tor
Output	Number of investigations opened Dollar amount of investigation/prosecution costs collected Dollar amount of criminal and civil restitution ordered Total dollar amount of collections - all sources Dollar amount of restitution collected administratively Total judgments obtained during the fiscal year - all sources Dollar amount of criminal court ordered restitution collected Dollar amount of fines ordered Dollar amount of civil monetary penalty ordered Dollar amount of investigations/ prosecution costs ordered Dollar amount of administration restitution ordered
Efficiency	Dollar amount of civil monetary penalty collected

The purpose of this objective is to maintain and/or improve performance of the unit as a whole.

#### Benchmarking

The Department of Health and Human Services manages the compilation of data collected from the Medicaid Fraud Control Units throughout the country. Comparisons of performance are based on collected data from other similarly situated units in other states.

## **Primary Persons Benefiting**

<b>Objective I.4</b>	The SPAT of the Criminal Division will provide written notice to offenders within 30 days from the date on which the LADOJ posts its determination of the registration and notification period end date to the offender's file in the Sex Offender and Child Predator Registry by June 30, 2031.
Strategy I.4a	Use Sex Offender and Child Predatory Registry to determine registration and notification end dates.
Strategy I.4b	Use management system to track written notices.
Performance Indicator	
Input	Number of offenders reviewed
Output	Number of written notices sent
Outcome	Number of written notices provided by the LADOJ within 30 days from date the determination is posted
Efficiency	Percentage of the number of written notices provided by the LADOJ within 30 days from date the determination is posted

Timely providing offenders with written notice is required by Louisiana Revised Statute 15:544.2 and is necessary for enforcement of the statutes related to registration of sex offenders and child predators. It is also necessary to show that the attorney general's office effectively administers and monitors the registration of and notification by sex offenders and child predators.

#### Benchmarking

We are the model in the State of Louisiana. No other agency reviews offenders' criminal histories and registration histories and posts a prospective registration and notification period end date.

#### **Primary Person Benefiting**

<b>Objective I.5</b>	The SPAT of the Criminal Division will respond to 95% of offenders'
	petitions seeking relief from registration within 30 days of receipt by June
	30, 2031.

Strategy I.5:	Use management system to log notice of petition and response.

# **Performance Indicator**

Input	Number of petitions received	
Output	Number of responses to petitions	
Outcome	Percentage of petitions for relief responded to by the LADOJ within 30 days of receipt	
Efficiency	Percentage of responses to petitions	

## Justification

Responding to these petitions is required by statute. Louisiana Revised Statutes 15:544(E), 15:544.1 and 15:544.2 require a response to these petitions.

#### Benchmarking

This is a standard and will not need benchmarking. The timely response to petitions is part of the work product of the legal professional.

# **Primary Person Benefiting**

<b>Objective I.6</b>	The SPAT of the Criminal Division will provide in-service trainings to law				
	enforcement and other agencies having a role in sex offender and chil				
	predator registration within 60 days of a request for training by June 30				
	2031.				

Strategy I.6	Use management system to log requests for trainings and dates of
	trainings.

#### **Performance Indicator**

Input	Number of requests for trainings received		
Output	Number of trainings provided		
Outcome	Number of trainings provided by the LADOJ within 60 days of request		
Efficiency	Percentage of the number of trainings provided by the LADOJ within 60 days of request		

#### Justification

Louisiana Revised Statute 15:552 requires SPAT to provide trainings to law enforcement and other agencies having a role in sex offender and child predator registration. This action is necessary to protect the citizens of Louisiana by ensuring all required agencies are knowledgeable of the requirements of the law and any yearly updates.

## Benchmarking

This is a standard and will not need benchmarking. Providing trainings to law enforcement and other agencies having a role in sex offender and child predator registration is vital to implementation and enforcement of the law.

## **Primary Person Benefiting**

<b>Objective I.7</b>	The SPAT of the Criminal Division will respond to requests for consultation			
	within 45 days of receipt of the request or receipt of all information			
	necessary to respond to the request, whichever is later, by June 30, 2031.			

Strategy I.7	Use management	system 1	to log	requests	for	consultation	and
	responses to reque	sts.					

## **Performance Indicator**

Input	Number of requests for consultation received		
Output	Number of responses to requests for consultation		
Outcome	Number of responses made to requests for consultation within 45 days of the request or receipt of all information necessary to respond to the request, whichever is later		
Efficiency	Percentage of the number of responses made to requests for consultation within 45 days of the request or receipt of all information necessary to respond to the request, whichever is later		

## Justification

A timely response to requests for consultation is necessary to show the attorney general's office is efficient and effective in providing assistance in the enforcement of our registration and notification laws as required by Louisiana Revised Statute 15:552(3).

#### Benchmarking

This is a standard and will not need benchmarking. The timely response to requests for consultation is part of the work product of the legal professional.

#### **Primary Person Benefiting**

<b>Objective I.8</b>	Through CCU to generate 240 ICAC cases by June 30, 2031.		
Strategy I.8	Engage in at least 300 hours proactive online investigation per fiscal year.		
Performance Indica	tor		
Input	Number of hours spent in proactive online investigation		
Output	Number of ICAC cases opened generated from proactive online investigations per fiscal year		
	Number of ICAC cases opened that are initiated through complaints or information received		
Efficiency	Number of LADOJ ICAC cases per 40 hours of LADOJ proactive online investigation		

# Outcome Total CCU arrests

# Justification

This action is necessary to provide protection to the citizens of Louisiana and to provide competent and quality legal representation in an area of law which remains virtually uncharted in Louisiana and the country.

# Benchmarking

We are the model in the State of Louisiana. There is no other law enforcement agency currently investigating cybercrimes to this extent. The ICAC task force operates with grant funding. The task forces operating under this grant report the information and progress but the numbers collected are, as a matter of security, not public information.

## **Primary Persons Benefiting**

<b>Objective I.9</b>	Complete 1,500 Forensic Lab examinations by June 30, 2031.	
Strategy I.9a	Implement and maintain evidence and task tracking system for forensic lab examinations.	
Strategy I.9b	Ensure that all examiners obtain EnCase certification.	
Performance Indica	licator	
Input	Number of request for forensic lab examinations received from outside agencies	
	Number of forensic lab examinations requested for LADOJ cases	
Output	Size (in gigabytes) of completed examinations	
Outcome	Total forensic examinations completed	
Efficiency	Percentage of forensic examinations completed	

This action is necessary to provide protection to the citizens of Louisiana and to provide competent and quality investigations and representation in an area of law enforcement which remains virtually uncharted in the state.

#### Benchmarking

We are the model in the State of Louisiana. There is no other law enforcement agency currently investigating cybercrimes to this extent. The ICAC task force operates with grant funding. The task forces operating under this grant report the information and progress but the numbers collected are, as a matter of security, not public information.

## **Primary Persons Benefiting**

<b>Objective I.10</b>	Investigate 1,000 non-ICAC CCU co	omplaints by June 30, 2031.
-----------------------	-----------------------------------	-----------------------------

**Strategy I.10** CCU supervisor shall prioritize and assign cases based on the seriousness and potential threat to the public.

## **Performance Indicator**

Input	Number of non-ICAC CCU complaints received and reviewed
Output	Number of non-ICAC CCU complaints assigned for investigation
Outcome	Number of non-ICAC CCU complaints where investigation is completed
	Number of cases opened as a result of a non-ICAC CCU complaint
Efficiency	Percentage of the number of non-ICAC CCU complaints where investigation is completed

# Justification

This activity is necessary to provide protection to the citizens of Louisiana and to provide competent and quality legal representation in an area of law which remains virtually uncharted in Louisiana and the country.

## Benchmarking

We are the model in the State of Louisiana. There is no other law enforcement agency currently investigating cybercrimes to this extent. The ICAC task force operates with grant funding. The task forces operating under this grant report the information and progress, but the numbers collected are, as a matter of security, not public information.

## **Primary Persons Benefiting**

<b>Objective I.11</b> Initiate or assist in 500 investigations per fiscal year by June 30, 2031.		
Strategy I.11a	Carefully screen complaints and requests for investigation to identify potential criminal violations warranting investigation.	
Strategy I.11b	Assist in 100% of investigations in recusal cases upon request by Criminal Division.	
Performance Indicator		
Input	Number of requests for assistance from other law enforcement agencies	
	Number of requests for assistance from non-law enforcement governmental agencies	
	Number of recusal requests Number of new investigations opened Number of open investigations per investigator	
Output	Number of closed investigations per investigator Number of total closed investigations	
Outcome	Number of new investigations opened due to LADOJ initiated Number of new investigations opened due to requested assistance	
Efficiency	Percentage of total closed investigations	

A timely response to cases received is necessary to show that the LADOJ is efficient and effective in handling cases for the state, furthering our stance that more cases should be handled in house to save money for the state.

#### Benchmarking

This is a standard and will not need benchmarking. The timely response cases received is part of the work product of the legal professional.

## **Primary Persons Benefiting**

<b>Objective I.12</b>	Initiate or assist in 50 fugitive apprehensions per fiscal year by June 30,
	2031.

Strategy I.12a	Carefully screen requests for assistance to identify all outstanding
	warrants per each target/fugitive.

**Strategy I.12b** The supervisor will review casework to make sure proper background searches are completed.

# **Performance Indicator**

Input	Number of requests for fugitive apprehension assistance from law enforcement agencies Number of cases opened
Output	Number of total closed investigations
Outcome	Number of fugitive apprehension arrests Number of outstanding warrants cleared Number of outstanding warrants
Efficiency	Percentage of total closed investigations

## Justification

A timely response to cases received is necessary to show that the LADOJ is efficient and effective in handling cases for the state, furthering our stance that more cases should be handled in house to save money for the state.

## Benchmarking

This is a standard and will not need benchmarking. The timely response cases received is part of the work product of the legal professional.

## **Primary Persons Benefiting**

# SITUATION INVENTORY

# **Principal Clients and Users**

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, financial, and insurance organizations, and other divisions and programs of the LADOJ.

# **External Factors**

The present political climate presents an external force where more and more cases are being referred to the attorney general's office as a direct result of the very proactive role taken by the presently elected incumbent. Elder 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 have dedicated funding to order transcripts from hearings that are vital to a successful prosecution. Experts are also key in many of our prosecutions. Experts must be paid. This is an area of concern. A prosecution should not be "hamstrung" because of an inability to hire good experts.

The obligation to prosecute the ever growing number of criminal cases resulting from the operation of Troop New Orleans (NOLA) also represents a potential strain on organizational resources in the future. Additionally, the Insurance Fraud Task Force also presents another potential future strain, as recent State Police efforts in combatting insurance fraud have more than doubled the usual caseload of prosecutions undertaken by the Insurance Fraud Support Unit.

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.

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.

## **Internal and External Considerations**

The New Orleans Section was created in late 2023 with the signed Cooperative Endeavor Agreements of November 29, 2023 and February 5, 2024, signed respectively by the attorney general and the district attorney for Orleans Parish. Per this agreement the attorney general's office, and specifically the attorneys assigned to the Troop NOLA/New Orleans section, are

empowered to prosecute any and all criminal matters resulting from an arrest or investigation conducted by the Louisiana State Police or any law enforcement agencies working under the direction of or in cooperation with the Louisiana State Police. Additionally, Troop NOLA/New Orleans Section prosecutes and handles any and all criminal matters related to, or involving any law enforcement officer-involved discharge of a firearm, any law enforcement officer-involved fatality, or any law enforcement officer-involved use-of-force incidents, arising from an arrest or investigation conducted by the Louisiana State Police, or any law enforcement agencies working under the direction of or in cooperation with the Louisiana State police. The Troop NOLA/New Orleans Section currently has 11 attorneys assigned to its division along with four administrative assistants. The New Orleans Section has opened a total of 432 criminal cases since the February 15, 2024 start date. Forty percent of the cases currently charged involve prosecution of convicted felons found in possession of firearms, or commission of crimes while in possession of a firearm. As of May 2025, the work of the Troop NOLA/New Orleans Section has resulted in over 60 guilty as charged pleas. On a daily basis, the attorneys and assistants actively monitor and receive immediate notifications from the Louisiana State Police once an arrest has been made in Orleans Parish. The attorneys are then responsible for attending first appearances, seven days a week, 365 days a year. After the first appearance, the cases are assigned to one of the ten trial attorneys, who are then responsible for the vertical screening and prosecution of the case. Attorneys are responsible for any and all pre-trial hearings as well as trials and resolution of cases. The obligation to prosecute the ever growing number of criminal cases resulting from the operation of Troop NOLA also represents a potential strain on organizational resources in the future. Additionally, the Insurance Fraud Task Force also presents another potential future strain, as recent State Police efforts in combatting insurance fraud have more than doubled the usual caseload of prosecutions undertaken by the Insurance Fraud Support Unit.

The core strength of the Criminal Division is its staff of attorneys and investigators which is composed of hard working, conscientious employees with expertise, deep institutional knowledge, and widely diversified professional skills. Together, our prosecutors have over 200 years combined experience in all aspects of criminal 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 and quickly adapt to diverse local practices in the different parishes of the state, are all extremely important skills that our attorneys possess. 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. 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 attend to the type of professional skills. 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. 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 greatest strength of the program is the present staff of prosecutors who have collective experience of over 150 years in the practice of law.

The program's primary weakness is the fact that we have only 27 full time prosecutors tasked with prosecuting cases statewide. The variety of venues, and the large geographic area of coverage sometimes create significant logistical, procedural, political, and practical challenges in bringing cases to trial. In addition, the types of cases recused to our office include high profile and sometimes politically charged issues which must go to trial. The rate of actual trials per case load is therefore greater than with local district attorney's offices.

We anticipate that, due to the present attorney general's pro-active involvement with law enforcement, 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.

Program:	Criminal
Objective:	I.1
Indicator Name:	Number cases closed

- 1. Type and Level: Input/General
- 2. **Rationale:** This indicator provides an overall feel for how well the department is meeting its objectives. It is necessary to track to support the outcome measures.
- 3. Use: This indicator will be monitored by the division and department management. It will be used for internal management purposes and for performance-based budgeting as an indicator of workload.
- 4. Clarity: This indicator is clearly identified.
- 5. Validity, Reliability and Accuracy: This is a valid indicator that is reliable and accurate. Performance indicators are reported to the Office of Planning and Budget, available to the public and the media via the internet, and are subject to audit.
- 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 quarterly basis.
- 7. Calculation Methodology: The indicator is calculated by the tracking program retrieving data by date range, searching the date closed.
- 8. Scope: This indicator is aggregated.
- 9. Caveats: This indicator is not a surrogate. It has no weaknesses. The source of the data does not have a bias. There is not a caveat.
- 10. **Responsible Person:** The person responsible for this indicator is the Criminal Division Executive Manager.

Program:	Criminal
Objective:	I.1
Indicator Name:	Number of recusals received

- 1. Type and Level: Input/General
- 2. **Rationale:** This indicator provides an overall feel for how well the department is meeting its objectives. It is necessary to track to support the outcome measures.
- 3. Use: This indicator will be monitored by the division and department management. It will be used for internal management purposes and for performance-based budgeting as an indicator of workload.
- 4. Clarity: This indicator is clearly identified.
- 5. Validity, Reliability and Accuracy: This is a valid indicator that is reliable and accurate. Performance indicators are reported to the Office of Planning and Budget, available to the public and the media via the internet, and are subject to audit.
- 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 quarterly basis.
- 7. Calculation Methodology: The indicator is calculated by the tracking program retrieving data by date range, searching the nature field which is marked recusals.
- 8. Scope: This indicator is aggregated.
- 9. Caveats: This indicator is not a surrogate. It has no weaknesses. The source of the data does not have a bias. There is not a caveat.
- 10. **Responsible Person:** The person responsible for this indicator is the Executive Manager, Criminal Division.

Program:	Criminal
Objective:	I.1
Indicator Name:	Number of requests for assistance

- 1. Type and Level: Input/General
- 2. **Rationale:** This indicator provides an overall feel for how well the department is meeting its objectives. It is necessary to track to support the outcome measures.
- 3. Use: This indicator will be monitored by the division and department management. It will be used for internal management purposes and for performance-based budgeting as an indicator of workload.
- 4. Clarity: This indicator is clearly identified.
- 5. Validity, Reliability and Accuracy: This is a valid indicator that is reliable and accurate. Performance indicators are reported to the Office of Planning and Budget, available to the public and the media via the internet, and are subject to audit.
- 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 quarterly basis.
- 7. **Calculation Methodology:** The indicator is calculated by the tracking program retrieving data by date range, searching the nature field marked request for assistance.
- 8. Scope: This indicator is aggregated.
- 9. Caveats: This indicator is not a surrogate. It has no weaknesses. The source of the data does not have a bias. There is not a caveat.
- 10. **Responsible Person:** The person responsible for this indicator is the Executive Manager, Criminal Division.

Program:	Criminal
Objective:	I.1
Indicator Name:	Number of parishes served

- 1. Type and Level: : Input/General
- 2. **Rationale:** This indicator provides an overall feel for how well the department is meeting its objectives. It is necessary to track to support the outcome measures.
- 3. Use: This indicator will be monitored by the division and department management. It will be used for internal management purposes and for performance-based budgeting as an indicator of workload.
- 4. Clarity: This indicator is clearly identified.
- 5. Validity, Reliability and Accuracy: This is a valid indicator that is reliable and accurate. Performance indicators are reported to the Office of Planning and Budget, available to the public and the media via the internet, and are subject to audit.
- 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 quarterly basis.
- 7. Calculation Methodology: The indicator is calculated by the tracking program retrieving data by date range, searching the parish field and open active cases.
- 8. Scope: This indicator is aggregated.
- 9. Caveats: This indicator is not a surrogate. It has no weaknesses. The source of the data does not have a bias. There is not a caveat.
- 10. **Responsible Person:** The person responsible for this indicator is the Executive Manager, Criminal Division.

Program:	Criminal
Objective:	I.1
Indicator Name:	Number of cases opened

- 1. Type and Level: Input/General
- 2. **Rationale:** This indicator provides an overall feel for how well the department is meeting its objectives. It is necessary to track to support the outcome measures.
- 3. Use: This indicator will be monitored by the division and department management. It will be used for internal management purposes and for performance-based budgeting as an indicator of workload.
- 4. Clarity: This indicator is clearly identified.
- 5. Validity, Reliability and Accuracy: This is a valid indicator that is reliable and accurate. Performance indicators are reported to the Office of Planning and Budget, available to the public and the media via the internet, and are subject to audit.
- 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 quarterly basis.
- 7. Calculation Methodology: The indicator is calculated by the tracking program retrieving data by date range, searching the date opened.
- 8. Scope: This indicator is aggregated.
- 9. Caveats: This indicator is not a surrogate. It has no weaknesses. The source of the data does not have a bias. There is not a caveat.
- 10. **Responsible Person:** The person responsible for this indicator is the Executive Manager, Criminal Division.

Program:	Criminal
Objective:	I.1
Indicator Name:	Percentage of cases received by recusal that are retained and handled in-house

- 1. Type and Level: Outcome/Key
- 2. **Rationale:** This indicator provides an overall feel for how well the department is meeting its objectives. It is necessary to track to support the outcome measures.
- 3. Use: This indicator will be monitored by the division and department management. It will be used for internal management purposes and for performance-based budgeting as an indicator of workload.
- 4. Clarity: This indicator is clearly identified.
- 5. Validity, Reliability and Accuracy: This is a valid indicator that is reliable and accurate. Performance indicators are reported to the Office of Planning and Budget, available to the public and the media via the internet, and are subject to audit.
- 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 quarterly basis.
- 7. Calculation Methodology: The indicator is calculated by the tracking program retrieving 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:** This indicator is aggregated.
- 9. Caveats: This indicator is not a surrogate. It has no weaknesses. The source of the data does not have a bias. There is not a caveat.
- 10. **Responsible Person:** The person responsible for this indicator is the Executive Manager, Criminal Division.

Program:	Criminal
Objective:	I.1
Indicator Name:	Number of cases refused due to conflict

- 1. Type and Level: Efficiency/Key
- 2. **Rationale:** This indicator provides an overall feel for how well the department is meeting its objectives. It is necessary to track to support the outcome measures.
- 3. Use: This indicator will be monitored by the division and department management. It will be used for internal management purposes and for performance-based budgeting as an indicator of workload.
- 4. Clarity: This indicator is clearly identified.
- 5. Validity, Reliability and Accuracy: This is a valid indicator that is reliable and accurate. Performance indicators are reported to the Office of Planning and Budget, available to the public and the media via the internet, and are subject to audit.
- 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 quarterly basis.
- 7. Calculation Methodology: The indicator is calculated by the tracking program retrieving 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: This indicator is aggregated.
- 9. **Caveats:** This indicator is not a surrogate. It has no weaknesses. The source of the data does not have a bias. There is not a caveat.
- 10. **Responsible Person:** The person responsible for this indicator is the Executive Manager, Criminal Division.

Program:	Criminal
Objective:	I.1
Indicator Name:	Number of cases received by recusal and retained and handled in-house

- 1. Type and Level: Efficiency/General
- 2. **Rationale:** This indicator provides an overall feel for how well the department is meeting its objectives. It is necessary to track to support the outcome measures.
- 3. Use: This indicator will be monitored by the division and department management. It will be used for internal management purposes and for performance-based budgeting as an indicator of workload.
- 4. Clarity: This indicator is clearly identified.
- 5. Validity, Reliability and Accuracy: This is a valid indicator that is reliable and accurate. Performance indicators are reported to the Office of Planning and Budget, available to the public and the media via the internet, and are subject to audit.
- 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 quarterly basis.
- 7. Calculation Methodology: The indicator is calculated by the tracking program retrieving 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: This indicator is aggregated.
- 9. Caveats: This indicator is not a surrogate. It has no weaknesses. The source of the data does not have a bias. There is not a caveat.
- 10. **Responsible Person:** The person responsible for this indicator is the Executive Manager, Criminal Division.

Program:	Criminal
Objective:	I.2
Indicator Name:	Number of requests for legal consultation

- 1. Type and Level: Input/General
- 2. **Rationale:** This indicator provides an overall feel for how well the department is meeting its objectives. It is necessary to track to support the outcome measures.
- 3. Use: This indicator will be monitored by the division and department management. It will be used for internal management purposes and for performance-based budgeting as an indicator of workload.
- 4. Clarity: This indicator is clearly identified.
- 5. Validity, Reliability and Accuracy: This is a valid indicator that is reliable and accurate. Performance indicators are reported to the Office of Planning and Budget, available to the public and the media via the internet, and are subject to audit.
- 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 quarterly basis.
- 7. Calculation Methodology: The indicator is calculated by the tracking program retrieving data by date range, searching the nature field marked request for consultation.
- 8. Scope: This indicator is aggregated.
- 9. Caveats: This indicator is not a surrogate. It has no weaknesses. The source of the data does not have a bias. There is not a caveat.
- 10. **Responsible Person:** The person responsible for this indicator is the Insurance Fraud Control Unit, Section Chief Director, Criminal Division.

Program:	Criminal
Objective:	I.2
Indicator Name:	Number of scheduled intelligence sharing meetings

- 1. Type and Level: Input/General
- 2. **Rationale:** This indicator provides an overall feel for how well the department is meeting its objectives. It is necessary to track to support the outcome measures.
- 3. Use: This indicator will be monitored by the division and department management. It will be used for internal management purposes and for performance-based budgeting as an indicator of workload.
- 4. Clarity: This indicator is clearly identified.
- 5. Validity, Reliability and Accuracy: This is a valid indicator that is reliable and accurate. Performance indicators are reported to the Office of Planning and Budget, available to the public and the media via the internet, and are subject to audit.
- 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 quarterly basis.
- 7. Calculation Methodology: The indicator is calculated by having a hand count of the number of meetings.
- 8. Scope: This indicator is aggregated.
- 9. Caveats: This indicator is not a surrogate. It has no weaknesses. The source of the data does not have a bias. There is not a caveat.
- 10. **Responsible Person:** The person responsible for this indicator is the Insurance Fraud Control Unit, Section Chief Director, Criminal Division.
| Program:        | Criminal   |
|-----------------|--|
| Objective:      | I.2  |
| Indicator Name: | Number of requests for legal consultation responded to within two working days |

- 1. Type and Level: Output/Supporting
- 2. **Rationale:** This indicator provides an overall feel for how well the department is meeting its objectives. It is necessary to track to support the outcome measures.
- 3. Use: This indicator will be monitored by the division and department management. It will be used for internal management purposes and for performance-based budgeting as an indicator of workload.
- 4. Clarity: This indicator is clearly identified.
- 5. Validity, Reliability and Accuracy: This is a valid indicator that is reliable and accurate. Performance indicators are reported to the Office of Planning and Budget, available to the public and the media via the internet, and are subject to audit.
- 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 quarterly basis.
- 7. Calculation Methodology: The indicator is calculated by the tracking program retrieving data by date range, searching the nature field marked request for consultation.
- 8. Scope: This indicator is aggregated.
- 9. Caveats: This indicator is not a surrogate. It has no weaknesses. The source of the data does not have a bias. There is not a caveat.
- 10. **Responsible Person:** The person responsible for this indicator is the Insurance Fraud Control Unit, Section Chief Director, Criminal Division.

Program:	Criminal
Objective:	I.2
Indicator Name:	Number of scheduled intelligence sharing meetings attended by LADOJ

- 1. Type and Level: Output/General
- 2. **Rationale:** This indicator provides an overall feel for how well the department is meeting its objectives. It is necessary to track to support the outcome measures.
- 3. Use: This indicator will be monitored by the division and department management. It will be used for internal management purposes and for performance-based budgeting as an indicator of workload.
- 4. Clarity: This indicator is clearly identified.
- 5. Validity, Reliability and Accuracy: This is a valid indicator that is reliable and accurate. Performance indicators are reported to the Office of Planning and Budget, available to the public and the media via the internet, and are subject to audit.
- 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 quarterly basis.
- 7. Calculation Methodology: The indicator is calculated by having a hand count of the number of meetings attended by LADOJ.
- 8. Scope: This indicator is aggregated.
- 9. Caveats: This indicator is not a surrogate. It has no weaknesses. The source of the data does not have a bias. There is not a caveat.
- 10. **Responsible Person:** The person responsible for this indicator is the Insurance Fraud Control Unit, Section Chief Director, Criminal Division.

Program:	Criminal
Objective:	I.2
Indicator Name:	Percent of requests for legal consultation responded to within two working days

- 1. Type and Level: Efficiency/Supporting
- 2. **Rationale:** This indicator provides an overall feel for how well the department is meeting its objectives. It is necessary to track to support the outcome measures.
- 3. Use: This indicator will be monitored by the division and department management. It will be used for internal management purposes and for performance-based budgeting as an indicator of workload.
- 4. Clarity: This indicator is clearly identified.
- 5. Validity, Reliability and Accuracy: This is a valid indicator that is reliable and accurate. Performance indicators are reported to the Office of Planning and Budget, available to the public and the media via the internet, and are subject to audit.
- 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 quarterly basis.
- 7. Calculation Methodology: The indicator is calculated by the tracking program retrieving data by date range, searching the nature field marked request for consultation and calculates the percentage responded to within two working days.
- 8. Scope: This indicator is aggregated.
- 9. Caveats: This indicator is not a surrogate. It has no weaknesses. The source of the data does not have a bias. There is not a caveat.
- 10. **Responsible Person:** The person responsible for this indicator is the Insurance Fraud Control Unit, Section Chief Director, Criminal Division.

Program:	Criminal
Objective:	I.2
Indicator Name:	Percent of scheduled intelligence sharing meeting attended by LADOJ

- 1. Type and Level: Outcome/Supporting
- 2. **Rationale:** This indicator provides an overall feel for how well the department is meeting its objectives. It is necessary to track to support the outcome measures.
- 3. Use: This indicator will be monitored by the division and department management. It will be used for internal management purposes and for performance-based budgeting as an indicator of workload.
- 4. Clarity: This indicator is clearly identified.
- 5. Validity, Reliability and Accuracy: This is a valid indicator that is reliable and accurate. Performance indicators are reported to the Office of Planning and Budget, available to the public and the media via the internet, and are subject to audit.
- 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 quarterly basis.
- 7. Calculation Methodology: The indicator calculates a percentage from the number of scheduled intelligence shared meetings and the number of scheduled intelligence shared meetings attended by LADOJ.
- 8. Scope: This indicator is aggregated.
- 9. Caveats: This indicator is not a surrogate. It has no weaknesses. The source of the data does not have a bias. There is not a caveat.
- 10. **Responsible Person:** The person responsible for this indicator is the Insurance Fraud Control Unit, Section Chief Director, Criminal Division.

Program:	Criminal
Objective:	I.3
Indicator Name:	Number of investigations opened

- 1. Type and Level: Output/Key
- 2. **Rationale:** This indicator provides an overall feel for how well the department is meeting its objectives. It is necessary to track to support the outcome measures.
- 3. Use: This indicator will be monitored by the division and department management. It will be used for internal management purposes and for performance-based budgeting as an indicator of workload.
- 4. Clarity: This indicator is clearly identified.
- 5. Validity, Reliability and Accuracy: This is a valid indicator that is reliable and accurate. Performance indicators are reported to the Office of Planning and Budget, available to the public and the media via the internet, and are subject to audit.
- 6. **Data Source, Collection and Reporting:** The MFCU case tracking database captures all performance information. All data will be reported on a quarterly basis.
- 7. Calculation Methodology: The indicator is calculated by adding the number of fraud cases opened, and searched by date range.
- 8. Scope: This indicator is aggregated.
- 9. Caveats: This indicator is not a surrogate. It has no weaknesses. The source of the data does not have a bias. There is not a caveat.
- 10. **Responsible Person:** The person responsible for this indicator is the Chief Investigator, Unit Director, MFCU.

Program:	Criminal
Objective:	I.3
Indicator Name:	Dollar amount of civil monetary penalty collected

- 1. Type and Level: Efficiency/General
- 2. **Rationale:** This indicator provides an overall feel for how well the department is meeting its objectives. It is necessary to track to support the outcome measures.
- 3. Use: This indicator will be monitored by the division and department management. It will be used for internal management purposes and for performance-based budgeting as an indicator of workload.
- 4. Clarity: This indicator is clearly identified.
- 5. Validity, Reliability and Accuracy: This is a valid indicator that is reliable and accurate. Performance indicators are reported to the Office of Planning and Budget, available to the public and the media via the internet, and are subject to audit.
- 6. **Data Source, Collection and Reporting:** The MFCU case tracking database captures all performance information. All data will be reported on a quarterly basis.
- 7. Calculation Methodology: The indicator is calculated by the dollar amount of civil monetary penalty collected being entered in the data base for every case collected, searching by date range.
- 8. Scope: This indicator is aggregated.
- 9. Caveats: This indicator is not a surrogate. It has no weaknesses. The source of the data does not have a bias. There is not a caveat.
- 10. **Responsible Person:** The person responsible for this indicator is the Chief Investigator, Unit Director, MFCU.

Program:	Criminal
Objective:	I.3
Indicator Name:	Dollar amount of civil monetary penalties ordered

- 1. Type and Level: Output/General
- 2. **Rationale:** This indicator provides an overall feel for how well the department is meeting its objectives. It is necessary to track to support the outcome measures.
- 3. Use: This indicator will be monitored by the division and department management. It will be used for internal management purposes and for performance-based budgeting as an indicator of workload.
- 4. Clarity: This indicator is clearly identified.
- 5. Validity, Reliability and Accuracy: This is a valid indicator that is reliable and accurate. Performance indicators are reported to the Office of Planning and Budget, available to the public and the media via the internet, and are subject to audit.
- 6. **Data Source, Collection and Reporting:** The MFCU case tracking database captures all performance information. All data will be reported on a quarterly basis.
- 7. Calculation Methodology: The indicator is calculated by the dollar amount of civil monetary penalty ordered being entered in the data base for every case, searching by date range.
- 8. Scope: This indicator is aggregated.
- 9. Caveats: This indicator is not a surrogate. It has no weaknesses. The source of the data does not have a bias. There is not a caveat.
- 10. **Responsible Person:** The person responsible for this indicator is the Chief Investigator, Unit Director, MFCU.

Program:	Criminal
Objective:	I.3
Indicator Name:	Dollar amount of investigation/prosecution costs collected

- 1. Type and Level: Output/General
- 2. **Rationale:** This indicator provides an overall feel for how well the department is meeting its objectives. It is necessary to track to support the outcome measures.
- 3. Use: This indicator will be monitored by the division and department management. It will be used for internal management purposes and for performance-based budgeting as an indicator of workload.
- 4. Clarity: This indicator is clearly identified.
- 5. Validity, Reliability and Accuracy: This is a valid indicator that is reliable and accurate. Performance indicators are reported to the Office of Planning and Budget, available to the public and the media via the internet, and are subject to audit.
- 6. **Data Source, Collection and Reporting:** The MFCU case tracking database captures all performance information. All data will be reported on a quarterly basis.
- 7. Calculation Methodology: The indicator is calculated by the dollar amount of investigation/prosecution costs collected being entered in the data base for every case, searching by date range.
- 8. Scope: This indicator is aggregated.
- 9. Caveats: This indicator is not a surrogate. It has no weaknesses. The source of the data does not have a bias. There is not a caveat.
- 10. **Responsible Person:** The person responsible for this indicator is the Chief Investigator, Unit Director, MFCU.

Program:	Criminal
Objective:	I.3
Indicator Name:	Dollar amount of investigation/prosecution costs ordered

- 1. Type and Level: Output/General
- 2. **Rationale:** This indicator provides an overall feel for how well the department is meeting its objectives. It is necessary to track to support the outcome measures.
- 3. Use: This indicator will be monitored by the division and department management. It will be used for internal management purposes and for performance-based budgeting as an indicator of workload.
- 4. Clarity: This indicator is clearly identified.
- 5. Validity, Reliability and Accuracy: This is a valid indicator that is reliable and accurate. Performance indicators are reported to the Office of Planning and Budget, available to the public and the media via the internet, and are subject to audit.
- 6. **Data Source, Collection and Reporting:** The MFCU case tracking database captures all performance information. All data will be reported on a quarterly basis.
- 7. Calculation Methodology: The indicator is calculated by the dollar amount of investigation/prosecution costs ordered being entered in the data base for every case, searching by date range.
- 8. Scope: This indicator is aggregated.
- 9. Caveats: This indicator is not a surrogate. It has no weaknesses. The source of the data does not have a bias. There is not a caveat.
- 10. **Responsible Person:** The person responsible for this indicator is the Chief Investigator, Unit Director, MFCU.

Program:	Criminal
Objective:	I.3
Indicator Name:	Dollar amount of restitution collected administratively

- 1. Type and Level: Output/General
- 2. **Rationale:** This indicator provides an overall feel for how well the department is meeting its objectives. It is necessary to track to support the outcome measures.
- 3. Use: This indicator will be monitored by the division and department management. It will be used for internal management purposes and for performance-based budgeting as an indicator of workload.
- 4. Clarity: This indicator is clearly identified.
- 5. Validity, Reliability and Accuracy: This is a valid indicator that is reliable and accurate. Performance indicators are reported to the Office of Planning and Budget, available to the public and the media via the internet, and are subject to audit.
- 6. **Data Source, Collection and Reporting:** The MFCU case tracking database captures all performance information. All data will be reported on a quarterly basis.
- 7. Calculation Methodology: The indicator is calculated by the dollar amount restitution collected administratively being entered in the data base for every case, searching by date range.
- 8. Scope: This indicator is aggregated.
- 9. Caveats: This indicator is not a surrogate. It has no weaknesses. The source of the data does not have a bias. There is not a caveat.
- 10. **Responsible Person:** The person responsible for this indicator is the Chief Investigator, Unit Director, MFCU.

Program:	Criminal
Objective:	I.3
Indicator Name:	Dollar amount of administrative restitution ordered

- 1. Type and Level: Output/General
- 2. **Rationale:** This indicator provides an overall feel for how well the department is meeting its objectives. It is necessary to track to support the outcome measures.
- 3. Use: This indicator will be monitored by the division and department management. It will be used for internal management purposes and for performance-based budgeting as an indicator of workload.
- 4. Clarity: This indicator is clearly identified.
- 5. Validity, Reliability and Accuracy: This is a valid indicator that is reliable and accurate. Performance indicators are reported to the Office of Planning and Budget, available to the public and the media via the internet, and are subject to audit.
- 6. **Data Source, Collection and Reporting:** The MFCU case tracking database captures all performance information. All data will be reported on a quarterly basis.
- 7. Calculation Methodology: The indicator is calculated by the dollar amount of administrative restitution ordered being entered in the data base for every case, searching by date range.
- 8. Scope: This indicator is aggregated.
- 9. Caveats: This indicator is not a surrogate. It has no weaknesses. The source of the data does not have a bias. There is not a caveat.
- 10. **Responsible Person:** The person responsible for this indicator is the Chief Investigator, Unit Director, MFCU.

Program:	Criminal
Objective:	I.3
Indicator Name:	Dollar amount of criminal court ordered restitution collected

- 1. Type and Level: Output/General
- 2. **Rationale:** This indicator provides an overall feel for how well the department is meeting its objectives. It is necessary to track to support the outcome measures.
- 3. Use: This indicator will be monitored by the division and department management. It will be used for internal management purposes and for performance-based budgeting as an indicator of workload.
- 4. Clarity: This indicator is clearly identified.
- 5. Validity, Reliability and Accuracy: This is a valid indicator that is reliable and accurate. Performance indicators are reported to the Office of Planning and Budget, available to the public and the media via the internet, and are subject to audit.
- 6. **Data Source, Collection and Reporting:** The MFCU case tracking database captures all performance information. All data will be reported on a quarterly basis.
- 7. Calculation Methodology: The indicator is calculated by the dollar amount of criminal restitution collected being entered in the data base for every case, searching by date range.
- 8. Scope: This indicator is aggregated.
- 9. Caveats: This indicator is not a surrogate. It has no weaknesses. The source of the data does not have a bias. There is not a caveat.
- 10. **Responsible Person:** The person responsible for this indicator is the Chief Investigator, Unit Director, MFCU.

Program:	Criminal
Objective:	I.3
Indicator Name:	Total dollar amount of collections – all sources

- 1. Type and Level: Output/General
- 2. **Rationale:** This indicator provides an overall feel for how well the department is meeting its objectives. It is necessary to track to support the outcome measures.
- 3. Use: This indicator will be monitored by the division and department management. It will be used for internal management purposes and for performance-based budgeting as an indicator of workload.
- 4. Clarity: This indicator is clearly identified.
- 5. Validity, Reliability and Accuracy: This is a valid indicator that is reliable and accurate. Performance indicators are reported to the Office of Planning and Budget, available to the public and the media via the internet, and are subject to audit.
- 6. **Data Source, Collection and Reporting:** The MFCU case tracking database captures all performance information. All data will be reported on a quarterly basis.
- 7. Calculation Methodology: The indicator is calculated by the dollar amount of collections being entered in the data base for every case, searching by date range.
- 8. Scope: This indicator is aggregated.
- 9. Caveats: This indicator is not a surrogate. It has no weaknesses. The source of the data does not have a bias. There is not a caveat.
- 10. **Responsible Person:** The person responsible for this indicator is the Chief Investigator, Unit Director, MFCU.

Program:	Criminal
Objective:	I.3
Indicator Name:	Total judgments obtained during fiscal year - all sources

- 1. Type and Level: Output/General
- 2. **Rationale:** This indicator provides an overall feel for how well the department is meeting its objectives. It is necessary to track to support the outcome measures.
- 3. Use: This indicator will be monitored by the division and department management. It will be used for internal management purposes and for performance-based budgeting as an indicator of workload.
- 4. Clarity: This indicator is clearly identified.
- 5. Validity, Reliability and Accuracy: This is a valid indicator that is reliable and accurate. Performance indicators are reported to the Office of Planning and Budget, available to the public and the media via the internet, and are subject to audit.
- 6. **Data Source, Collection and Reporting:** The MFCU case tracking database captures all performance information. All data will be reported on a quarterly basis.
- 7. Calculation Methodology: The indicator is calculated by the total amount of judgments obtained being entered in the data base for every case, searching by date range.
- 8. Scope: This indicator is aggregated.
- 9. Caveats: This indicator is not a surrogate. It has no weaknesses. The source of the data does not have a bias. There is not a caveat.
- 10. **Responsible Person:** The person responsible for this indicator is the Chief Investigator, Unit Director, MFCU.

Program:	Criminal
Objective:	I.3
Indicator Name:	Dollar amount of fines ordered

- 1. Type and Level: Output/General
- 2. **Rationale:** This indicator provides an overall feel for how well the department is meeting its objectives. It is necessary to track to support the outcome measures.
- 3. Use: This indicator will be monitored by the division and department management. It will be used for internal management purposes and for performance-based budgeting as an indicator of workload.
- 4. Clarity: This indicator is clearly identified.
- 5. Validity, Reliability and Accuracy: This is a valid indicator that is reliable and accurate. Performance indicators are reported to the Office of Planning and Budget, available to the public and the media via the internet, and are subject to audit.
- 6. **Data Source, Collection and Reporting:** The MFCU case tracking database captures all performance information. All data will be reported on a quarterly basis.
- 7. Calculation Methodology: The indicator is calculated by the dollar amount of funds ordered being entered in the data base for every case, searching by date range.
- 8. Scope: This indicator is aggregated.
- 9. Caveats: This indicator is not a surrogate. It has no weaknesses. The source of the data does not have a bias. There is not a caveat.
- 10. **Responsible Person:** The person responsible for this indicator is the Chief Investigator, Unit Director, MFCU.

Program:	Criminal
Objective:	I.3
Indicator Name:	Dollar amount of criminal and civil restitution ordered

- 1. Type and Level: Input/General
- 2. **Rationale:** This indicator provides an overall feel for how well the department is meeting its objectives. It is necessary to track to support the outcome measures.
- 3. Use: This indicator will be monitored by the division and department management. It will be used for internal management purposes and for performance-based budgeting as an indicator of workload.
- 4. Clarity: This indicator is clearly identified.
- 5. Validity, Reliability and Accuracy: This is a valid indicator that is reliable and accurate. Performance indicators are reported to the Office of Planning and Budget, available to the public and the media via the internet, and are subject to audit.
- 6. **Data Source, Collection and Reporting:** The MFCU case tracking database captures all performance information. All data will be reported on a quarterly basis.
- 7. Calculation Methodology: The indicator is calculated by the dollar amount of civil restitution ordered being entered in the data base, searching by date range.
- 8. Scope: This indicator is aggregated.
- 9. Caveats: This indicator is not a surrogate. It has no weaknesses. The source of the data does not have a bias. There is not a caveat.
- 10. **Responsible Person:** The person responsible for this indicator is the Chief Investigator, Unit Director, MFCU.

Program:	Criminal
Objective:	I.4
Indicator Name:	Number of offenders reviewed

- 1. Type and Level: Input/Key
- 2. **Rationale:** This indicator provides an overall feel for how well the department is meeting its objectives. It is necessary to track to support the outcome measures.
- 3. Use: This indicator will be monitored by the division and department management. It will be used for internal management purposes and for performance-based budgeting as an indicator of workload.
- 4. Clarity: This indicator is clearly identified.
- 5. Validity, Reliability and Accuracy: This is a valid indicator that is reliable and accurate. Performance indicators are reported to the Office of Planning and Budget, available to the public and the media via the internet, and are subject to audit.
- 6. **Data Source, Collection, and Reporting:** The data source is an analysis of all of the department's objectives and performance indicators. It is tracked and gathered quarterly.
- 7. Calculation Methodology: The indicator is calculated by adding the number of offenders reviewed.
- 8. Scope: This indicator is aggregated.
- 9. Caveats: This indicator is not a surrogate. It has no weaknesses. The source of the data does not have a bias. There is not a caveat.
- 10. **Responsible Person(s):** The people responsible for this indicator are the Unit Director-MFCU and the Special Agent in Charge-MFCU.

Program:	Criminal
Objective:	I.4
Indicator Name:	Number of written notices sent

- 1. Type and Level: Output/Supporting
- 2. **Rationale:** This indicator provides an overall feel for how well the department is meeting its objectives. It is necessary to track to support the outcome measures.
- 3. Use: This indicator will be monitored by the division and department management. It will be used for internal management purposes and for performance-based budgeting as an indicator of workload.
- 4. Clarity: This indicator is clearly identified.
- 5. Validity, Reliability and Accuracy: This is a valid indicator that is reliable and accurate. Performance indicators are reported to the Office of Planning and Budget, available to the public and the media via the internet, and are subject to audit.
- 6. **Data Source, Collection, and Reporting:** The data source is an analysis of all of the department's objectives and performance indicators. It is tracked and gathered quarterly.
- 7. Calculation Methodology: The indicator is calculated by adding the number of written notices sent by date range.
- 8. Scope: This indicator is aggregated.
- 9. Caveats: This indicator is not a surrogate. It has no weaknesses. The source of the data does not have a bias. There is not a caveat.
- 10. **Responsible Person(s):** The people responsible for this indicator are the Unit Director-MFCU and the Special Agent in Charge-MFCU.

Program:	Criminal
Objective:	I.4
Indicator Name:	Number of written notices provided by the LADOJ within 30 days from date the determination is posted

- 1. Type and Level: Output/General
- 2. **Rationale:** This indicator provides an overall feel for how well the department is meeting its objectives. It is necessary to track to support the outcome measures.
- 3. Use: This indicator will be monitored by the division and department management. It will be used for internal management purposes and for performance-based budgeting as an indicator of workload.
- 4. Clarity: This indicator is clearly identified.
- 5. Validity, Reliability and Accuracy: This is a valid indicator that is reliable and accurate. Performance indicators are reported to the Office of Planning and Budget, available to the public and the media via the internet, and are subject to audit.
- 6. **Data Source, Collection, and Reporting:** The data source is an analysis of all of the department's objectives and performance indicators. It is tracked and gathered quarterly.
- 7. Calculation Methodology: The indicator is calculated by adding the number of written notices provided by the LADOJ within 30 days from date the determination is posted.
- 8. Scope: This indicator is aggregated.
- 9. Caveats: This indicator is not a surrogate. It has no weaknesses. The source of the data does not have a bias. There is not a caveat.
- 10. **Responsible Person(s):** The people responsible for this indicator are the Unit Director-MFCU and the Special Agent in Charge-MFCU.

Program:	Criminal
Objective:	I.4
Indicator Name:	Percentage of written notices provided by the LADOJ within 30 days from date the determination is posted

- 1. Type and Level: Efficiency/Supporting
- 2. **Rationale:** This indicator provides an overall feel for how well the department is meeting its objectives. It is necessary to track to support the outcome measures.
- 3. Use: This indicator will be monitored by the division and department management. It will be used for internal management purposes and for performance-based budgeting as an indicator of workload.
- 4. Clarity: This indicator is clearly identified.
- 5. Validity, Reliability and Accuracy: This is a valid indicator that is reliable and accurate. Performance indicators are reported to the Office of Planning and Budget, available to the public and the media via the internet, and are subject to audit.
- 6. **Data Source, Collection, and Reporting:** The data source is an analysis of all of the department's objectives and performance indicators. It is tracked and gathered quarterly.
- 7. Calculation Methodology: The indicator is calculated by dividing the number of written notices provided by the LADOJ within 30 days from date the determination is posted by the number of notices sent.
- 8. Scope: This indicator is aggregated.
- 9. Caveats: This indicator is not a surrogate. It has no weaknesses. The source of the data does not have a bias. There is not a caveat.
- 10. **Responsible Person(s):** The people responsible for this indicator are the Unit Director-MFCU and the Special Agent in Charge-MFCU.

Program:	Criminal
Objective:	I.5
Indicator Name:	Number of petitions received

- 1. Type and Level: Input/Key
- 2. **Rationale:** This indicator provides an overall feel for how well the department is meeting its objectives. It is necessary to track to support the outcome measures.
- 3. Use: This indicator will be monitored by the division and department management. It will be used for internal management purposes and for performance-based budgeting as an indicator of workload.
- 4. Clarity: This indicator is clearly identified.
- 5. Validity, Reliability and Accuracy: This is a valid indicator that is reliable and accurate. Performance indicators are reported to the Office of Planning and Budget, available to the public and the media via the internet, and are subject to audit.
- 6. **Data Source, Collection, and Reporting:** The data source is an analysis of all of the department's objectives and performance indicators. It is tracked and gathered quarterly.
- 7. Calculation Methodology: The indicator is calculated by adding the number of petitions received by date range.
- 8. Scope: This indicator is aggregated.
- 9. Caveats: This indicator is not a surrogate. It has no weaknesses. The source of the data does not have a bias. There is not a caveat.
- 10. **Responsible Person(s):** The people responsible for this indicator are the Unit Director-MFCU and the Special Agent in Charge-MFCU.

Program:	Criminal
Objective:	I.5
Indicator Name:	Number of responses to petitions

- 1. Type and Level: Output/Supporting
- 2. **Rationale:** This indicator provides an overall feel for how well the department is meeting its objectives. It is necessary to track to support the outcome measures.
- 3. Use: This indicator will be monitored by the division and department management. It will be used for internal management purposes and for performance-based budgeting as an indicator of workload.
- 4. Clarity: This indicator is clearly identified.
- 5. Validity, Reliability and Accuracy: This is a valid indicator that is reliable and accurate. Performance indicators are reported to the Office of Planning and Budget, available to the public and the media via the internet, and are subject to audit.
- 6. **Data Source, Collection, and Reporting:** The data source is an analysis of all of the department's objectives and performance indicators. It is tracked and gathered quarterly.
- 7. Calculation Methodology: The indicator is calculated by adding the number of responses to petitions by date range.
- 8. Scope: This indicator is aggregated.
- 9. Caveats: This indicator is not a surrogate. It has no weaknesses. The source of the data does not have a bias. There is not a caveat.
- 10. **Responsible Person(s):** The people responsible for this indicator are the Unit Director-MFCU and the Special Agent in Charge-MFCU.

Program:	Criminal
Objective:	I.5
Indicator Name:	Percentage of petitions for relief responded to by the LADOJ within 30 days of receipt

- 1. Type and Level: Outcome/General
- 2. **Rationale:** This indicator provides an overall feel for how well the department is meeting its objectives. It is necessary to track to support the outcome measures.
- 3. Use: This indicator will be monitored by the division and department management. It will be used for internal management purposes and for performance-based budgeting as an indicator of workload.
- 4. Clarity: This indicator is clearly identified.
- 5. Validity, Reliability and Accuracy: This is a valid indicator that is reliable and accurate. Performance indicators are reported to the Office of Planning and Budget, available to the public and the media via the internet, and are subject to audit.
- 6. **Data Source, Collection, and Reporting:** The data source is an analysis of all of the department's objectives and performance indicators. It is tracked and gathered quarterly.
- 7. Calculation Methodology: The indicator is calculated by dividing the number petitions for relief responded to by the LADOJ within 30 days of receipt by the number of responses to petitions.
- 8. Scope: This indicator is aggregated.
- 9. Caveats: This indicator is not a surrogate. It has no weaknesses. The source of the data does not have a bias. There is not a caveat.
- 10. **Responsible Person(s):** The people responsible for this indicator are the Unit Director-MFCU and the Special Agent in Charge-MFCU.

Program:	Criminal
Objective:	I.5
Indicator Name:	Percentage of responses to petition

- 1. Type and Level: Efficiency/Supporting
- 2. **Rationale:** This indicator provides an overall feel for how well the department is meeting its objectives. It is necessary to track to support the outcome measures.
- 3. Use: This indicator will be monitored by the division and department management. It will be used for internal management purposes and for performance-based budgeting as an indicator of workload.
- 4. Clarity: This indicator is clearly identified.
- 5. Validity, Reliability and Accuracy: This is a valid indicator that is reliable and accurate. Performance indicators are reported to the Office of Planning and Budget, available to the public and the media via the internet, and are subject to audit.
- 6. **Data Source, Collection, and Reporting:** The data source is an analysis of all of the department's objectives and performance indicators. It is tracked and gathered quarterly.
- 7. Calculation Methodology: The indicator is calculated by the dividing the number of responses to petitions by the number of petitions received.
- 8. Scope: This indicator is aggregated.
- 9. Caveats: This indicator is not a surrogate. It has no weaknesses. The source of the data does not have a bias. There is not a caveat.
- 10. **Responsible Person(s):** The people responsible for this indicator are the Unit Director-MFCU and the Special Agent in Charge-MFCU.

Program:	Criminal
Objective:	I.6
Indicator Name:	Number of requests for trainings

- 1. Type and Level: Input/Key
- 2. **Rationale:** This indicator provides an overall feel for how well the department is meeting its objectives. It is necessary to track to support the outcome measures.
- 3. Use: This indicator will be monitored by the division and department management. It will be used for internal management purposes and for performance-based budgeting as an indicator of workload.
- 4. Clarity: This indicator is clearly identified.
- 5. Validity, Reliability and Accuracy: This is a valid indicator that is reliable and accurate. Performance indicators are reported to the Office of Planning and Budget, available to the public and the media via the internet, and are subject to audit.
- 6. **Data Source, Collection, and Reporting:** The data source is an analysis of all of the department's objectives and performance indicators. It is tracked and gathered quarterly.
- 7. Calculation Methodology: The indicator is calculated by adding the number of requests for trainings by date range.
- 8. Scope: This indicator is aggregated.
- 9. Caveats: This indicator is not a surrogate. It has no weaknesses. The source of the data does not have a bias. There is not a caveat.
- 10. **Responsible Person(s):** The people responsible for this indicator are the Unit Director-MFCU and the Special Agent in Charge-MFCU.

Program:	Criminal
Objective:	I.6
Indicator Name:	Number of trainings provided

- 1. Type and Level: Output/General
- 2. **Rationale:** This indicator provides an overall feel for how well the department is meeting its objectives. It is necessary to track to support the outcome measures.
- 3. Use: This indicator will be monitored by the division and department management. It will be used for internal management purposes and for performance-based budgeting as an indicator of workload.
- 4. Clarity: This indicator is clearly identified.
- 5. Validity, Reliability and Accuracy: This is a valid indicator that is reliable and accurate. Performance indicators are reported to the Office of Planning and Budget, available to the public and the media via the internet, and are subject to audit.
- 6. **Data Source, Collection, and Reporting:** The data source is an analysis of all of the department's objectives and performance indicators. It is tracked and gathered quarterly.
- 7. **Calculation Methodology:** The indicator is calculated by adding the number of trainings provided by date range.
- 8. Scope: This indicator is aggregated.
- 9. Caveats: This indicator is not a surrogate. It has no weaknesses. The source of the data does not have a bias. There is not a caveat.
- 10. **Responsible Person(s):** The people responsible for this indicator are the Unit Director-MFCU and the Special Agent in Charge-MFCU.

Program:	Criminal
Objective:	I.6
Indicator Name:	Number of trainings provided by the LADOJ within 60 days of request

- 1. Type and Level: Outcome/General
- 2. **Rationale:** This indicator provides an overall feel for how well the department is meeting its objectives. It is necessary to track to support the outcome measures.
- 3. Use: This indicator will be monitored by the division and department management. It will be used for internal management purposes and for performance-based budgeting as an indicator of workload.
- 4. Clarity: This indicator is clearly identified.
- 5. Validity, Reliability and Accuracy: This is a valid indicator that is reliable and accurate. Performance indicators are reported to the Office of Planning and Budget, available to the public and the media via the internet, and are subject to audit.
- 6. **Data Source, Collection, and Reporting:** The data source is an analysis of all of the department's objectives and performance indicators. It is tracked and gathered quarterly.
- 7. **Calculation Methodology:** The indicator is calculated by adding the number of trainings provided by the LADOJ within 60 days of request by date range.
- 8. Scope: This indicator is aggregated.
- 9. Caveats: This indicator is not a surrogate. It has no weaknesses. The source of the data does not have a bias. There is not a caveat.
- 10. **Responsible Person(s):** The people responsible for this indicator are the Unit Director-MFCU and the Special Agent in Charge-MFCU.

Program:	Criminal
Objective:	I.6
Indicator Name:	Percentage of trainings provided by the LADOJ within 60 days of request

- 1. Type and Level: Efficiency/General
- 2. **Rationale:** This indicator provides an overall feel for how well the department is meeting its objectives. It is necessary to track to support the outcome measures.
- 3. Use: This indicator will be monitored by the division and department management. It will be used for internal management purposes and for performance-based budgeting as an indicator of workload.
- 4. Clarity: This indicator is clearly identified.
- 5. Validity, Reliability and Accuracy: This is a valid indicator that is reliable and accurate. Performance indicators are reported to the Office of Planning and Budget, available to the public and the media via the internet, and are subject to audit.
- 6. **Data Source, Collection, and Reporting:** The data source is an analysis of all of the department's objectives and performance indicators. It is tracked and gathered quarterly.
- 7. **Calculation Methodology:** The indicator is calculated by dividing the number of trainings provided by the LADOJ within 60 days of request by the number of trainings provided.
- 8. Scope: This indicator is aggregated.
- 9. Caveats: This indicator is not a surrogate. It has no weaknesses. The source of the data does not have a bias. There is not a caveat.
- 10. **Responsible Person(s):** The people responsible for this indicator are the Unit Director-MFCU and the Special Agent in Charge-MFCU.

Program:	Criminal
Objective:	I.7
Indicator Name:	Number of requests for consultation received

- 1. Type and Level: Input/Key
- 2. **Rationale:** This indicator provides an overall feel for how well the department is meeting its objectives. It is necessary to track to support the outcome measures.
- 3. Use: This indicator will be monitored by the division and department management. It will be used for internal management purposes and for performance-based budgeting as an indicator of workload.
- 4. Clarity: This indicator is clearly identified.
- 5. Validity, Reliability and Accuracy: This is a valid indicator that is reliable and accurate. Performance indicators are reported to the Office of Planning and Budget, available to the public and the media via the internet, and are subject to audit.
- 6. **Data Source, Collection, and Reporting:** The data source is an analysis of all of the department's objectives and performance indicators. It is tracked and gathered quarterly.
- 7. **Calculation Methodology:** The indicator is calculated by adding the number of requests for consultation received by date range.
- 8. Scope: This indicator is aggregated.
- 9. Caveats: This indicator is not a surrogate. It has no weaknesses. The source of the data does not have a bias. There is not a caveat.
- 10. **Responsible Person(s):** The people responsible for this indicator are the Unit Director-MFCU and the Special Agent in Charge-MFCU.

Program:	Criminal
Objective:	I.7
Indicator Name:	Number of responses to requests for consultation

- 1. Type and Level: Output/Supporting
- 2. **Rationale:** This indicator provides an overall feel for how well the department is meeting its objectives. It is necessary to track to support the outcome measures.
- 3. Use: This indicator will be monitored by the division and department management. It will be used for internal management purposes and for performance-based budgeting as an indicator of workload.
- 4. Clarity: This indicator is clearly identified.
- 5. Validity, Reliability and Accuracy: This is a valid indicator that is reliable and accurate. Performance indicators are reported to the Office of Planning and Budget, available to the public and the media via the internet, and are subject to audit.
- 6. **Data Source, Collection, and Reporting:** The data source is an analysis of all of the department's objectives and performance indicators. It is tracked and gathered quarterly.
- 7. Calculation Methodology: The indicator is calculated by adding the number of responses to requests for consultation by date range.
- 8. Scope: This indicator is aggregated.
- 9. Caveats: This indicator is not a surrogate. It has no weaknesses. The source of the data does not have a bias. There is not a caveat.
- 10. **Responsible Person(s):** The people responsible for this indicator are the Unit Director-MFCU and the Special Agent in Charge-MFCU.

Program:	Criminal
Objective:	I.7
Indicator Name:	Number of responses made to requests for consultation within 45 days of the request or receipt of all information necessary to respond to the request, whichever is later

- 1. Type and Level: Outcome/General
- 2. **Rationale:** This indicator provides an overall feel for how well the department is meeting its objectives. It is necessary to track to support the outcome measures.
- 3. Use: This indicator will be monitored by the division and department management. It will be used for internal management purposes and for performance-based budgeting as an indicator of workload.
- 4. Clarity: This indicator is clearly identified.
- 5. Validity, Reliability and Accuracy: This is a valid indicator that is reliable and accurate. Performance indicators are reported to the Office of Planning and Budget, available to the public and the media via the internet, and are subject to audit.
- 6. **Data Source, Collection, and Reporting:** The data source is an analysis of all of the department's objectives and performance indicators. It is tracked and gathered quarterly.
- 7. Calculation Methodology: The indicator is calculated by adding the number of responses made to requests for consultation within 45 days of the request or receipt of all information necessary to respond to the request, whichever is later, by date range.
- 8. Scope: This indicator is aggregated.
- 9. Caveats: This indicator is not a surrogate. It has no weaknesses. The source of the data does not have a bias. There is not a caveat.
- 10. **Responsible Person(s):** The people responsible for this indicator are the Unit Director-MFCU and the Special Agent in Charge-MFCU.

Program:	Criminal
Objective:	I.7
Indicator Name:	Percentage of responses made to requests for consultation within 45 days of the request or receipt of all information necessary to respond to the request, whichever is later

- 1. Type and Level: Efficiency/Supporting
- 2. **Rationale:** This indicator provides an overall feel for how well the department is meeting its objectives. It is necessary to track to support the outcome measures.
- 3. Use: This indicator will be monitored by the division and department management. It will be used for internal management purposes and for performance-based budgeting as an indicator of workload.
- 4. Clarity: This indicator is clearly identified.
- 5. Validity, Reliability and Accuracy: This is a valid indicator that is reliable and accurate. Performance indicators are reported to the Office of Planning and Budget, available to the public and the media via the internet, and are subject to audit.
- 6. **Data Source, Collection, and Reporting:** The data source is an analysis of all of the department's objectives and performance indicators. It is tracked and gathered quarterly.
- 7. Calculation Methodology: The indicator is calculated by dividing the number of responses made to requests for consultation within 45 days of the request or receipt of all information necessary to respond to the request, whichever is later, by the number of responses to requests for consultation by date range.
- 8. **Scope:** This indicator is aggregated.
- 9. Caveats: This indicator is not a surrogate. It has no weaknesses. The source of the data does not have a bias. There is not a caveat.
- 10. **Responsible Person(s):** The people responsible for this indicator are the Unit Director-MFCU and the Special Agent in Charge-MFCU.

Program:	Criminal
Objective:	I.8
Indicator Name:	Number of ICAC cases opened that are initiated through complaints or information received

- 1. Type and Level: Output/General
- 2. **Rationale:** This indicator provides an overall feel for how well the department is meeting its objectives. It is necessary to track to support the outcome measures.
- 3. Use: This indicator will be monitored by the division and department management. It will be used for internal management purposes and for performance-based budgeting as an indicator of workload.
- 4. Clarity: This indicator is clearly identified.
- 5. Validity, Reliability and Accuracy: This is a valid indicator that is reliable and accurate. Performance indicators are reported to the Office of Planning and Budget, available to the public and the media via the internet, and are subject to audit.
- 6. **Data Source, Collection and Reporting:** Data is tracked in the Investigation Tracking system. All data will be reported on a quarterly basis.
- 7. **Calculation Methodology:** The indicator is calculated by adding the number of ICAC cases opened that are initiated through complaints or information received by date range.
- 8. Scope: This indicator is aggregated.
- 9. Caveats: This indicator is not a surrogate. It has no weaknesses. The source of the data does not have a bias. There is not a caveat.
- 10. **Responsible Person:** The person responsible for this indicator is the Chief Deputy Director Investigation.

Program:	Criminal
Objective:	I.8
Indicator Name:	Number of ICAC cases opened generated from proactive online investigation per fiscal year

- 1. Type and Level: Output/Key
- 2. **Rationale:** This indicator provides an overall feel for how well the department is meeting its objectives. It is necessary to track to support the outcome measures.
- 3. Use: This indicator will be monitored by the division and department management. It will be used for internal management purposes and for performance-based budgeting as an indicator of workload.
- 4. Clarity: This indicator is clearly identified.
- 5. Validity, Reliability and Accuracy: This is a valid indicator that is reliable and accurate. Performance indicators are reported to the Office of Planning and Budget, available to the public and the media via the internet, and are subject to audit.
- 6. **Data Source, Collection and Reporting:** Data is tracked in the Investigation Tracking system. All data will be reported on a quarterly basis.
- 7. **Calculation Methodology:** The indicator is calculated by adding the number of LADOJ ICAC cases being entered as resulting from proactive online investigation.
- 8. Scope: This indicator is aggregated.
- 9. Caveats: This indicator is not a surrogate. It has no weaknesses. The source of the data does not have a bias. There is not a caveat.
- 10. **Responsible Person:** The person responsible for this indicator is the Chief Deputy Director Investigation.

Program:	Criminal
Objective:	I.8
Indicator Name:	Number of hours spent in proactive online investigation

- 1. Type and Level: Input/Key
- 2. **Rationale:** This indicator provides an overall feel for how well the department is meeting its objectives. It is necessary to track to support the outcome measures.
- 3. Use: This indicator will be monitored by the division and department management. It will be used for internal management purposes and for performance-based budgeting as an indicator of workload.
- 4. Clarity: This indicator is clearly identified.
- 5. Validity, Reliability and Accuracy: This is a valid indicator that is reliable and accurate. Performance indicators are reported to the Office of Planning and Budget, available to the public and the media via the internet, and are subject to audit.
- 6. **Data Source, Collection and Reporting:** Data is tracked in the Investigation Tracking system. All data will be reported on a quarterly basis.
- 7. Calculation Methodology: The indicator is calculated by the number of hours spent in proactive online investigation.
- 8. Scope: This indicator is aggregated.
- 9. Caveats: This indicator is not a surrogate. It has no weaknesses. The source of the data does not have a bias. There is not a caveat.
- 10. **Responsible Person:** The person responsible for this indicator is the Chief Deputy Director Investigation.

Program:	Criminal
Objective:	I.8
Indicator Name:	Number of LADOJ ICAC cases per 40 hours of LADOJ proactive online investigation per fiscal year

- 1. Type and Level: Efficiency/Supporting
- 2. **Rationale:** This indicator provides an overall feel for how well the department is meeting its objectives. It is necessary to track to support the outcome measures.
- 3. Use: This indicator will be monitored by the division and department management. It will be used for internal management purposes and for performance-based budgeting as an indicator of workload.
- 4. Clarity: This indicator is clearly identified.
- 5. Validity, Reliability and Accuracy: This is a valid indicator that is reliable and accurate. Performance indicators are reported to the Office of Planning and Budget, available to the public and the media via the internet, and are subject to audit.
- 6. **Data Source, Collection and Reporting:** Data is tracked in the Investigation Tracking system. All data will be reported on a quarterly basis.
- 7. **Calculation Methodology:** The indicator is calculated by adding the number of LADOJ ICAC cases per 40 hours of LADOJ proactive online investigation per fiscal year.
- 8. Scope: This indicator is aggregated.
- 9. Caveats: This indicator is not a surrogate. It has no weaknesses. The source of the data does not have a bias. There is not a caveat.
- 10. **Responsible Person:** The person responsible for this indicator is the Chief Deputy Director Investigation.
| Program:        | Criminal          |
|-----------------|-------------------|
| Objective:      | I.8               |
| Indicator Name: | Total CCU arrests |

- 1. Type and Level: Output/General
- 2. **Rationale:** This indicator provides an overall feel for how well the department is meeting its objectives. It is necessary to track to support the outcome measures.
- 3. Use: This indicator will be monitored by the division and department management. It will be used for internal management purposes and for performance-based budgeting as an indicator of workload.
- 4. Clarity: This indicator is clearly identified.
- 5. Validity, Reliability and Accuracy: This is a valid indicator that is reliable and accurate. Performance indicators are reported to the Office of Planning and Budget, available to the public and the media via the internet, and are subject to audit.
- 6. **Data Source, Collection and Reporting:** Data is tracked in the Investigation Tracking system. All data will be reported on a quarterly basis.
- 7. Calculation Methodology: The indicator is calculated by adding the number of CCU arrests by date range search.
- 8. Scope: This indicator is aggregated.
- 9. Caveats: This indicator is not a surrogate. It has no weaknesses. The source of the data does not have a bias. There is not a caveat.
- 10. **Responsible Person:** The person responsible for this indicator is the Chief Deputy Director Investigation.

Program:	Criminal
Objective:	I.9
Indicator Name:	Number of request for forensic lab examinations received from outside agencies

- 1. Type and Level: Input/General
- 2. **Rationale:** This indicator provides an overall feel for how well the department is meeting its objectives. It is necessary to track to support the outcome measures.
- 3. Use: This indicator will be monitored by the division and department management. It will be used for internal management purposes and for performance-based budgeting as an indicator of workload.
- 4. Clarity: This indicator is clearly identified.
- 5. Validity, Reliability and Accuracy: This is a valid indicator that is reliable and accurate. Performance indicators are reported to the Office of Planning and Budget, available to the public and the media via the internet, and are subject to audit.
- 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 quarterly basis.
- 7. Calculation Methodology: The indicator is calculated by adding the number of requests being entered as from outside agencies, searching by date range.
- 8. Scope: This indicator is aggregated.
- 9. Caveats: This indicator is not a surrogate. It has no weaknesses. The source of the data does not have a bias. There is not a caveat.
- 10. **Responsible Person:** The person responsible for this indicator is the Chief Deputy Director Investigation.

Program:	Criminal
Objective:	I.9
Indicator Name:	Number of forensic lab examinations requested for LADOJ cases

- 1. Type and Level: Output/General
- 2. **Rationale:** This indicator provides an overall feel for how well the department is meeting its objectives. It is necessary to track to support the outcome measures.
- 3. Use: This indicator will be monitored by the division and department management. It will be used for internal management purposes and for performance-based budgeting as an indicator of workload.
- 4. Clarity: This indicator is clearly identified.
- 5. Validity, Reliability and Accuracy: This is a valid indicator that is reliable and accurate. Performance indicators are reported to the Office of Planning and Budget, available to the public and the media via the internet, and are subject to audit.
- 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 quarterly basis.
- 7. Calculation Methodology: The indicator is calculated by adding the number of requests being entered as from LADOJ, searching by date range.
- 8. Scope: This indicator is aggregated.
- 9. Caveats: This indicator is not a surrogate. It has no weaknesses. The source of the data does not have a bias. There is not a caveat.
- 10. **Responsible Person:** The person responsible for this indicator is the Chief Deputy Director Investigation.

Program:	Criminal
Objective:	I.9
Indicator Name:	Size (in gigabytes) of completed examinations

- 1. Type and Level: Output/Supporting
- 2. **Rationale:** This indicator provides an overall feel for how well the department is meeting its objectives. It is necessary to track to support the outcome measures.
- 3. Use: This indicator will be monitored by the division and department management. It will be used for internal management purposes and for performance-based budgeting as an indicator of workload.
- 4. Clarity: This indicator is clearly identified.
- 5. Validity, Reliability and Accuracy: This is a valid indicator that is reliable and accurate. Performance indicators are reported to the Office of Planning and Budget, available to the public and the media via the internet, and are subject to audit.
- 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 quarterly basis.
- 7. **Calculation Methodology:** The indicator is calculated by adding the total number of size (gigabytes) of completed examinations, searching by date range.
- 8. Scope: This indicator is aggregated.
- 9. Caveats: This indicator is not a surrogate. It has no weaknesses. The source of the data does not have a bias. There is not a caveat.
- 10. **Responsible Person:** The person responsible for this indicator is the Chief Deputy Director Investigation.

Program:	Criminal
Objective:	I.9
Indicator Name:	Total forensic examinations completed

- 1. Type and Level: Outcome/Supporting
- 2. **Rationale:** This indicator provides an overall feel for how well the department is meeting its objectives. It is necessary to track to support the outcome measures.
- 3. Use: This indicator will be monitored by the division and department management. It will be used for internal management purposes and for performance-based budgeting as an indicator of workload.
- 4. Clarity: This indicator is clearly identified.
- 5. Validity, Reliability and Accuracy: This is a valid indicator that is reliable and accurate. Performance indicators are reported to the Office of Planning and Budget, available to the public and the media via the internet, and are subject to audit.
- 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 quarterly basis.
- 7. Calculation Methodology: The indicator is calculated by adding the total number of completed examinations, searching by date range.
- 8. Scope: This indicator is aggregated.
- 9. Caveats: This indicator is not a surrogate. It has no weaknesses. The source of the data does not have a bias. There is not a caveat.
- 10. **Responsible Person:** The person responsible for this indicator is the Chief Deputy Director Investigation.

Program:	Criminal
Objective:	I.9
Indicator Name:	Percentage of forensic examinations completed

- 1. Type and Level: Efficiency/Supporting
- 2. **Rationale:** This indicator provides an overall feel for how well the department is meeting its objectives. It is necessary to track to support the outcome measures.
- 3. Use: This indicator will be monitored by the division and department management. It will be used for internal management purposes and for performance-based budgeting as an indicator of workload.
- 4. Clarity: This indicator is clearly identified.
- 5. Validity, Reliability and Accuracy: This is a valid indicator that is reliable and accurate. Performance indicators are reported to the Office of Planning and Budget, available to the public and the media via the internet, and are subject to audit.
- 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 quarterly basis.
- 7. Calculation Methodology: The indicator is calculated by dividing the number of forensic examinations completed by number of requests for forensic examinations by date range.
- 8. Scope: This indicator is aggregated.
- 9. Caveats: This indicator is not a surrogate. It has no weaknesses. The source of the data does not have a bias. There is not a caveat.
- 10. **Responsible Person:** The person responsible for this indicator is the Chief Deputy Director Investigation.

Program:	Criminal
Objective:	I.10
Indicator Name:	Number of non-ICAC CCU complaints received and reviewed

- 1. Type and Level: Input/Supporting
- 2. **Rationale:** This indicator provides an overall feel for how well the department is meeting its objectives. It is necessary to track to support the outcome measures.
- 3. Use: This indicator will be monitored by the division and department management. It will be used for internal management purposes and for performance-based budgeting as an indicator of workload.
- 4. Clarity: This indicator is clearly identified.
- 5. Validity, Reliability and Accuracy: This is a valid indicator that is reliable and accurate. Performance indicators are reported to the Office of Planning and Budget, available to the public and the media via the internet, and are subject to audit.
- 6. **Data Source, Collection and Reporting:** Data is tracked in the Investigation Tracking system. All data will be reported on a quarterly basis.
- 7. Calculation Methodology: The indicator is calculated by adding the number of non-ICAC CCU complaints received and reviewed by date range search.
- 8. Scope: This indicator is aggregated.
- 9. Caveats: This indicator is not a surrogate. It has no weaknesses. The source of the data does not have a bias. There is not a caveat.
- 10. **Responsible Person:** The person responsible for this indicator is the Chief Deputy Director Investigation.

Program:	Criminal
Objective:	I.10
Indicator Name:	Number of non-ICAC CCU complaints assigned for investigation

- 1. Type and Level: Output/Supporting
- 2. **Rationale:** This indicator provides an overall feel for how well the department is meeting its objectives. It is necessary to track to support the outcome measures.
- 3. Use: This indicator will be monitored by the division and department management. It will be used for internal management purposes and for performance-based budgeting as an indicator of workload.
- 4. Clarity: This indicator is clearly identified.
- 5. Validity, Reliability and Accuracy: This is a valid indicator that is reliable and accurate. Performance indicators are reported to the Office of Planning and Budget, available to the public and the media via the internet, and are subject to audit.
- 6. **Data Source, Collection and Reporting:** Data is tracked in the Investigation Tracking system. All data will be reported on a quarterly basis.
- 7. **Calculation Methodology:** The indicator is calculated by adding the number of non-ICAC CCU complaints assigned for investigation by date range search.
- 8. Scope: This indicator is aggregated.
- 9. Caveats: This indicator is not a surrogate. It has no weaknesses. The source of the data does not have a bias. There is not a caveat.
- 10. **Responsible Person:** The person responsible for this indicator is the Chief Deputy Director Investigation.

Program:	Criminal
Objective:	I.10
Indicator Name:	Number of non-ICAC CCU complaints where investigation is completed

- 1. Type and Level: Outcome/Supporting
- 2. **Rationale:** This indicator provides an overall feel for how well the department is meeting its objectives. It is necessary to track to support the outcome measures.
- 3. Use: This indicator will be monitored by the division and department management. It will be used for internal management purposes and for performance-based budgeting as an indicator of workload.
- 4. Clarity: This indicator is clearly identified.
- 5. Validity, Reliability and Accuracy: This is a valid indicator that is reliable and accurate. Performance indicators are reported to the Office of Planning and Budget, available to the public and the media via the internet, and are subject to audit.
- 6. **Data Source, Collection and Reporting:** Data is tracked in the Investigation Tracking system. All data will be reported on a quarterly basis.
- 7. **Calculation Methodology:** The indicator is calculated by adding the number of non-ICAC CCU complaints where investigation is completed by date range search.
- 8. Scope: This indicator is aggregated.
- 9. Caveats: This indicator is not a surrogate. It has no weaknesses. The source of the data does not have a bias. There is not a caveat.
- 10. **Responsible Person:** The person responsible for this indicator is the Chief Deputy Director Investigation.

Program:	Criminal
Objective:	I.10
Indicator Name:	Percentage of non-ICAC CCU complaints where investigation is completed

- 1. Type and Level: Efficiency/Supporting
- 2. **Rationale:** This indicator provides an overall feel for how well the department is meeting its objectives. It is necessary to track to support the outcome measures.
- 3. Use: This indicator will be monitored by the division and department management. It will be used for internal management purposes and for performance-based budgeting as an indicator of workload.
- 4. Clarity: This indicator is clearly identified.
- 5. Validity, Reliability and Accuracy: This is a valid indicator that is reliable and accurate. Performance indicators are reported to the Office of Planning and Budget, available to the public and the media via the internet, and are subject to audit.
- 6. **Data Source, Collection and Reporting:** Data is tracked in the Investigation Tracking system. All data will be reported on a quarterly basis.
- 7. **Calculation Methodology:** The indicator is calculated by dividing the number of non-ICAC CCU complaints where investigation is completed by the number of non-ICAC CCU complaints received and reviewed.
- 8. Scope: This indicator is aggregated.
- 9. Caveats: This indicator is not a surrogate. It has no weaknesses. The source of the data does not have a bias. There is not a caveat.
- 10. **Responsible Person:** The person responsible for this indicator is the Chief Deputy Director Investigation.

Program:	Criminal
Objective:	I.10
Indicator Name:	Number of cases opened as a result of a non-ICAC CCU complaint

- 1. Type and Level: Outcome/Key
- 2. **Rationale:** This indicator provides an overall feel for how well the department is meeting its objectives. It is necessary to track to support the outcome measures.
- 3. Use: This indicator will be monitored by the division and department management. It will be used for internal management purposes and for performance-based budgeting as an indicator of workload.
- 4. Clarity: This indicator is clearly identified.
- 5. Validity, Reliability and Accuracy: This is a valid indicator that is reliable and accurate. Performance indicators are reported to the Office of Planning and Budget, available to the public and the media via the internet, and are subject to audit.
- 6. **Data Source, Collection and Reporting:** Data is tracked in the Investigation Tracking system. All data will be reported on a quarterly basis.
- 7. Calculation Methodology: The indicator is calculated by the number of cases opened as a result of complaints received as non-ICAC CCU by date range search.
- 8. Scope: This indicator is aggregated.
- 9. Caveats: This indicator is not a surrogate. It has no weaknesses. The source of the data does not have a bias. There is not a caveat.
- 10. **Responsible Person:** The person responsible for this indicator is the Chief Deputy Director Investigation.

Program:	Criminal
Objective:	I.11
Indicator Name:	Number of requests for assistance from law enforcement agencies

- 1. Type and Level: Input/General
- 2. **Rationale:** This indicator provides an overall feel for how well the department is meeting its objectives. It is necessary to track to support the outcome measures.
- 3. Use: This indicator will be monitored by the division and department management. It will be used for internal management purposes and for performance-based budgeting as an indicator of workload.
- 4. Clarity: This indicator is clearly identified.
- 5. Validity, Reliability and Accuracy: This is a valid indicator that is reliable and accurate. Performance indicators are reported to the Office of Planning and Budget, available to the public and the media via the internet, and are subject to audit.
- 6. **Data Source, Collection and Reporting:** Data is tracked in the Investigation Tracking system. All data will be reported on a quarterly basis.
- 7. Calculation Methodology: The indicator is calculated by adding the number of requests where assistance from a law enforcement agency by date range search.
- 8. Scope: This indicator is aggregated.
- 9. Caveats: This indicator is not a surrogate. It has no weaknesses. The source of the data does not have a bias. There is not a caveat.
- 10. **Responsible Person:** The person responsible for this indicator is the Chief Deputy Director Investigation.

Program:	Criminal
Objective:	I.11
Indicator Name:	Number of requests for assistance from non-law enforcement governmental agencies

- 1. Type and Level: Input/General
- 2. **Rationale:** This indicator provides an overall feel for how well the department is meeting its objectives. It is necessary to track to support the outcome measures.
- 3. Use: This indicator will be monitored by the division and department management. It will be used for internal management purposes and for performance-based budgeting as an indicator of workload.
- 4. Clarity: This indicator is clearly identified.
- 5. Validity, Reliability and Accuracy: This is a valid indicator that is reliable and accurate. Performance indicators are reported to the Office of Planning and Budget, available to the public and the media via the internet, and are subject to audit.
- 6. **Data Source, Collection and Reporting:** Data is tracked in the Investigation Tracking system. All data will be reported on a quarterly basis.
- 7. **Calculation Methodology:** The indicator is calculated by adding the number of requests for assistance from a non-law enforcement governmental agency by date range search.
- 8. Scope: This indicator is aggregated.
- 9. Caveats: This indicator is not a surrogate. It has no weaknesses. The source of the data does not have a bias. There is not a caveat.
- 10. **Responsible Person:** The person responsible for this indicator is the Chief Deputy Director Investigation.

Program:	Criminal
Objective:	I.11
Indicator Name:	Number of recusal requests

- 1. Type and Level: Input/General
- 2. **Rationale:** This indicator provides an overall feel for how well the department is meeting its objectives. It is necessary to track to support the outcome measures.
- 3. Use: This indicator will be monitored by the division and department management. It will be used for internal management purposes and for performance-based budgeting as an indicator of workload.
- 4. Clarity: This indicator is clearly identified.
- 5. Validity, Reliability and Accuracy: This is a valid indicator that is reliable and accurate. Performance indicators are reported to the Office of Planning and Budget, available to the public and the media via the internet, and are subject to audit.
- 6. **Data Source, Collection and Reporting:** Data is tracked in the Investigation Tracking system. All data will be reported on a quarterly basis.
- 7. Calculation Methodology: The indicator is calculated by adding the number of recusals requests by date range search.
- 8. Scope: This indicator is aggregated.
- 9. Caveats: This indicator is not a surrogate. It has no weaknesses. The source of the data does not have a bias. There is not a caveat.
- 10. **Responsible Person:** The person responsible for this indicator is the Chief Deputy Director Investigation.

Program:	Criminal
Objective:	I.11
Indicator Name:	Number of open investigations per investigator

- 1. Type and Level: Input/Key
- 2. **Rationale:** This indicator provides an overall feel for how well the department is meeting its objectives. It is necessary to track to support the outcome measures.
- 3. Use: This indicator will be monitored by the division and department management. It will be used for internal management purposes and for performance-based budgeting as an indicator of workload.
- 4. Clarity: This indicator is clearly identified.
- 5. Validity, Reliability and Accuracy: This is a valid indicator that is reliable and accurate. Performance indicators are reported to the Office of Planning and Budget, available to the public and the media via the internet, and are subject to audit.
- 6. **Data Source, Collection and Reporting:** Data is tracked in the Investigation Tracking system. All data will be reported on a quarterly basis.
- 7. Calculation Methodology: The indicator is calculated by dividing the number of open investigations by the number of investigators by date range.
- 8. Scope: This indicator is aggregated.
- 9. Caveats: This indicator is not a surrogate. It has no weaknesses. The source of the data does not have a bias. There is not a caveat.
- 10. **Responsible Person:** The person responsible for this indicator is the Chief Deputy Director Investigation.

Program:	Criminal
Objective:	I.11
Indicator Name:	Number of closed investigations per investigator

- 1. Type and Level: Output/Supporting
- 2. **Rationale:** This indicator provides an overall feel for how well the department is meeting its objectives. It is necessary to track to support the outcome measures.
- 3. Use: This indicator will be monitored by the division and department management. It will be used for internal management purposes and for performance-based budgeting as an indicator of workload.
- 4. Clarity: This indicator is clearly identified.
- 5. Validity, Reliability and Accuracy: This is a valid indicator that is reliable and accurate. Performance indicators are reported to the Office of Planning and Budget, available to the public and the media via the internet, and are subject to audit.
- 6. **Data Source, Collection and Reporting:** Data is tracked in the Investigation Tracking system. All data will be reported on a quarterly basis.
- 7. Calculation Methodology: The indicator is calculated by dividing the number of closed investigations by the number of investigators, searching by date range.
- 8. Scope: This indicator is aggregated.
- 9. Caveats: This indicator is not a surrogate. It has no weaknesses. The source of the data does not have a bias. There is not a caveat.
- 10. **Responsible Person:** The person responsible for this indicator is the Chief Deputy Director Investigation.

Program:	Criminal
Objective:	I.11
Indicator Name:	Number of total closed investigations

- 1. Type and Level: Output/General
- 2. **Rationale:** This indicator provides an overall feel for how well the department is meeting its objectives. It is necessary to track to support the outcome measures.
- 3. Use: This indicator will be monitored by the division and department management. It will be used for internal management purposes and for performance-based budgeting as an indicator of workload.
- 4. Clarity: This indicator is clearly identified.
- 5. Validity, Reliability and Accuracy: This is a valid indicator that is reliable and accurate. Performance indicators are reported to the Office of Planning and Budget, available to the public and the media via the internet, and are subject to audit.
- 6. **Data Source, Collection and Reporting:** Data is tracked in the Investigation Tracking system. All data will be reported on a quarterly basis.
- 7. Calculation Methodology: The indicator is calculated by adding the number of closed investigations by date range.
- 8. Scope: This indicator is aggregated.
- 9. Caveats: This indicator is not a surrogate. It has no weaknesses. The source of the data does not have a bias. There is not a caveat.
- 10. **Responsible Person:** The person responsible for this indicator is the Chief Deputy Director Investigation.

Program:	Criminal
Objective:	I.11
Indicator Name:	Number of new investigations opened

- 1. Type and Level: Input/Key
- 2. **Rationale:** This indicator provides an overall feel for how well the department is meeting its objectives. It is necessary to track to support the outcome measures.
- 3. Use: This indicator will be monitored by the division and department management. It will be used for internal management purposes and for performance-based budgeting as an indicator of workload.
- 4. Clarity: This indicator is clearly identified.
- 5. Validity, Reliability and Accuracy: This is a valid indicator that is reliable and accurate. Performance indicators are reported to the Office of Planning and Budget, available to the public and the media via the internet, and are subject to audit.
- 6. **Data Source, Collection and Reporting:** Data is tracked in the Investigation Tracking system. All data will be reported on a quarterly basis.
- 7. Calculation Methodology: The indicator is calculated by adding the number of new investigations opened by date range.
- 8. Scope: This indicator is aggregated.
- 9. Caveats: This indicator is not a surrogate. It has no weaknesses. The source of the data does not have a bias. There is not a caveat.
- 10. **Responsible Person:** The person responsible for this indicator is the Chief Deputy Director Investigation.

Program:	Criminal
Objective:	I.11
Indicator Name:	Number of new investigations opened due to LADOJ initiated

- 1. Type and Level: Outcome/Supporting
- 2. **Rationale:** This indicator provides an overall feel for how well the department is meeting its objectives. It is necessary to track to support the outcome measures.
- 3. Use: This indicator will be monitored by the division and department management. It will be used for internal management purposes and for performance-based budgeting as an indicator of workload.
- 4. Clarity: This indicator is clearly identified.
- 5. Validity, Reliability and Accuracy: This is a valid indicator that is reliable and accurate. Performance indicators are reported to the Office of Planning and Budget, available to the public and the media via the internet, and are subject to audit.
- 6. **Data Source, Collection and Reporting:** Data is tracked in the Investigation Tracking system. All data will be reported on a quarterly basis.
- 7. Calculation Methodology: The indicator is calculated by adding the number of new investigations opened where LADOJ initiated by date range.
- 8. Scope: This indicator is aggregated.
- 9. Caveats: This indicator is not a surrogate. It has no weaknesses. The source of the data does not have a bias. There is not a caveat.
- 10. **Responsible Person:** The person responsible for this indicator is the Chief Deputy Director Investigation.

Program:	Criminal
Objective:	I.11
Indicator Name:	Number of new investigations opened due to requested assistance

- 1. Type and Level: Outcome/Supporting
- 2. **Rationale:** This indicator provides an overall feel for how well the department is meeting its objectives. It is necessary to track to support the outcome measures.
- 3. Use: This indicator will be monitored by the division and department management. It will be used for internal management purposes and for performance-based budgeting as an indicator of workload.
- 4. Clarity: This indicator is clearly identified.
- 5. Validity, Reliability and Accuracy: This is a valid indicator that is reliable and accurate. Performance indicators are reported to the Office of Planning and Budget, available to the public and the media via the internet, and are subject to audit.
- 6. **Data Source, Collection and Reporting:** Data is tracked in the Investigation Tracking system. All data will be reported on a quarterly basis.
- 7. Calculation Methodology: The indicator is calculated by adding the number of new investigations opened where assistance is requested by date range.
- 8. Scope: This indicator is aggregated.
- 9. Caveats: This indicator is not a surrogate. It has no weaknesses. The source of the data does not have a bias. There is not a caveat.
- 10. **Responsible Person:** The person responsible for this indicator is the Chief Deputy Director Investigation.

Program:	Criminal
Objective:	I.11
Indicator Name:	Percentage of total closed investigations

- 1. Type and Level: Efficiency/Supporting
- 2. **Rationale:** This indicator provides an overall feel for how well the department is meeting its objectives. It is necessary to track to support the outcome measures.
- 3. Use: This indicator will be monitored by the division and department management. It will be used for internal management purposes and for performance-based budgeting as an indicator of workload.
- 4. Clarity: This indicator is clearly identified.
- 5. Validity, Reliability and Accuracy: This is a valid indicator that is reliable and accurate. Performance indicators are reported to the Office of Planning and Budget, available to the public and the media via the internet, and are subject to audit.
- 6. **Data Source, Collection and Reporting:** Data is tracked in the Investigation Tracking system. All data will be reported on a quarterly basis.
- 7. Calculation Methodology: The indicator is calculated by dividing the number of closed investigations by the total number of new investigations opened by date range.
- 8. Scope: This indicator is aggregated.
- 9. Caveats: This indicator is not a surrogate. It has no weaknesses. The source of the data does not have a bias. There is not a caveat.
- 10. **Responsible Person:** The person responsible for this indicator is the Chief Deputy Director Investigation.

Program:	Criminal
Objective:	I.12
Indicator Name:	Number of requests for fugitive apprehension assistance from law enforcement agencies

- 1. Type and Level: Outcome/Supporting
- 2. **Rationale:** This indicator provides an overall feel for how well the department is meeting its objectives. It is necessary to track to support the outcome measures.
- 3. Use: This indicator will be monitored by the division and department management. It will be used for internal management purposes and for performance-based budgeting as an indicator of workload.
- 4. Clarity: This indicator is clearly identified.
- 5. Validity, Reliability and Accuracy: This is a valid indicator that is reliable and accurate. Performance indicators are reported to the Office of Planning and Budget, available to the public and the media via the internet, and are subject to audit.
- 6. **Data Source, Collection and Reporting:** Data is tracked in the Investigation Tracking system. All data will be reported on a quarterly basis.
- 7. Calculation Methodology: The indicator is calculated by adding the number of requests for fugitive apprehension assistance from law enforcement agencies by date range.
- 8. Scope: This indicator is aggregated.
- 9. Caveats: This indicator is not a surrogate. It has no weaknesses. The source of the data does not have a bias. There is not a caveat.
- 10. **Responsible Person:** The person responsible for this indicator is the Chief Deputy Director Investigation.

Program:	Criminal
Objective:	I.12
Indicator Name:	Number of outstanding warrants

- 1. Type and Level: Outcome/Supporting
- 2. **Rationale:** This indicator provides an overall feel for how well the department is meeting its objectives. It is necessary to track to support the outcome measures.
- 3. Use: This indicator will be monitored by the division and department management. It will be used for internal management purposes and for performance-based budgeting as an indicator of workload.
- 4. Clarity: This indicator is clearly identified.
- 5. Validity, Reliability and Accuracy: This is a valid indicator that is reliable and accurate. Performance indicators are reported to the Office of Planning and Budget, available to the public and the media via the internet, and are subject to audit.
- 6. **Data Source, Collection and Reporting:** Data is tracked in the Investigation Tracking system. All data will be reported on a quarterly basis.
- 7. Calculation Methodology: The indicator is calculated by adding the number of outstanding warrants in the Investigation Tracking system.
- 8. Scope: This indicator is aggregated.
- 9. Caveats: This indicator is not a surrogate. It has no weaknesses. The source of the data does not have a bias. There is not a caveat.
- 10. **Responsible Person:** The person responsible for this indicator is the Chief Deputy Director Investigation.

Program:	Criminal
Objective:	I.12
Indicator Name:	Number of fugitive apprehension arrests

- 1. Type and Level: Outcome/Key
- 2. **Rationale:** This indicator provides an overall feel for how well the department is meeting its objectives. It is necessary to track to support the outcome measures.
- 3. Use: This indicator will be monitored by the division and department management. It will be used for internal management purposes and for performance-based budgeting as an indicator of workload.
- 4. Clarity: This indicator is clearly identified.
- 5. Validity, Reliability and Accuracy: This is a valid indicator that is reliable and accurate. Performance indicators are reported to the Office of Planning and Budget, available to the public and the media via the internet, and are subject to audit.
- 6. **Data Source, Collection and Reporting:** Data is tracked in the Investigation Tracking system. All data will be reported on a quarterly basis.
- 7. Calculation Methodology: The indicator is calculated by adding the number of arrests in the fugitive apprehension section by date range.
- 8. Scope: This indicator is aggregated.
- 9. Caveats: This indicator is not a surrogate. It has no weaknesses. The source of the data does not have a bias. There is not a caveat.
- 10. **Responsible Person:** The person responsible for this indicator is the Chief Deputy Director Investigation.

Program:	Criminal
Objective:	I.12
Indicator Name:	Number of total closed investigations

- 1. Type and Level: Output/Supporting
- 2. **Rationale:** This indicator provides an overall feel for how well the department is meeting its objectives. It is necessary to track to support the outcome measures.
- 3. Use: This indicator will be monitored by the division and department management. It will be used for internal management purposes and for performance-based budgeting as an indicator of workload.
- 4. Clarity: This indicator is clearly identified.
- 5. Validity, Reliability and Accuracy: This is a valid indicator that is reliable and accurate. Performance indicators are reported to the Office of Planning and Budget, available to the public and the media via the internet, and are subject to audit.
- 6. **Data Source, Collection and Reporting:** Data is tracked in the Investigation Tracking system. All data will be reported on a quarterly basis.
- 7. Calculation Methodology: The indicator is calculated by adding the number of fugitive apprehension cases closed by date range.
- 8. Scope: This indicator is aggregated.
- 9. Caveats: This indicator is not a surrogate. It has no weaknesses. The source of the data does not have a bias. There is not a caveat.
- 10. **Responsible Person:** The person responsible for this indicator is the Chief Deputy Director Investigation.

Program:	Criminal
Objective:	I.12
Indicator Name:	Number of outstanding warrants cleared

- 1. Type and Level: Outcome/Key
- 2. **Rationale:** This indicator provides an overall feel for how well the department is meeting its objectives. It is necessary to track to support the outcome measures.
- 3. Use: This indicator will be monitored by the division and department management. It will be used for internal management purposes and for performance-based budgeting as an indicator of workload.
- 4. Clarity: This indicator is clearly identified.
- 5. Validity, Reliability and Accuracy: This is a valid indicator that is reliable and accurate. Performance indicators are reported to the Office of Planning and Budget, available to the public and the media via the internet, and are subject to audit.
- 6. **Data Source, Collection and Reporting:** Data is tracked in the Investigation Tracking system. All data will be reported on a quarterly basis.
- 7. Calculation Methodology: The indicator is calculated by adding the number of warrants cleared by fugitive apprehension unit by date range.
- 8. Scope: This indicator is aggregated.
- 9. Caveats: This indicator is not a surrogate. It has no weaknesses. The source of the data does not have a bias. There is not a caveat.
- 10. **Responsible Person:** The person responsible for this indicator is the Chief Deputy Director Investigation.

Program:	Criminal
Objective:	I.12
Indicator Name:	Number of cases opened

- 1. Type and Level: Input/Key
- 2. **Rationale:** This indicator provides an overall feel for how well the department is meeting its objectives. It is necessary to track to support the outcome measures.
- 3. Use: This indicator will be monitored by the division and department management. It will be used for internal management purposes and for performance-based budgeting as an indicator of workload.
- 4. Clarity: This indicator is clearly identified.
- 5. Validity, Reliability and Accuracy: This is a valid indicator that is reliable and accurate. Performance indicators are reported to the Office of Planning and Budget, available to the public and the media via the internet, and are subject to audit.
- 6. **Data Source, Collection and Reporting:** Data is tracked in the Investigation Tracking system. All data will be reported on a quarterly basis.
- 7. Calculation Methodology: The indicator is calculated by adding the number of cases opened by date range.
- 8. Scope: This indicator is aggregated.
- 9. Caveats: This indicator is not a surrogate. It has no weaknesses. The source of the data does not have a bias. There is not a caveat.
- 10. **Responsible Person:** The person responsible for this indicator is the Chief Deputy Director Investigation.

Program:	Criminal
Objective:	I.12
Indicator Name:	Percentage of total closed investigations

- 1. Type and Level: Efficiency/Supporting
- 2. **Rationale:** This indicator provides an overall feel for how well the department is meeting its objectives. It is necessary to track to support the outcome measures.
- 3. Use: This indicator will be monitored by the division and department management. It will be used for internal management purposes and for performance-based budgeting as an indicator of workload.
- 4. Clarity: This indicator is clearly identified.
- 5. Validity, Reliability and Accuracy: This is a valid indicator that is reliable and accurate. Performance indicators are reported to the Office of Planning and Budget, available to the public and the media via the internet, and are subject to audit.
- 6. **Data Source, Collection and Reporting:** Data is tracked in the Investigation Tracking system. All data will be reported on a quarterly basis.
- 7. Calculation Methodology: The indicator is calculated by dividing the number of closed investigations by the number of cases opened by date range.
- 8. Scope: This indicator is aggregated.
- 9. Caveats: This indicator is not a surrogate. It has no weaknesses. The source of the data does not have a bias. There is not a caveat.
- 10. **Responsible Person:** The person responsible for this indicator is the Chief Deputy Director Investigation.

# **LITIGATION PROGRAM**

## Mission

The mission of the Litigation Program is to provide legal representation to the State of Louisiana through the ORM, and universities which are exempted from ORM coverage, in accordance with Louisiana Revised Statute 17:3139.5. The Litigation Program defends the state's departments, agencies, boards, and commissions along with their officers, officials, employees, and agents in all claims covered by the state's Self-Insurance Fund, including all tort claims, whether or not covered by the Self-Insurance Fund.

The state's tort liability exposure is far greater than that in the private sector, both in dollar amount, and in the variety of claims asserted, examples of which include: road hazard liability, public health care provider liability, legislative liability, regulatory liability, and liability for allegedly wrongful actions of state officers, officials, employees, and agents. Suits against the state may range from minor workers' compensation claims, to complex multi-district federal litigation which could involve hundreds of suits and/or parties leading to hundreds of millions of dollars of exposure. The estimated attorneys' fees claims for applicable cases can range from less than five hundred dollars up to hundreds of thousands of dollars.

### **Program Activities**

The Litigation Program provides legal and professional services for the state in all claims through ORM, and through universities exempted from ORM coverage as outlined in Louisiana Revised Statute 17:3139.5, including all tort claims filed against the state. The Litigation Program is headquartered in Baton Rouge. The Baton Rouge Office is subdivided into nine designated sections: Executive, Case Administration, Appeals, Civil Rights, General Liability, Medical Malpractice, Road Hazard, Transportation, and Workers' Compensation. The Litigation Division maintains five regional offices in Alexandria, Lafayette, Monroe, New Orleans, and Shreveport.

## **Baton Rouge Office:**

## **Executive Section**

The Executive Section ensures the daily activities, duties, and responsibilities of the division are accomplished. The section is primarily responsible for managing the division's budget, personnel, and property for six offices across the state. They coordinate the statewide defense efforts in tort suits against the state and administers interagency agreements with ORM and the Louisiana State University.

The Executive Section also includes the Special Litigation Unit, which defends the state's judiciary, the Office of Disciplinary Counsel, the Attorney Disciplinary Board, and the Judiciary Commission. Special Litigation defends select cases in need of special handling, such as complex matters, those filed in other states, and those that involve other divisions or contract counsel, as well as advising the Litigation Division director and division managers regarding employment-related issues.

# **Case** Administration

The Case Administration Section is responsible for administrative oversight of all tort litigation against the state, which involves the case intake process, coverage determinations, appointment of counsel, conflict assessment, report processing and facilitation, closure of cases, and maintenance and configuration of the division's case management system.

# **Appeals Section**

The Appeals Section handles appellate proceedings for in-house cases and is also involved in appellate proceedings handled by contract counsel. The section handles all aspects of appellate proceedings in the Louisiana Supreme Court and Louisiana Circuit Courts of Appeal, including appeals from final judgments, supervisory writs from interlocutory judgments, and applications for writs of certiorari. The Appeals Section also works closely on in-house cases with the Solicitor General of Louisiana on federal appellate proceedings in the United States Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit and the Supreme Court of the United States. Appeals Section staff are located in Baton Rouge and regional offices across the state. The Litigation Division benefits from having its own in-house appellate specialists, who are also experienced civil trial litigators.

# **Civil Rights Section**

The Civil Rights Section defends suits filed in both state and federal court involving the alleged deprivation of civil rights. Such suits include claims brought under 42 United States Constitution §1983, the Civil Rights Act of 1964, as amended, the Age Discrimination in Employment Act, the Americans with Disabilities Act, the Family and Medical Leave Act of 1993, the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, the Religious Land Use and Institutionalized Persons Act, and parallel state statutes. The Civil Rights Section also represents state agencies, agency officials, and agency employees in civil rights actions brought under the Louisiana Constitution.

# **General Liability Section**

The General Liability Section defends all tort suits against the state arising from incidents that do not fall fit within any other section. The types of claims handled by this section include injuries occurring on the premises of a state agency, including slip-and-fall incidents, broken chairs, and other defective items; lawsuits involving failure to train, supervise, or protect students, foster children, or children placed in state custody; inmate negligence and medical claims, general maritime claims; asbestos claims; defamation claims; and abuse and neglect claims.

# Medical Malpractice Section

The Medical Malpractice Section defends the state, state agencies, and state health care providers against claims of medical malpractice in both the medical review panel process and in subsequent lawsuits. The Medical Malpractice Section also defends the interests of state health care providers in depositions, hearings, and trials where these health care providers have been subpoenaed as witnesses.

In addition to legal representation of state health care providers, the Medical Malpractice Section also offers lectures to Louisiana State University Health Sciences Center staff and residents. These

educational events familiarize the state's doctors and doctors-in-training with the legal system and how best to minimize potential liability.

# **Road Hazard Section**

The Road Hazard Section defends the Louisiana Department of Transportation and Development against claims where a condition of the roadway or its maintenance is alleged to have caused or contributed to an accident. All money judgments against the Louisiana Department of Transportation and Development for road hazard claims, whether through trial or agreement between the parties, must be satisfied by an appropriation from the Louisiana Legislature and approved by the governor prior to payment.

## **Transportation Section**

The Transportation Section defends the state, state agencies, and state employees in lawsuits involving automobile, maritime, and aviation accidents and other automobile-related actions that occurred while the state employee was engaged in on-the-job activities, including accidents involving inmate transport.

# Workers' Compensation Section

The Workers' Compensation Section defends the state and all of its agencies in workers' compensation proceedings, where a dispute arises concerning benefits payable under the Workers' Compensation Act. The Workers' Compensation Section also files suits to recover funds from third parties that the state paid to injured state employees or state agencies. The Workers' Compensation Section also represents the state in seeking reimbursement of workers' compensation benefits paid by ORM from the Second Injury Fund by appealing decisions of the Second Injury Board wherein the Board denied ORM's claim for reimbursement.

# **Regional Offices:**

The Litigation Division has five regional offices, which are located in Alexandria, Lafayette, Monroe, New Orleans, and Shreveport. All regional offices are managed by a regional office chief.

# Alexandria Office

The Alexandria Regional Office serves the following parishes across north and central Louisiana: Allen, Avoyelles, Beauregard, Catahoula, Concordia, Grant, LaSalle, Natchitoches, Rapides, Sabine, Vernon, and Winn. The Alexandria Office also defends workers' compensation claims filed in the Office of Workers' Compensation District 2. Some of the state agencies represented by the Alexandria Office include portions of the Louisiana Department of Transportation and Development's Districts 5, 8, and 58, Louisiana State Police Troop E, Pinecrest Supports and Services Center, Northwestern State University, Louisiana State University of Alexandria, and Raymond Laborde Correctional Center.

# Lafayette Office

The Lafayette Regional Office serves the following parishes in south and southwest Louisiana: Acadia, Allen, Beauregard, Calcasieu, Cameron, Evangeline, Iberia, Jefferson Davis, Lafayette, St. Landry, St. Martin, St. Mary, Vermilion, and Vernon. The Lafayette Office also defends workers' compensation claims filed in the Office of Workers' Compensation Districts 3 and 4. Some of the state agencies represented by the Lafayette Office include Louisiana State Police Troops D and I, University of Louisiana at Lafayette, McNeese State University, Louisiana State University Eunice, Allen Correctional Center, and portions of the Louisiana Department of Transportation and Development's Districts 3 and 7.

# Monroe Office

The Monroe Regional Office serves the following parishes in northeast Louisiana: Caldwell, East Carroll, Franklin, Jackson, Lincoln, Madison, Morehouse, Ouachita, Richland, Union, Tensas, and West Carroll. The Monroe Office also defends workers' compensation claims filed in the Office of Workers' Compensation District 1E. Some of the state agencies represented by the Monroe Office include portions of the Louisiana Department of Transportation and Development's Districts 5 and 58, University of Louisiana at Monroe, Louisiana Tech University, University Health Conway-Monroe, Louisiana State Police Troop F, and the Swanson Center for Youth.

## New Orleans Office

The New Orleans Regional Office serves the following parishes in southeast Louisiana: Assumption, Jefferson, Lafourche, Orleans, Plaquemines, St. Bernard, St. Charles, St. James, St. John the Baptist, St. Tammany, Tangipahoa, Terrebonne, and Washington. The New Orleans Office also defends workers' compensation claims filed in the Office of Workers' Compensation Districts 7, 8, and 9. Some of the state agencies represented by the New Orleans Office include Louisiana State University Health Sciences Center New Orleans, portions of the Louisiana Department of Transportation and Development's Districts 2 and 62, Louisiana State Police Troops B, C, and I, B.B. Rayburn Correctional Center, New Orleans City Park Improvement Association, Louisiana Stadium and Exposition District, SMG, University of New Orleans, Southern University at New Orleans, Delgado Community College, and Nunez Community College.

## Shreveport Office

The Shreveport Regional Office serves the following parishes in northwest and north-central Louisiana: Bienville, Bossier, Caddo, Claiborne, De Soto, Jackson, Red River, Sabine, Webster, and Winn. The Shreveport Office also defends workers' compensation claims filed in the Office of Workers' Compensation District 1W. Some of the state agencies represented by the Shreveport Office include Louisiana State University Health Sciences Center Shreveport, portions of the Louisiana Department of Transportation and Development's Districts 4 and 5, Louisiana State Police Troop G, David Wade Correctional Center, and Louisiana State University Shreveport.

# Authorization for Goal(s)

Louisiana Revised Statutes 36:701(D), 36:704(H), 36:704(J), 49:257(A), 39:1533(B), 40:1237, 13:5108.1, and 13:1905.

# **Program Goal**

I. The Litigation Program will provide superior legal representation to the State of Louisiana, state officials and state employees in all claims covered by the state's Self-Insurance Fund, including all tort claims, whether or not covered by the Self-Insurance Fund.

GOAL I	The Litigation Program will provide superior legal representation to the State of Louisiana, state officials and state employees in all claims covered by the state's Self-Insurance Fund, including all tort claims, whether or not covered by the Self-Insurance Fund.		
Sub-Goal	ORM	Provide legal and professional services to the ORM and universities exempt from ORM coverage by Louisiana Revised Statute 17:3139.5, in the most cost effective nanner.	
Objective I.1		Through the Litigation Program, to better utilize the funds available to ORM and exempt institutions for legal expense by handling in-house at least 85% of new risk litigation cases opened each fiscal year by June 30, 2031.	
Strate	egy I.1a	Management shall review case assignment reports on a monthly basis.	
Strate	egy I.1b	Management shall, in its hiring practices, attempt to ensure as wide a range of specialization and experience as possible.	
Strate	egy I.1c	Management shall monitor attorney workload and progress to ensure that cases are handled efficiently.	
Performance	Indica	tors	
Input		Number of new cases	
Outpı	ıt	Number of open cases Number of open cases assigned to contract counsel Number of open cases assigned to in-house counsel Number of new cases assigned to contract counsel Number of new cases assigned to in-house counsel Percentage of open cases assigned to in-house counsel Percentage of open cases assigned to contract counsel	
Efficie	ency	Average number of days open for open cases assigned to contract counsel	
		Average number of days open for open cases assigned to in-house counsel	
Outco	me	Percentage of new cases assigned to in-house counsel	
Justification			

This objective results in a measure of case activity by attorneys on the Litigation Division staff rather than by contract attorneys.

### Benchmarking

An economic analysis of case activity coupled with a temporal analysis of the life of cases assigned to in-house and contract counsel.

# **Primary Persons Benefiting**

The State of Louisiana, public fisc, ORM, and universities exempt from ORM coverage by Louisiana Revised Statute 17:3139.5 will be the primary beneficiaries of this objective. The benefit will result from spending less money on the defense of tort claims filed against the State of Louisiana. Ultimately, the benefit will inure to the Louisiana taxpayers.

### SITUATION INVENTORY

### **Principal Clients and Users**

The principal clients and users of the Litigation Program are the ORM and universities exempt from ORM coverage by Louisiana Revised Statute 17:3139.5, state officials and employees to whom we provide a defense, and their employing agencies, boards, and commissions. Ultimately, the Louisiana taxpayers are the primary stakeholders and persons benefiting from the program's protection of the state's tort liability exposure.

### **External Factors**

The external environment is beyond the control of the program, specifically the number of suits that are filed which ORM sends to the program for assignment of defense. The existence of conflicts in representation that may necessitate the need for additional counsel or reassignment of counsel is another external factor. The program's efficiency in resolving claims and suits is directly impacted by external factors beyond its control, including, but not limited to, the nature of claims, the named parties, expeditiousness of the courts, appeal delays, and legislative appropriation of judgments and settlements.

#### **Internal and External Considerations**

The program continues to provide superior legal representation to the state, state officials, and state employees when sued over events arising out of the activities of state government. The program advises ORM on certain pre-litigation claims.

The program's strengths include experienced attorneys and manageable caseloads, access to premium tools and resources, and the utilization of regional offices across the state. The program fulfills its mission and remains resilient through internal changes in department administration and program leadership. Improvements have been realized in efforts to enhance the supervision and management of cases assigned both in-house and to contract counsel. The program has prioritized its focus on recruiting and retaining quality employees.

Budget cuts affecting hiring and the retention of qualified personnel are concerns of the program. The number of suits that are filed which ORM sends to the program for assignment of defense is beyond the department's control, as well as the existence of conflicts in representation that may necessitate the need for additional counsel or reassignment of counsel. Tort reform and applicable prescriptive period deadlines are factors that could affect the external environment of the program in the future as well.
Program:	Litigation
Objective:	I.1
Indicator Name:	Number of new cases received by the Litigation Program in the fiscal year

- 1. Type and Level: Input/General
- 2. **Rationale**: This indicator provides an overall feel for how well the department is meeting its objectives. It is necessary to track to support the outcome measures.
- 3. Use: This indicator will be monitored by the division and department management. It will be used for internal management purposes and for performance-based budgeting as an indicator of workload.
- 4. Clarity: The indicator is clearly identified.
- 5. Validity, Reliability and Accuracy: This is a valid indicator that is reliable and accurate. Performance indicators are reported to the Office of Planning and Budget, available to the public and the media via the internet, and are subject to audit.
- 6. **Data Source, Collection and Reporting**: The source for the indicator data is an internal case management system, and the data is maintained and updated continuously. Data is reported quarterly and annually.
- 7. Calculation Methodology: The indicator is a standard calculation of the number of new cases reported in the case management system for a specified date range.
- 8. **Scope**: The indicator is aggregated and can be segmented by the office and type of litigation.
- 9. **Caveats**: The accuracy of the indicator is directly correlated to the accuracy of data available and input in the case management system. The number of suits filed against the state and submitted for defense is beyond the control of the program.
- 10. **Responsible Person**: The person responsible for this indicator is the Director of the Litigation Program.

Program:	Litigation
Objective:	I.1
Indicator Name:	Number of open cases

- 1. Type and Level: Output/General
- 2. **Rationale**: This indicator provides an overall feel for how well the department is meeting its objectives. It is necessary to track to support the outcome measures.
- 3. Use: This indicator will be monitored by the division and department management. It will be used for internal management purposes and for performance-based budgeting as an indicator of workload.
- 4. Clarity: The indicator is clearly identified.
- 5. Validity, Reliability and Accuracy: This is a valid indicator that is reliable and accurate. Performance indicators are reported to the Office of Planning and Budget, available to the public and the media via the internet, and are subject to audit.
- 6. **Data Source, Collection and Reporting**: The source for the indicator data is an internal case management system, and the data is maintained and updated continuously. Data is reported quarterly and annually.
- 7. Calculation Methodology: The indicator is a standard calculation of the number of open cases reported in the case management system at any given time.
- 8. **Scope**: The indicator is aggregated and can be segmented by the office, type of litigation and assignment to in-house or contract counsel.
- 9. **Caveats**: The accuracy of the indicator is directly correlated to the accuracy of data available and input in the case management system. The number of suits filed against the state and submitted for defense is beyond the control of the program, and case closures are impacted by external factors also beyond the control of the program.
- 10. **Responsible Person**: The person responsible for this indicator is the Director of the Litigation Program.

Program:	Litigation
Objective:	I.1
Indicator Name:	Number of open cases assigned to contract counsel

- 1. Type and Level: Output/General
- 2. **Rationale**: This indicator provides an overall feel for how well the department is meeting its objectives. It is necessary to track to support the outcome measures.
- 3. Use: This indicator will be monitored by the division and department management. It will be used for internal management purposes and for performance-based budgeting as an indicator of workload.
- 4. Clarity: The indicator is clearly identified.
- 5. Validity, Reliability and Accuracy: This is a valid indicator that is reliable and accurate. Performance indicators are reported to the Office of Planning and Budget, available to the public and the media via the internet, and are subject to audit.
- 6. **Data Source, Collection and Reporting**: The source for the indicator data is an internal case management system, and the data is maintained and updated continuously. Data is reported quarterly and annually.
- 7. **Calculation Methodology**: The indicator is a standard calculation of the number of open cases reported in the case management system assigned to contract counsel at any given time.
- 8. **Scope**: The indicator is aggregated and can be segmented by the office and type of litigation.
- 9. Caveats: The accuracy of the indicator is directly correlated to the accuracy of data available and input in the case management system. The existence of conflicts, nature of claims, and the named parties impact the assignment and reassignment of counsel, all of which are factors beyond the control of the program.
- 10. **Responsible Person**: The person responsible for this indicator is the Director of the Litigation Program.

Program:	Litigation
Objective:	I.1
Indicator Name:	Number of open cases assigned to in-house counsel

- 1. Type and Level: Output/General
- 2. **Rationale**: This indicator provides an overall feel for how well the department is meeting its objectives. It is necessary to track to support the outcome measures.
- 3. Use: This indicator will be monitored by the division and department management. It will be used for internal management purposes and for performance-based budgeting as an indicator of workload.
- 4. Clarity: The indicator is clearly identified.
- 5. Validity, Reliability and Accuracy: This is a valid indicator that is reliable and accurate. Performance indicators are reported to the Office of Planning and Budget, available to the public and the media via the internet, and are subject to audit.
- 6. **Data Source, Collection and Reporting**: The source for the indicator data is an internal case management system, and the data is maintained and updated continuously. Data is reported quarterly and annually.
- 7. **Calculation Methodology**: The indicator is a standard calculation of the number of open cases reported in the case management system assigned to in-house counsel at any given time.
- 8. **Scope**: The indicator is aggregated and can be segmented by the office and type of litigation.
- 9. Caveats: The accuracy of the indicator is directly correlated to the accuracy of data available and input in the case management system. The existence of conflicts, nature of claims, and the named parties impact the assignment and reassignment of counsel, all of which are factors beyond the control of the program.
- 10. **Responsible Person**: The person responsible for this indicator is the Director of the Litigation Program.

Program:	Litigation
Objective:	I.1
Indicator Name:	Number of new cases assigned to contract counsel

- 1. Type and Level: Output/General
- 2. **Rationale**: This indicator provides an overall feel for how well the department is meeting its objectives. It is necessary to track to support the outcome measures.
- 3. Use: This indicator will be monitored by the division and department management. It will be used for internal management purposes and for performance-based budgeting as an indicator of workload.
- 4. Clarity: The indicator is clearly identified.
- 5. Validity, Reliability and Accuracy: This is a valid indicator that is reliable and accurate. Performance indicators are reported to the Office of Planning and Budget, available to the public and the media via the internet, and are subject to audit.
- 6. **Data Source, Collection and Reporting**: The source for the indicator data is an internal case management system, and the data is maintained and updated continuously. Data is reported quarterly and annually.
- 7. Calculation Methodology: The indicator is a standard calculation of the number of new cases assigned to contract counsel for a specified date range.
- 8. **Scope**: The indicator is aggregated and can be segmented by the office and type of litigation.
- 9. **Caveats**: The accuracy of the indicator is directly correlated to the accuracy of data available and input in the case management system. The number of suits filed against the state and submitted for defense is beyond the control of the program. The existence of conflicts, nature of claims, and the named parties impact the assignment and reassignment of counsel, all of which are factors beyond the control of the program.
- 10. **Responsible Person**: The person responsible for this indicator is the Director of the Litigation Program.

Program:	Litigation
Objective:	I.1
Indicator Name:	Number of new cases assigned to in-house counsel

- 1. Type and Level: Output/General
- 2. **Rationale**: This indicator provides an overall feel for how well the department is meeting its objectives. It is necessary to track to support the outcome measures.
- 3. Use: This indicator will be monitored by the division and department management. It will be used for internal management purposes and for performance-based budgeting as an indicator of workload.
- 4. Clarity: The indicator is clearly identified.
- 5. Validity, Reliability and Accuracy: This is a valid indicator that is reliable and accurate. Performance indicators are reported to the Office of Planning and Budget, available to the public and the media via the internet, and are subject to audit.
- 6. **Data Source, Collection and Reporting**: The source for the indicator data is an internal case management system, and the data is maintained and updated continuously. Data is reported quarterly and annually.
- 7. Calculation Methodology: The indicator is a standard calculation of the number of new cases assigned to in-house counsel for a specified date range.
- 8. **Scope**: The indicator is aggregated and can be segmented by the office and type of litigation.
- 9. **Caveats**: The accuracy of the indicator is directly correlated to the accuracy of data available and input in the case management system. The number of suits filed against the state and submitted for defense is beyond the control of the program. The existence of conflicts, nature of claims, and the named parties impact the assignment and reassignment of counsel, all of which are factors beyond the control of the program.
- 10. **Responsible Person**: The person responsible for this indicator is the Director of the Litigation Program.

Program:	Litigation
Objective:	I.1
Indicator Name:	Percentage of open cases assigned to in-house counsel

- 1. Type and Level: Output/General
- 2. **Rationale**: This indicator provides an overall feel for how well the department is meeting its objectives. It is necessary to track to support the outcome measures.
- 3. Use: This indicator will be monitored by the division and department management. It will be used for internal management purposes and for performance-based budgeting as an indicator of workload.
- 4. Clarity: The indicator is clearly identified.
- 5. Validity, Reliability and Accuracy: This is a valid indicator that is reliable and accurate. Performance indicators are reported to the Office of Planning and Budget, available to the public and the media via the internet, and are subject to audit.
- 6. **Data Source, Collection and Reporting**: The source of the indicator is an internal case management system, and the data is maintained and updated continuously. Data is reported quarterly and annually.
- 7. Calculation Methodology: The indicator is calculated by dividing the number of open cases assigned to in-house counsel by the total number of open cases at any given time.
- 8. **Scope**: The indicator is aggregated and can be segmented by the office and type of litigation.
- 9. Caveats: The accuracy of the indicator is directly correlated to the accuracy of data available and input in the case management system. The number of suits filed against the state and submitted for defense is beyond the control of the program, and case closures are impacted by external factors also beyond the control of the program. The existence of conflicts, nature of claims, and the named parties impact the assignment and reassignment of counsel, all of which are factors beyond the control of the program.
- 10. **Responsible Person**: The person responsible for this indicator is the Director of the Litigation Program.

Program:	Litigation
Objective:	I.1
Indicator Name:	Percentage of open cases assigned to contract counsel

- 1. Type and Level: Efficiency/General
- 2. **Rationale**: This indicator provides an overall feel for how well the department is meeting its objectives. It is necessary to track to support the outcome measures.
- 3. Use: This indicator will be monitored by the division and department management. It will be used for internal management purposes and for performance-based budgeting as an indicator of workload.
- 4. Clarity: The indicator is clearly identified.
- 5. Validity, Reliability and Accuracy: This is a valid indicator that is reliable and accurate. Performance indicators are reported to the Office of Planning and Budget, available to the public and the media via the internet, and are subject to audit.
- 6. **Data Source, Collection and Reporting**: The source for the indicator data is an internal case management system, and the data is maintained and updated continuously. Data is reported quarterly and annually.
- 7. **Calculation Methodology**: The indicator is calculated by dividing the number of open cases assigned to contract counsel by the total number of open cases at any given time.
- 8. Scope: The indicator is aggregated and can be segmented by office and type of litigation.
- 9. Caveats: The accuracy of the indicator is directly correlated to the accuracy of data available and input in the case management system. The number of suits filed against the state and submitted for defense is beyond the control of the program, and case closures are impacted by external factors also beyond the control of the program. The existence of conflicts, nature of claims, and the named parties impact the assignment and reassignment of counsel, all of which are factors beyond the control of the program.
- 10. **Responsible Person**: The person responsible for this indicator is the Director of the Litigation Program.

Program:	Litigation
Objective:	I.1
Indicator Name:	Average number of days open for open cases assigned to contract counsel

- 1. Type and Level: Efficiency/General
- 2. **Rationale**: This indicator provides an overall feel for how well the department is meeting its objectives. It is necessary to track to support the outcome measures.
- 3. Use: This indicator will be monitored by the division and department management. It will be used for internal management purposes and for performance-based budgeting as an indicator of workload.
- 4. Clarity: The indicator is clearly identified.
- 5. Validity, Reliability and Accuracy: This is a valid indicator that is reliable and accurate. Performance indicators are reported to the Office of Planning and Budget, available to the public and the media via the internet, and are subject to audit.
- 6. **Data Source, Collection and Reporting**: The source for the indicator data is an internal case management system, and the data is maintained and updated continuously. Data is reported quarterly and annually.
- 7. Calculation Methodology: The indicator is a ratio of average days open for open cases assigned to contract counsel.
- 8. **Scope**: The indicator is aggregated.
- 9. **Caveats**: The accuracy of the indicator is directly correlated to the accuracy of data available and input in the case management system. Case closures are impacted by external factors beyond the control of the program.
- 10. **Responsible Person**: The person responsible for this indicator is the Director of the Litigation Program.

Program:	Litigation
Objective:	I.1
Indicator Name:	Average number of days open for open cases assigned to in-house counsel

- 1. Type and Level: Efficiency/General
- 2. **Rationale**: This indicator provides an overall feel for how well the department is meeting its objectives. It is necessary to track to support the outcome measures.
- 3. Use: This indicator will be monitored by the division and department management. It will be used for internal management purposes and for performance-based budgeting as an indicator of workload.
- 4. Clarity: The indicator is clearly identified.
- 5. Validity, Reliability and Accuracy: This is a valid indicator that is reliable and accurate. Performance indicators are reported to the Office of Planning and Budget, available to the public and the media via the internet, and are subject to audit.
- 6. **Data Source, Collection and Reporting**: The source for the indicator data is an internal case management system, and the data is maintained and updated continuously. Data is reported quarterly and annually.
- 7. Calculation Methodology: The indicator is a ratio of average days open for open cases assigned to in-house counsel.
- 8. **Scope**: The indicator is aggregated.
- 9. **Caveats**: The accuracy of the indicator is directly correlated to the accuracy of data available and input in the case management system. Case closures are impacted by external factors beyond the control of the program.
- 10. **Responsible Person**: The person responsible for this indicator is the Director of the Litigation Program.

Program:	Litigation
Objective:	I.1
Indicator Name:	Percentage of new cases assigned to in-house counsel

- 1. Type and Level: Outcome/Key
- 2. **Rationale**: This indicator provides an overall feel for how well the department is meeting its objectives. It is necessary to track to support the outcome measures.
- 3. Use: This indicator will be monitored by the division and department management. It will be used for internal management purposes and for performance-based budgeting as an indicator of workload.
- 4. Clarity: The indicator is clearly identified.
- 5. Validity, Reliability and Accuracy: This is a valid indicator that is reliable and accurate. Performance indicators are reported to the Office of Planning and Budget, available to the public and the media via the internet, and are subject to audit.
- 6. **Data Source, Collection, and Reporting**: The source for the indicator data is an internal case management system, and the data is maintained and updated continuously. Data is reported quarterly and annually.
- 7. **Calculation Methodology**: The indicator is calculated by dividing the number of new cases assigned to in-house counsel by the total number of new cases for a specified date range.
- 8. Scope: The indicator is aggregated and can be segmented by office and type of litigation.
- 9. **Caveats**: The accuracy of the indicator is directly correlated to the accuracy of data available and input in the case management system. The number of suits filed against the state and submitted for defense is beyond the control of the program. The existence of conflicts, nature of claims, and the named parties impact the assignment and reassignment of counsel, all of which are factors beyond the control of the program.
- 10. **Responsible Person**: The person responsible for this indicator is the Director of the Litigation Program.

# **GAMING PROGRAM**

### Mission

The mission of the Gaming Division is to create a regulatory atmosphere for licensed gaming which instills public confidence and trust that gaming activities are conducted honestly and are free from criminal and corrupt elements, to ensure the integrity of individual gaming entities by the regulation of persons, practices, associations and activities within the gaming industry, and to anticipate and support necessary corrective rulemaking and legislation.

### **Program Activities**

The Gaming Division is statutorily mandated to provide legal advice and representation to the Louisiana Gaming Control Board, Louisiana State Police, Louisiana Lottery Corporation, Louisiana State Racing Commission, and the Louisiana Department of Revenue, Office of Charitable Gaming. Additionally, the Gaming Division provides advice and counsel to numerous state agencies as to all Tribal Gaming matters, including, without limitation, the governor's office and the Indian Gaming Unit of Louisiana State Police's Gaming Enforcement Division.

The Gaming Division provides legal representation, advice, and counsel to the Louisiana Gaming Control Board in areas of land-based casino, riverboat gaming, video draw poker gaming, fantasy sports contests, sports wagering, slot machine gaming at racetracks, and gaming on Tribal lands. The Gaming Division represents the board in judicial appeals of administrative actions and defends the board in all civil litigation relating to gaming. The Gaming Division negotiates on behalf of, represents, and provides counsel to the board regarding the Casino Operating Contract and matters of exclusivity relating to the land-based casino, as well as handles all rulemaking.

The Gaming Division provides legal advice and counsel to the Louisiana State Police, Gaming Enforcement Division in all areas of gaming regulation, including licensing, enforcement, and rulemaking. The Gaming Division provides legal representation to the Gaming Enforcement Division in all gaming matters before the Administrative Hearing Office, as well as all appeals to the Louisiana Gaming Control Board, Nineteenth Judicial District Court, First Circuit Court of Appeals, and Louisiana Supreme Court.

The Gaming Division provides legal advice and counsel to the Louisiana Lottery Corporation on gaming matters, including, without limitation, Lottery Corporation contracts with vendors and lessors, Requests for Proposals, and invoices. The Gaming Division provides legal representation to the Lottery Corporation in administrative proceedings and vendor bankruptcy proceedings, and litigates suits filed against the Lottery Corporation.

The Gaming Division provides legal representation and counsel to the Louisiana State Racing Commission in all matters regarding the regulation of the horse racing industry, pari-mutuel wagering, and off-track wagering. The Gaming Division also litigates administrative actions on behalf of the Racing Commission and defends the Racing Commission in all civil litigation to which it is a party.

The Gaming Division provides legal advice and representation to the Louisiana Department of Revenue, Office of Charitable Gaming in all areas of charitable gaming regulation, including

licensing, enforcement, and rulemaking, as well as litigating administrative actions, including denials of applications, suspensions, revocations, and civil penalties. The Gaming Division assists in the review of files and applications, represents the Office of Charitable Gaming in judicial appeals of administrative actions, and defends the Office of Charitable Gaming in other civil litigation related to gaming.

The Gaming Division provides legal representation to the Louisiana State Police, Gaming Enforcement Division, Indian Gaming Unit in regard to the denial, suspension, and revocation of state certifications to work for or do business with Tribal casinos. The Gaming Division advises the governor's office on matters of Tribal Gaming and Tribal law, as well as assists with drafting the compacts that control Tribal gaming in Louisiana. The Gaming Division also serves as a resource for members of the legislature, local officials, and governmental agencies regarding matters of Tribal gaming, the compacts, and general Tribal law.

# Authorization for Goal(s)

Louisiana Revised Statutes 27:1 et seq, 4:141 et seq, 4:701 et seq, and 47:9000 et seq.

# **Program Goal**

I. The LADOJ will provide superior legal and professional services to Louisiana citizens, private sector organizations, and all governmental entities.

- GOAL I The LADOJ will provide superior legal and professional services to Louisiana citizens, private sector organizations, and all governmental entities.
- **Sub-Goal** Improve service to gaming regulatory clients, law enforcement agencies, the industry, and general public.
- **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, 2031.
- **Objective I.2** Forward 95% of video gaming administrative action and denial files to the Louisiana Gaming Control Board within 60 business days of assignment by June 30, 2031.
- **Objective I.3** Forward 95% of casino gaming administrative action and denial files to the Louisiana Gaming Control Board within 30 business days of assignment by June 30, 2031.

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, 2031.
Strategy I.1	Licensing and Compliance Section Chief shall use Legal Files to manage timeliness of file processing.
Performance Indica	itor
Input	Number of casino gaming approval files received from State Police Number of video gaming approval files received from State Police
Output	Number of casino gaming approval files processed by Licensing and Compliance
	Number of video gaming approval files processed by Licensing and Compliance
	Number of casino gaming approval files returned to State Police Number of video gaming approval files returned to State Police
Efficiency	Average number of business days from assignment of casino gaming approval files until forwarded to Louisiana Gaming Control Board
	Average number of business days from assignment of video gaming approval files until forwarded to Louisiana Gaming Control Board
	Number of casino gaming approval files processed within 20 business days of assignment
	Number of video gaming approval files processed within 20 business days of assignment
Outcome	Percent of casino gaming approval files processed within 20 business days of assignment
	Percent of video gaming approval files processed within 20 business days of assignment
	Number of complex casino gaming approval files
	Number of complex video gaming approval files processed in more than 20 business days of assignment

#### Justification

The delivery of video and casino gaming approval files to the Louisiana Gaming Control Board within 20 business days is critical to the success of the Louisiana Gaming industry, as well as the client seeking approval for such a license. For purposes of these Objectives and Performance Indicators, "casino gaming" includes landbased gaming, riverboat gaming, slots at the track, sports wagering, and fantasy sports contests. The assignment date is less any time the file is returned to State Police or held pending response from State Police or Section Chief of Licensing and Compliance.

# Benchmarking

Research other gaming jurisdictions' procedures and develop standards as applicable.

## **Primary Person Benefiting**

The primary person benefiting from this indicator is the Louisiana Gaming Control Board.

Objective I.2	Forward 95% of video gaming administrative action and denial files to the Louisiana Gaming Control Board within 60 business days of assignment by June 30, 2031.	
Strategy I.2	Licensing and Compliance Section Chief shall use the Legal Files program to manage timeliness of file processing.	
Performance Indica	tor	
Input	Number of video gaming administrative action and denial files received from State Police.	
Output	Number of video gaming administrative action and denial files processed by Licensing and Compliance	
	Number of video gaming administrative action and denial files returned to State Police	
Efficiency	Average number of business days from assignment of video gaming administrative action and denial files until forwarded to the Louisiana Gaming Control Board	
	Number of video gaming administrative action and denial files processed within 60 business days of assignment	
Outcome	Percent of video gaming administrative action and denial files processed within 60 business days of assignment	
	Number of complex video gaming administrative action and denial files processed in more than 60 business days of assignment	

#### Justification

A typical Gaming file will be reviewed by several regulatory agencies before being finalized. To ensure that gaming clients are receiving efficient service, a processing time of 60 days has been established for video gaming administrative action and denial files. The assignment date is less any time the file is returned to State Police, in compliance conference status, or held pending response from State Police or Section Chief of Licensing and Compliance.

#### Benchmarking

Research other gaming jurisdictions' procedures and develop standards as applicable.

#### **Primary Person Benefiting**

The primary person benefiting will be the gaming clients.

Forward 95% of casino gaming administrative action and denial files to the Louisiana Gaming Control Board within 30 business days of assignment by June 30, 2031.
Licensing and Compliance Section Chief shall use Legal Files to manage timeliness of file processing.
tor
Number of casino gaming administrative action and denial files received from State Police
Number of casino gaming administration action and denial files processed by Licensing and Compliance
Number of casino gaming administrative action and denial files returned to State Police
Average number of business days from assignment of casino gaming administrative action and denial files until forwarded to the Louisiana Gaming Control Board
Number of casino gaming administrative action and denial files processed within 30 business days of assignment
Percent of casino gaming administrative action and denial files processed within 30 business days of assignment Number of complex casino gaming administrative action and denial files processed in more than 30 business days of assignment

#### Justification

A typical Gaming file will be reviewed by several regulatory agencies before being finalized. To ensure that gaming clients are receiving efficient service, a processing time of 30 days has been established for casino gaming action and denial files. For purposes of these Objectives and Performance Indicators, "casino gaming" includes landbased gaming, riverboat gaming, slots at the track, sports wagering, and fantasy sports contests. The assignment date is less any time the file is returned to State Police or held pending response from State Police or Section Chief of Licensing and Compliance.

#### Benchmarking

Research other gaming jurisdictions' procedures and develop standards as applicable.

#### **Primary Person Benefiting**

The primary person benefiting will be the gaming clients.

### SITUATION INVENTORY

### **Principal Clients and Users**

The principal clients and users of the Gaming Program are the citizens of the state of Louisiana, Louisiana Gaming Control Board, Louisiana State Police, Gaming Enforcement Division, Louisiana State Racing Commission, Louisiana Lottery Corporation, and the Louisiana Department of Revenue and Taxation, Office of Charitable Gaming. Additionally, the Gaming Division serves in an advisory capacity to the governor's office on matters related to Tribal Gaming and Tribal law

#### **External Factors**

External factors facing the Gaming Program are legal challenges to licensees' voluntary procurement goals and the state's monitoring of compliance, competition from other jurisdictions; expansion and new types of gaming occurring in the United States and in Louisiana; illegal gambling; and the continued and growing focus on responsible gaming and protecting the state's most vulnerable individuals.

Additional factors include the expansion of gaming in existing and new jurisdictions to address state budget problems; scrutinized/increased taxes on gaming licensees; illegal gambling operations in physical locations in Louisiana; illegal online operators; 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; increasing issues with online raffles; and prediction markets attempting to obtain legitimacy as commodities, when they are illegal sports wagers.

#### **Internal and External Considerations**

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, or clients, while also serving as a collaborative partner in the gaming industry to provide guidance, oversight, and a regulatory framework which enables industry stakeholders, i.e., riverboat, racetrack, video draw poker licensees, etc., to operate responsibly and within legal compliance. The division also assists in protecting the general public by serving to ensure that the gaming industry is free from criminal and corrupt elements.

Division personnel have been organized so that legal representation may be provided in an efficient manner. The division consists of four sections which provide specific legal services to its clients. The sections within the Gaming Division are Licensing and Compliance Casino, Licensing and Compliance Video Poker, Adjudications, and General Gaming.

The Division utilizes Legal Files for its case tracking system. The system allows the division to provide consistent and competent services to its client agencies. The tracking system allows the division to successfully meet established performance objectives. The tracking system has also improved the storing of all case file documents. The division's integrated tracking system has been replaced with Legal Files.

The Gaming Division provides legal representation related to particular types of gaming activity, specifically Riverboat Casino Gaming, Video Draw Poker, Louisiana Lottery, Charitable Gaming, Racetrack Gaming, including slots at the racetracks, Tribal Gaming Landbased Casino Gaming, Fantasy Sports Contests, and Sports Wagering.

The Gaming Division operates an outreach program called Problem Gambling Resource Services, pursuant to a contract with the Department of Health. Through the program, the division brings awareness to the legal community about problem gambling and the free gambling treatment available for all Louisiana residents.

The division's legal staff is comprised of hard working, conscientious attorneys with expertise and widely diversified legal skills. Over time, the division has established successful working relationships with various industry stakeholders, other state agencies, and law enforcement, which increases highly successful outcomes and work productivity for gaming related matters; and as a result of the division's case tracking system, years of attorney compiled network files, and its in-office gaming library, the division possesses a significant amount of institutional knowledge that provides a strong foundation for newly hired attorneys.

Weaknesses of the division include limitations of support staff, and salary and budget limitations that do not allow the department to remain competitive with the private industry. Employee turnover rates are due to non-competitive salaries. Turnover leads to a diminished legal team, which is critically harmful, as the division needs to maintain institutional knowledge and longevity with its attorneys given the complexity and specialized nature of gaming law. Legislative changes and the division's budget are concerns that arise annually.

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. Increased resources and travel may be necessary, as the gaming industry is worldwide, now with a strong prevalence throughout the United States and common regulatory and licensing issues affecting numerous jurisdictions.

Program:	Gaming
Objective:	I.1
Indicator Name:	Number of casino gaming approval files received from State Police
Le dissease La DAG DI Cardan	N

- 1. Type and Level: Input/General
- 2. **Rationale:** This indicator provides an overall feel for how well the department is meeting its objectives. It is necessary to track to support the outcome measures.
- 3. Use: This indicator will be monitored by the division and department management. It will be used for internal management purposes and for performance-based budgeting as an indicator of workload.
- 4. **Clarity:** This indicator clearly identifies what is being measured. The indicator does not contain jargon or acronyms.
- 5. Validity, Reliability and Accuracy: This is a valid indicator that is reliable and accurate. Performance indicators are reported to the Office of Planning and Budget, available to the public and the media via the internet, and are subject to audit.
- 6. **Data Source, Collection and Reporting:** The data source is the Legal Files program that tracks all data related to performance indicators. All data will be reported on a quarterly basis.
- 7. Calculation Methodology: The indicator is calculated by counting the number of casino gaming approval files received from State Police.
- 8. Scope: This indicator is aggregated.
- 9. Caveats: This indicator is not a surrogate. It has no weaknesses. The source of the data does not have a bias. There is not a caveat.
- 10. **Responsible Person:** The people responsible for this indicator are the Tracking Manager, Section Chiefs of Licensing and Compliance.

Program:	Gaming
Objective:	I.1
Indicator Name:	Number of video gaming approval files received from State Police
	NT.

- 1. Type and Level: Input/General
- 2. **Rationale:** This indicator provides an overall feel for how well the department is meeting its objectives. It is necessary to track to support the outcome measures.
- 3. Use: This indicator will be monitored by the division and department management. It will be used for internal management purposes and for performance-based budgeting as an indicator of workload.
- 4. **Clarity:** This indicator clearly identifies what is being measured. The indicator does not contain jargon or acronyms.
- 5. Validity, Reliability and Accuracy: This is a valid indicator that is reliable and accurate. Performance indicators are reported to the Office of Planning and Budget, available to the public and the media via the internet, and are subject to audit.
- 6. **Data Source, Collection and Reporting:** The data source is the Legal Files program that tracks all data related to performance indicators. All data will be reported on a quarterly basis.
- 7. Calculation Methodology: The indicator is calculated by counting the number of video gaming approval files received from State Police.
- 8. Scope: This indicator is aggregated.
- 9. Caveats: This indicator is not a surrogate. It has no weaknesses. The source of the data does not have a bias. There is not a caveat.
- 10. **Responsible Person:** The people responsible for this indicator are the Tracking Manager, Section Chiefs of Licensing and Compliance.

Program:	Gaming
Objective:	I.1
Indicator Name:	Number of casino gaming approval files processed by Licensing and Compliance

- 1. Type and Level: Output/General
- 2. **Rationale:** This indicator provides an overall feel for how well the department is meeting its objectives. It is necessary to track to support the outcome measures.
- 3. Use: This indicator will be monitored by the division and department management. It will be used for internal management purposes and for performance-based budgeting as an indicator of workload.
- 4. **Clarity:** This indicator clearly identifies what is being measured. The indicator does not contain jargon or acronyms.
- 5. Validity, Reliability and Accuracy: This is a valid indicator that is reliable and accurate. Performance indicators are reported to the Office of Planning and Budget, available to the public and the media via the internet, and are subject to audit.
- 6. **Data Source, Collection and Reporting:** The data source is the Legal Files program that tracks all data related to performance indicators. All data will be reported on a quarterly basis.
- 7. Calculation Methodology: The indicator is calculated by counting the number of casino gaming approval files processed.
- 8. Scope: This indicator is aggregated.
- 9. Caveats: This indicator is not a surrogate. It has no weaknesses. The source of the data does not have a bias. There is not a caveat.
- 10. **Responsible Person:** The people responsible for this indicator are the Tracking Manager, Section Chiefs of Licensing and Compliance.

Program:	Gaming
Objective:	I.1
Indicator Name:	Number of video gaming approval files processed by Licensing and Compliance

- 1. Type and Level: Output/General
- 2. **Rationale:** This indicator provides an overall feel for how well the department is meeting its objectives. It is necessary to track to support the outcome measures.
- 3. Use: This indicator will be monitored by the division and department management. It will be used for internal management purposes and for performance-based budgeting as an indicator of workload.
- 4. **Clarity:** This indicator clearly identifies what is being measured. The indicator does not contain jargon or acronyms.
- 5. Validity, Reliability and Accuracy: This is a valid indicator that is reliable and accurate. Performance indicators are reported to the Office of Planning and Budget, available to the public and the media via the internet, and are subject to audit.
- 6. **Data Source, Collection and Reporting:** The data source is the Legal Files program that tracks all data related to performance indicators. All data will be reported on a quarterly basis.
- 7. Calculation Methodology: The indicator is calculated by counting the number of video gaming approval files processed.
- 8. Scope: This indicator is aggregated.
- 9. Caveats: This indicator is not a surrogate. It has no weaknesses. The source of the data does not have a bias. There is not a caveat.
- 10. **Responsible Person:** The people responsible for this indicator are the Tracking Manager, Section Chiefs of Licensing and Compliance.

Program:	Gaming
Objective:	I.1
Indicator Name:	Number of casino gaming approval files returned to State Police

- 1. Type and Level: Output/General
- 2. **Rationale:** This indicator provides an overall feel for how well the department is meeting its objectives. It is necessary to track to support the outcome measures.
- 3. Use: This indicator will be monitored by the division and department management. It will be used for internal management purposes and for performance-based budgeting as an indicator of workload.
- 4. **Clarity:** This indicator clearly identifies what is being measured. The indicator does not contain jargon or acronyms.
- 5. Validity, Reliability and Accuracy: This is a valid indicator that is reliable and accurate. Performance indicators are reported to the Office of Planning and Budget, available to the public and the media via the internet, and are subject to audit.
- 6. **Data Source, Collection and Reporting:** The data source is the Legal Files program that tracks all data related to performance indicators. All data will be reported on a quarterly basis.
- 7. Calculation Methodology: The indicator is calculated by counting the number of casino gaming approval files returned to State Police.
- 8. Scope: This indicator is aggregated.
- 9. Caveats: This indicator is not a surrogate. It has no weaknesses. The source of the data does not have a bias. There is not a caveat.
- 10. **Responsible Person:** The people responsible for this indicator are the Tracking Manager, Section Chiefs of Licensing and Compliance.

Program:	Gaming
Objective:	I.1
Indicator Name:	Number of video gaming approval files returned to State Police

- 1. Type and Level: Output/General
- 2. **Rationale:** This indicator provides an overall feel for how well the department is meeting its objectives. It is necessary to track to support the outcome measures.
- 3. Use: This indicator will be monitored by the division and department management. It will be used for internal management purposes and for performance-based budgeting as an indicator of workload.
- 4. **Clarity:** This indicator clearly identifies what is being measured. The indicator does not contain jargon or acronyms.
- 5. Validity, Reliability and Accuracy: This is a valid indicator that is reliable and accurate. Performance indicators are reported to the Office of Planning and Budget, available to the public and the media via the internet, and are subject to audit.
- 6. **Data Source, Collection and Reporting:** The data source is the Legal Files program that tracks all data related to performance indicators. All data will be reported on a quarterly basis.
- 7. Calculation Methodology: The indicator is calculated by counting the number of video gaming approval files returned to State Police.
- 8. Scope: This indicator is aggregated.
- 9. Caveats: This indicator is not a surrogate. It has no weaknesses. The source of the data does not have a bias. There is not a caveat.
- 10. **Responsible Person:** The people responsible for this indicator are the Tracking Manager, Section Chiefs of Licensing and Compliance.

Program:	Gaming
Objective:	I.1
Indicator Name:	Average number of business days from assignment of casino gaming approval files until forwarded to Louisiana Gaming Control Board

- 1. Type and Level: Efficiency/Supporting
- 2. **Rationale:** This indicator provides an overall feel for how well the department is meeting its objectives. It is necessary to track to support the outcome measures.
- 3. Use: This indicator will be monitored by the division and department management. It will be used for internal management purposes and for performance-based budgeting as an indicator of workload.
- 4. **Clarity:** This indicator clearly identifies what is being measured. The indicator does not contain jargon or acronyms.
- 5. Validity, Reliability and Accuracy: This is a valid indicator that is reliable and accurate. Performance indicators are reported to the Office of Planning and Budget, available to the public and the media via the internet, and are subject to audit.
- 6. **Data Source, Collection and Reporting:** The data source is the Legal Files program that tracks all data related to performance indicators. All data will be reported on a quarterly basis.
- 7. Calculation Methodology: The indicator is calculated by the average number of business days from assignment of casino gaming approval files until forwarded to board.
- 8. Scope: This indicator is aggregated.
- 9. Caveats: This indicator is not a surrogate. It has no weaknesses. The source of the data does not have a bias. There is not a caveat.
- 10. **Responsible Person:** The people responsible for this indicator are the Tracking Manager, Section Chiefs of Licensing and Compliance.

Program:	Gaming
Objective:	I.1
Indicator Name:	Number of casino gaming approval files processed within 20 business days of assignment

- 1. Type and Level: Efficiency/Supporting
- 2. **Rationale:** This indicator provides an overall feel for how well the department is meeting its objectives. It is necessary to track to support the outcome measures.
- 3. Use: This indicator will be monitored by the division and department management. It will be used for internal management purposes and for performance-based budgeting as an indicator of workload.
- 4. **Clarity:** This indicator clearly identifies what is being measured. The indicator does not contain jargon or acronyms.
- 5. Validity, Reliability and Accuracy: This is a valid indicator that is reliable and accurate. Performance indicators are reported to the Office of Planning and Budget, available to the public and the media via the internet, and are subject to audit.
- 6. **Data Source, Collection and Reporting:** The data source is the Legal Files program that tracks all data related to performance indicators. All data will be reported on a quarterly basis.
- 7. Calculation Methodology: The indicator is calculated by counting the number of casino gaming approval files processed within 20 business days of assignment.
- 8. Scope: This indicator is aggregated.
- 9. Caveats: This indicator is not a surrogate. It has no weaknesses. The source of the data does not have a bias. There is not a caveat.
- 10. **Responsible Person:** The people responsible for this indicator are the Tracking Manager, Section Chiefs of Licensing and Compliance.

Program:	Gaming
Objective:	I.1
Indicator Name:	Number of video gaming approval files processed within 20 business days of assignment

- 1. Type and Level: Efficiency/Supporting
- 2. **Rationale:** This indicator provides an overall feel for how well the department is meeting its objectives. It is necessary to track to support the outcome measures.
- 3. Use: This indicator will be monitored by the division and department management. It will be used for internal management purposes and for performance-based budgeting as an indicator of workload.
- 4. **Clarity:** This indicator clearly identifies what is being measured. The indicator does not contain jargon or acronyms.
- 5. Validity, Reliability and Accuracy: This is a valid indicator that is reliable and accurate. Performance indicators are reported to the Office of Planning and Budget, available to the public and the media via the internet, and are subject to audit.
- 6. **Data Source, Collection and Reporting:** The data source is the Legal Files program that tracks all data related to performance indicators. All data will be reported on a quarterly basis.
- 7. Calculation Methodology: The indicator is calculated by counting the number of video gaming approval files processed within 20 business days of assignment.
- 8. Scope: This indicator is aggregated.
- 9. Caveats: This indicator is not a surrogate. It has no weaknesses. The source of the data does not have a bias. There is not a caveat.
- 10. **Responsible Person:** The people responsible for this indicator are the Tracking Manager, Section Chiefs of Licensing and Compliance.

Program:	Gaming
Objective:	I.1
Indicator Name:	Percent of casino gaming approval files processed within 20 business days of assignment

- 1. Type and Level: Outcome/Supporting
- 2. **Rationale:** This indicator provides an overall feel for how well the department is meeting its objectives. It is necessary to track to support the outcome measures.
- 3. Use: This indicator will be monitored by the division and department management. It will be used for internal management purposes and for performance-based budgeting as an indicator of workload.
- 4. **Clarity:** This indicator clearly identifies what is being measured. The indicator does not contain jargon or acronyms.
- 5. Validity, Reliability and Accuracy: This is a valid indicator that is reliable and accurate. Performance indicators are reported to the Office of Planning and Budget, available to the public and the media via the internet, and are subject to audit.
- 6. **Data Source, Collection and Reporting:** The data source is the Legal Files program that tracks all data related to performance indicators. All data will be reported on a quarterly basis.
- 7. Calculation Methodology: The indicator is calculated by the percent of casino gaming approval files processed within 20 business days of assignment.
- 8. Scope: This indicator is aggregated.
- 9. Caveats: This indicator is not a surrogate. It has no weaknesses. The source of the data does not have a bias. There is not a caveat.
- 10. **Responsible Person:** The people responsible for this indicator are the Tracking Manager, Section Chiefs of Licensing and Compliance.

Program:	Gaming
Objective:	I.1
Indicator Name:	Percent of video gaming approval files processed within 20 business days of assignment

- 1. Type and Level: Outcome/Supporting
- 2. **Rationale:** This indicator provides an overall feel for how well the department is meeting its objectives. It is necessary to track to support the outcome measures.
- 3. Use: This indicator will be monitored by the division and department management. It will be used for internal management purposes and for performance-based budgeting as an indicator of workload.
- 4. **Clarity:** This indicator clearly identifies what is being measured. The indicator does not contain jargon or acronyms.
- 5. Validity, Reliability and Accuracy: This is a valid indicator that is reliable and accurate. Performance indicators are reported to the Office of Planning and Budget, available to the public and the media via the internet, and are subject to audit.
- 6. **Data Source, Collection and Reporting:** The data source is the Legal Files program that tracks all data related to performance indicators. All data will be reported on a quarterly basis.
- 7. Calculation Methodology: The indicator is calculated by the percent of video gaming approval files processed within 20 business days of assignment.
- 8. Scope: This indicator is aggregated.
- 9. Caveats: This indicator is not a surrogate. It has no weaknesses. The source of the data does not have a bias. There is not a caveat.
- 10. **Responsible Person:** The people responsible for this indicator are the Tracking Manager, Section Chiefs of Licensing and Compliance.

Program:	Gaming
Objective:	I.1
Indicator Name:	Number of complex casino gaming approval files processed in more than 20 business days of assignment

- 1. Type and Level: Outcome/General
- 2. **Rationale:** This indicator provides an overall feel for how well the department is meeting its objectives. It is necessary to track to support the outcome measures.
- 3. Use: This indicator will be monitored by the division and department management. It will be used for internal management purposes and for performance-based budgeting as an indicator of workload.
- 4. **Clarity:** This indicator clearly identifies what is being measured. The indicator does not contain jargon or acronyms.
- 5. Validity, Reliability and Accuracy: This is a valid indicator that is reliable and accurate. Performance indicators are reported to the Office of Planning and Budget, available to the public and the media via the internet, and are subject to audit.
- 6. **Data Source, Collection and Reporting:** The data source is the Legal Files program that tracks all data related to performance indicators. All data will be reported on a quarterly basis.
- 7. Calculation Methodology: The indicator is calculated by counting the number of complex casino gaming approval files processed in more than 20 business days of assignment.
- 8. Scope: This indicator is aggregated.
- 9. Caveats: This indicator is not a surrogate. It has no weaknesses. The source of the data does not have a bias. There is not a caveat.
- 10. **Responsible Person:** The people responsible for this indicator are the Tracking Manager, Section Chiefs of Licensing and Compliance.

Program:	Gaming
Objective:	I.1
Indicator Name:	Number of complex video gaming approval files processed in more than 20 business days of assignment

- 1. Type and Level: Outcome/General
- 2. **Rationale:** This indicator provides an overall feel for how well the department is meeting its objectives. It is necessary to track to support the outcome measures.
- 3. Use: This indicator will be monitored by the division and department management. It will be used for internal management purposes and for performance-based budgeting as an indicator of workload.
- 4. **Clarity:** This indicator clearly identifies what is being measured. The indicator does not contain jargon or acronyms.
- 5. Validity, Reliability and Accuracy: This is a valid indicator that is reliable and accurate. Performance indicators are reported to the Office of Planning and Budget, available to the public and the media via the internet, and are subject to audit.
- 6. **Data Source, Collection and Reporting:** The data source is the Legal Files program that tracks all data related to performance indicators. All data will be reported on a quarterly basis.
- 7. Calculation Methodology: The indicator is calculated by counting the number of complex video gaming approval files processed in more than 20 business days of assignment.
- 8. Scope: This indicator is aggregated.
- 9. Caveats: This indicator is not a surrogate. It has no weaknesses. The source of the data does not have a bias. There is not a caveat.
- 10. **Responsible Person:** The people responsible for this indicator are the Tracking Manager, Section Chiefs of Licensing and Compliance.

Program:	Gaming
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:** This indicator provides an overall feel for how well the department is meeting its objectives. It is necessary to track to support the outcome measures.
- 3. Use: This indicator will be monitored by the division and department management. It will be used for internal management purposes and for performance-based budgeting as an indicator of workload.
- 4. **Clarity:** This indicator clearly identifies what is being measured. The indicator does not contain jargon or acronyms.
- 5. Validity, Reliability and Accuracy: This is a valid indicator that is reliable and accurate. Performance indicators are reported to the Office of Planning and Budget, available to the public and the media via the internet, and are subject to audit.
- 6. **Data Source, Collection and Reporting:** The data source is the Legal Files program that tracks all data related to performance indicators. All data will be reported on a quarterly basis.
- 7. Calculation Methodology: The indicator is calculated by the number of video gaming administrative action and denial files received from State Police.
- 8. Scope: This indicator is aggregated.
- 9. Caveats: This indicator is not a surrogate. It has no weaknesses. The source of the data does not have a bias. There is not a caveat.
- 10. **Responsible Person:** The people responsible for this indicator are the Tracking Manager, Section Chiefs of Licensing and Compliance.

Program:	Gaming
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:** This indicator provides an overall feel for how well the department is meeting its objectives. It is necessary to track to support the outcome measures.
- 3. Use: This indicator will be monitored by the division and department management. It will be used for internal management purposes and for performance-based budgeting as an indicator of workload.
- 4. **Clarity:** This indicator clearly identifies what is being measured. The indicator does not contain jargon or acronyms.
- 5. Validity, Reliability and Accuracy: This is a valid indicator that is reliable and accurate. Performance indicators are reported to the Office of Planning and Budget, available to the public and the media via the internet, and are subject to audit.
- 6. **Data Source, Collection and Reporting:** The data source is the Legal Files program that tracks all data related to performance indicators. All data will be reported on a quarterly basis.
- 7. Calculation Methodology: The indicator is calculated by the number of video gaming administrative action and denial files returned to State Police.
- 8. Scope: This indicator is aggregated.
- 9. Caveats: This indicator is not a surrogate. It has no weaknesses. The source of the data does not have a bias. There is not a caveat.
- 10. **Responsible Person:** The people responsible for this indicator are the Tracking Manager, Section Chiefs of Licensing and Compliance.

Program:	Gaming
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

- 1. Type and Level: Efficiency/Supporting
- 2. **Rationale:** This indicator provides an overall feel for how well the department is meeting its objectives. It is necessary to track to support the outcome measures.
- 3. Use: This indicator will be monitored by the division and department management. It will be used for internal management purposes and for performance-based budgeting as an indicator of workload.
- 4. **Clarity:** This indicator clearly identifies what is being measured. The indicator does not contain jargon or acronyms.
- 5. Validity, Reliability and Accuracy: This is a valid indicator that is reliable and accurate. Performance indicators are reported to the Office of Planning and Budget, available to the public and the media via the internet, and are subject to audit.
- 6. **Data Source, Collection and Reporting:** The data source is the Legal Files program that tracks all data related to performance indicators. All data will be reported on a quarterly basis.
- 7. Calculation Methodology: The indicator is calculated by the average number of business days from assignment of video gaming administrative action and denial files until forwarded to the board.
- 8. Scope: This indicator is aggregated.
- 9. Caveats: This indicator is not a surrogate. It has no weaknesses. The source of the data does not have a bias. There is not a caveat.
- 10. **Responsible Person:** The people responsible for this indicator are the Tracking Manager, Section Chiefs of Licensing and Compliance.
| Program:        | Gaming  |
|-----------------|---|
| 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:** This indicator provides an overall feel for how well the department is meeting its objectives. It is necessary to track to support the outcome measures.
- 3. Use: This indicator will be monitored by the division and department management. It will be used for internal management purposes and for performance-based budgeting as an indicator of workload.
- 4. **Clarity:** This indicator clearly identifies what is being measured. The indicator does not contain jargon or acronyms.
- 5. Validity, Reliability and Accuracy: This is a valid indicator that is reliable and accurate. Performance indicators are reported to the Office of Planning and Budget, available to the public and the media via the internet, and are subject to audit.
- 6. **Data Source, Collection and Reporting:** The data source is the Legal Files program that tracks all data related to performance indicators. All data will be reported on a quarterly basis.
- 7. **Calculation Methodology:** The indicator is calculated by counting the number of number of video gaming administrative action and denial files processed within 60 business days of assignment.
- 8. Scope: This indicator is aggregated.
- 9. Caveats: This indicator is not a surrogate. It has no weaknesses. The source of the data does not have a bias. There is not a caveat.
- 10. **Responsible Person:** The people responsible for this indicator are the Tracking Manager, Section Chiefs of Licensing and Compliance.

Program:	Gaming
Objective:	I.2
Indicator Name:	Percent of video gaming administrative action and denial files processed within 60 business days of assignment

- 1. Type and Level: Outcome/Key
- 2. **Rationale:** This indicator provides an overall feel for how well the department is meeting its objectives. It is necessary to track to support the outcome measures.
- 3. Use: This indicator will be monitored by the division and department management. It will be used for internal management purposes and for performance-based budgeting as an indicator of workload.
- 4. **Clarity:** This indicator clearly identifies what is being measured. The indicator does not contain jargon or acronyms.
- 5. Validity, Reliability and Accuracy: This is a valid indicator that is reliable and accurate. Performance indicators are reported to the Office of Planning and Budget, available to the public and the media via the internet, and are subject to audit.
- 6. **Data Source, Collection and Reporting:** The data source is the Legal Files program that tracks all data related to performance indicators. All data will be reported on a quarterly basis.
- 7. Calculation Methodology: The indicator is calculated by the percent of video gaming administrative action and denial files processed within 60 business days of assignment.
- 8. Scope: This indicator is aggregated.
- 9. Caveats: This indicator is not a surrogate. It has no weaknesses. The source of the data does not have a bias. There is not a caveat.
- 10. **Responsible Person:** The people responsible for this indicator are the Tracking Manager, Section Chiefs of Licensing and Compliance.

Program:	Gaming
Objective:	I.2
Indicator Name:	Number of complex video gaming administrative action and denial files processed in more than 60 business days of assignment

- 1. Type and Level: Outcome/General
- 2. **Rationale:** This indicator provides an overall feel for how well the department is meeting its objectives. It is necessary to track to support the outcome measures.
- 3. Use: This indicator will be monitored by the division and department management. It will be used for internal management purposes and for performance-based budgeting as an indicator of workload.
- 4. **Clarity:** This indicator clearly identifies what is being measured. The indicator does not contain jargon or acronyms.
- 5. Validity, Reliability and Accuracy: This is a valid indicator that is reliable and accurate. Performance indicators are reported to the Office of Planning and Budget, available to the public and the media via the internet, and are subject to audit.
- 6. **Data Source, Collection and Reporting:** The data source is the Legal Files program that tracks all data related to performance indicators. All data will be reported on a quarterly basis.
- 7. Calculation Methodology: The indicator is calculated by counting the number of complex video gaming administrative action and denial files processed in more than 60 business days of assignment.
- 8. **Scope:** This indicator is aggregated.
- 9. Caveats: This indicator is not a surrogate. It has no weaknesses. The source of the data does not have a bias. There is not a caveat.
- 10. **Responsible Person:** The people responsible for this indicator are the Tracking Manager, Section Chiefs of Licensing and Compliance.

Program:	Gaming
Objective:	I.
Indicator Name:	Number of video gaming administrative action and denial files processed by Licensing and Compliance

- 1. Type and Level: Output/General
- 2. **Rationale:** This indicator provides an overall feel for how well the department is meeting its objectives. It is necessary to track to support the outcome measures.
- 3. Use: This indicator will be monitored by the division and department management. It will be used for internal management purposes and for performance-based budgeting as an indicator of workload.
- 4. **Clarity:** This indicator clearly identifies what is being measured. The indicator does not contain jargon or acronyms.
- 5. Validity, Reliability and Accuracy: This is a valid indicator that is reliable and accurate. Performance indicators are reported to the Office of Planning and Budget, available to the public and the media via the internet, and are subject to audit.
- 6. **Data Source, Collection and Reporting:** The data source is the Legal Files program that tracks all data related to performance indicators. All data will be reported on a quarterly basis.
- 7. Calculation Methodology: The indicator is calculated by counting the number of casino gaming administrative action and denial files processed by Licensing and Compliance.
- 8. Scope: This indicator is aggregated.
- 9. Caveats: This indicator is not a surrogate. It has no weaknesses. The source of the data does not have a bias. There is not a caveat.
- 10. **Responsible Person:** The people responsible for this indicator are the Tracking Manager, Section Chiefs of Licensing and Compliance.

Program:	Gaming
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:** This indicator provides an overall feel for how well the department is meeting its objectives. It is necessary to track to support the outcome measures.
- 3. Use: This indicator will be monitored by the division and department management. It will be used for internal management purposes and for performance-based budgeting as an indicator of workload.
- 4. **Clarity:** This indicator clearly identifies what is being measured. The indicator does not contain jargon or acronyms.
- 5. Validity, Reliability and Accuracy: This is a valid indicator that is reliable and accurate. Performance indicators are reported to the Office of Planning and Budget, available to the public and the media via the internet, and are subject to audit.
- 6. **Data Source, Collection and Reporting:** The data source is the Legal Files program that tracks all data related to performance indicators. All data will be reported on a quarterly basis.
- 7. Calculation Methodology: The indicator is calculated by counting the number of casino gaming administrative action and denial files received from State Police.
- 8. Scope: This indicator is aggregated.
- 9. Caveats: This indicator is not a surrogate. It has no weaknesses. The source of the data does not have a bias. There is not a caveat.
- 10. **Responsible Person:** The people responsible for this indicator are the Tracking Manager, Section Chiefs of Licensing and Compliance.

Program:	Gaming
Objective:	I.3
Indicator Name:	Number of casino gaming administrative action and denial files processed by Licensing and Compliance

- 1. Type and Level: Output/General
- 2. **Rationale:** This indicator provides an overall feel for how well the department is meeting its objectives. It is necessary to track to support the outcome measures.
- 3. Use: This indicator will be monitored by the division and department management. It will be used for internal management purposes and for performance-based budgeting as an indicator of workload.
- 4. **Clarity** This indicator clearly identifies what is being measured. The indicator does not contain jargon or acronyms.
- 5. Validity, Reliability and Accuracy: This is a valid indicator that is reliable and accurate. Performance indicators are reported to the Office of Planning and Budget, available to the public and the media via the internet, and are subject to audit.
- 6. **Data Source, Collection and Reporting:** The data source is the Legal Files program that tracks all data related to performance indicators. All data will be reported on a quarterly basis.
- 7. Calculation Methodology: The indicator is calculated by counting the number of casino gaming administrative action and denial files processed by Licensing and Compliance.
- 8. Scope: This indicator is aggregated.
- 9. Caveats: This indicator is not a surrogate. It has no weaknesses. The source of the data does not have a bias. There is not a caveat.
- 10. **Responsible Person:** The people responsible for this indicator are the Tracking Manager, Section Chiefs of Licensing and Compliance.

Program:	Gaming
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:** This indicator provides an overall feel for how well the department is meeting its objectives. It is necessary to track to support the outcome measures.
- 3. Use: This indicator will be monitored by the division and department management. It will be used for internal management purposes and for performance-based budgeting as an indicator of workload.
- 4. **Clarity:** This indicator clearly identifies what is being measured. The indicator does not contain jargon or acronyms.
- 5. Validity, Reliability and Accuracy: This is a valid indicator that is reliable and accurate. Performance indicators are reported to the Office of Planning and Budget, available to the public and the media via the internet, and are subject to audit.
- 6. **Data Source, Collection and Reporting:** The data source is the Legal Files program that tracks all data related to performance indicators. All data will be reported on a quarterly basis.
- 7. Calculation Methodology: The indicator is calculated by counting the number of casino gaming administrative action and denial files returned to State Police.
- 8. Scope: This indicator is aggregated.
- 9. Caveats: This indicator is not a surrogate. It has no weaknesses. The source of the data does not have a bias. There is not a caveat.
- 10. **Responsible Person:** The people responsible for this indicator are the Tracking Manager, Section Chiefs of Licensing and Compliance.

Program:	Gaming
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

- 1. Type and Level: Efficiency/Supporting
- 2. **Rationale:** This indicator provides an overall feel for how well the department is meeting its objectives. It is necessary to track to support the outcome measures.
- 3. Use: This indicator will be monitored by the division and department management. It will be used for internal management purposes and for performance-based budgeting as an indicator of workload.
- 4. **Clarity:** This indicator clearly identifies what is being measured. The indicator does not contain jargon or acronyms.
- 5. Validity, Reliability and Accuracy: This is a valid indicator that is reliable and accurate. Performance indicators are reported to the Office of Planning and Budget, available to the public and the media via the internet, and are subject to audit.
- 6. **Data Source, Collection and Reporting:** The data source is the Legal Files program that tracks all data related to performance indicators. All data will be reported on a quarterly basis.
- 7. Calculation Methodology: The indicator is calculated by the average number of business days from assignment of casino administrative action and denial files until forwarded to board.
- 8. Scope: This indicator is aggregated.
- 9. Caveats: This indicator is not a surrogate. It has no weaknesses. The source of the data does not have a bias. There is not a caveat.
- 10. **Responsible Person:** The people responsible for this indicator are the Tracking Manager, Section Chiefs of Licensing and Compliance.

Program:	Gaming
Objective:	I.3
Indicator Name:	Percentage of casino gaming administrative action and denial files processed within 30 business days of assignment

- 1. Type and Level: Outcome/Key
- 2. **Rationale:** This indicator provides an overall feel for how well the department is meeting its objectives. It is necessary to track to support the outcome measures.
- 3. Use: This indicator will be monitored by the division and department management. It will be used for internal management purposes and for performance-based budgeting as an indicator of workload.
- 4. **Clarity:** This indicator clearly identifies what is being measured. The indicator does not contain jargon or acronyms.
- 5. Validity, Reliability and Accuracy: This is a valid indicator that is reliable and accurate. Performance indicators are reported to the Office of Planning and Budget, available to the public and the media via the internet, and are subject to audit.
- 6. **Data Source, Collection and Reporting:** The data source is the Legal Files program that tracks all data related to performance indicators. All data will be reported on a quarterly basis.
- 7. Calculation Methodology: The indicator is calculated by the percent of casino gaming administrative action and denial files processed within 30 business days of assignment.
- 8. Scope: This indicator is aggregated.
- 9. Caveats: This indicator is not a surrogate. It has no weaknesses. The source of the data does not have a bias. There is not a caveat.
- 10. **Responsible Person:** The people responsible for this indicator are the Tracking Manager, Section Chiefs of Licensing and Compliance.

Program:	Gaming
Objective:	I.3
Indicator Name:	Number of complex casino gaming administrative action and denial files processed in more than 30 business days of assignment

- 1. Type and Level: Outcome/General
- 2. **Rationale:** This indicator provides an overall feel for how well the department is meeting its objectives. It is necessary to track to support the outcome measures.
- 3. Use: This indicator will be monitored by the division and department management. It will be used for internal management purposes and for performance-based budgeting as an indicator of workload.
- 4. **Clarity:** This indicator clearly identifies what is being measured. The indicator does not contain jargon or acronyms.
- 5. Validity, Reliability and Accuracy: This is a valid indicator that is reliable and accurate. Performance indicators are reported to the Office of Planning and Budget, available to the public and the media via the internet, and are subject to audit.
- 6. **Data Source, Collection and Reporting:** The data source is the Legal Files program that tracks all data related to performance indicators. All data will be reported on a quarterly basis.
- 7. Calculation Methodology: The indicator is calculated by counting the number of complex casino gaming administrative action and denial files processed in more than 30 business days of assignment.
- 8. Scope: This indicator is aggregated.
- 9. Caveats: This indicator is not a surrogate. It has no weaknesses. The source of the data does not have a bias. There is not a caveat.
- 10. **Responsible Person:** The people responsible for this indicator are the Tracking Manager, Section Chiefs of Licensing and Compliance.

Program:	Gaming
Objective:	I.
Indicator Name:	Percent of casino gaming administrative action and denial files processed within 30 business days of assignment

- 1. Type and Level: Outcome/Key
- 2. **Rationale:** This indicator provides an overall feel for how well the department is meeting its objectives. It is necessary to track to support the outcome measures.
- 3. Use: This indicator will be monitored by the division and department management. It will be used for internal management purposes and for performance-based budgeting as an indicator of workload.
- 4. **Clarity:** This indicator clearly identifies what is being measured. The indicator does not contain jargon or acronyms.
- 5. Validity, Reliability and Accuracy: This is a valid indicator that is reliable and accurate. Performance indicators are reported to the Office of Planning and Budget, available to the public and the media via the internet, and are subject to audit.
- 6. **Data Source, Collection and Reporting:** The data source is the Legal Files program that tracks all data related to performance indicators. All data will be reported on a quarterly basis.
- 7. Calculation Methodology: The indicator is calculated by the percent of video gaming administrative action and denial files processed within 60 business days of assignment.
- 8. Scope: This indicator is aggregated.
- 9. Caveats: This indicator is not a surrogate. It has no weaknesses. The source of the data does not have a bias. There is not a caveat.
- 10. **Responsible Person:** The people responsible for this indicator are the Tracking Manager, Section Chiefs of Licensing and Compliance.

## Louisiana Strategic Plan Update FY 2026-2027 through FY 2030-2031 Top Five Performance Indicators

Instructions: Use the boxes below to identify the top five performance indicators that highlight the efforts to achieve the agency's vision, mission, and philosophy.

Department and Agency Name: Department of Justice
Performance Indicator 1
(Please identify the objective associated with this performance indicator) <u>Civil Law Program:</u> Objective 1.2
Through the Civil Division, to retain in-house 98% of the litigation cases received each fiscal year by June 30, 2031. <b>Performance Indicator</b> Percentage of cases handled in-house each fiscal year
Performance Indicator 2
(please identify the objective associated with this performance indicator)
<u>Civil Law Program:</u> Objective 1.5 Provide and maintain a strong outreach program by providing public presentations on civil law programs and responding to constituent calls and inquiries in a timely manner.
Performance Indicator Total number of presentations made to public and private entities
Performance Indicator 3
(please identify the objective associated with this performance indicator) <u>Civil Law Program:</u> Objective 1.8 Consumer Protection Section shall respond to 100% of verified consumer disputes within 15 days of receipt by June 30, 2031.
Performance Indicator Number of verified consumer disputes responded to within 15 days of receipt
Performance Indicator 4
(please identify the objective associated with this performance indicator)
Criminal Law and Medicaid Fraud Program:
<b>Objective 1.1</b> The Criminal Division will prosecute 95% of cases received through recusal by June 30, 2031.
Performance Indicator Number of cases closed
Performance Indicator 5
(please identify the objective associated with this performance indicator)
Litigation Program: Objective 1.1 Through the Litigation Program, to better utilize the funds available to ORM and exempt institutions for legal expense by handling in-house at least 85% of new risk litigation cases opened each fiscal year by June 30, 2031.
Performance Indicator Percentage of new cases assigned to in-house counsel