FLORIDA DEPARTMENT OF LAW ENFORCEMENT

Review of Cabinet and Long-Range Program Plan Performance Measures

Project Number PM-1718-01

September 2018

Service ★ Integrity ★ Respect ★ Quality

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

In 2015, the Florida Cabinet developed performance metrics as a method of regularly reviewing the work of Cabinet appointees. The Agency's performance measures document the Florida Department of Law Enforcement (FDLE) Commissioner's objectives in the form of a "performance contract" with the Governor and Cabinet. The measures for fiscal year 2017-2018 were approved at the Florida Cabinet Meeting held on October 17, 2017.

Section 216.013, Florida Statutes (F.S.), requires state agencies to develop Long-Range Program Plans (LRPPs) to achieve state goals. These include specific performance measures and standards. The LRPP for fiscal year 2018-2019 was submitted on September 29, 2017.

Section 20.055, F.S., designates the Office of Inspector General (OIG) as the entity responsible for assessing the reliability and validity of the Department's performance measures. Pursuant to the statute, the OIG initiated a review of new or revised cabinet and LRPP measures on April 10, 2018.

OBJECTIVES, SCOPE AND METHODOLOGY

The objectives of this review were to assess the reliability and validity of Cabinet and LRPP performance measures and standards that are new or revised in the current year, and make recommendations for improvement, if appropriate. The scope of this review included the following five measures:

1. Number of intelligence reports/percentage of intelligence reports that address a priority information need.
2. Percentage of registered sex predator/offender case reviews completed.
3. Number of missing person intelligence checks conducted.
4. Percentage of criminal history record checks responded to within defined timeframes.
5. Percentage of customers with positive service rating.

The review focused primarily on data from March through July 2018. To meet the objectives, the review included the following:

- Research and analysis of performance measurement reports, data, and other relevant information.
- Research of prior reviews of performance measures.
- Research of statutes, agency manuals, policies and procedures.
- Interviews with designated agency Performance Measure Liaisons.

The following definitions were used to determine validity and reliability:

Validity – The degree to which the methodology measures what it is intended to measure.

Reliability – The degree to which the methodology produces consistent results.

BACKGROUND

Section 216.013, F.S. requires state agencies to develop Long-Range Program Plans (LRPPs) to achieve state goals. LRPPs provide the framework for development of budget requests and include the agency's mission, goals, objectives, relevant trends and conditions, program descriptions, and performance measures. Information about performance measures includes standards for each measure, descriptions of data sources, and measurement methodology. The LRPP for fiscal year 2018-2019 was submitted on September 29, 2017. Similar to the LRPP, the Florida Cabinet performance metrics were developed as a method of regularly reviewing the work of Cabinet appointees, and they document the FDLE Commissioner's measures (objectives) for the Governor and Florida Cabinet. The Agency's performance measures for fiscal year 2017-2018 were approved at the Florida Cabinet Meeting held on October 17, 2017.

The Office of External Affairs (OEA) is responsible for coordinating statewide communications, managing FDLE's policy and performance systems, and serving as liaison to stakeholders. FDLE maintains a Performance Measures Guide, which includes descriptions for cabinet measures, measures found in the LRPP, and other measures used for internal reporting and tracking purposes. FDLE's Performance Accountability Measurement System (PAMS) is the mechanism for listing FDLE performance measures, providing standards for the measures, and tracking progress toward achieving those standards. FDLE program members develop the measures, collect data, and report results to the OEA. The OEA maintains the PAMS spreadsheet.

Section 216.013, F.S., requires assessment of validity and reliability of performance data. Section 20.055, F.S., designates the Office of Inspector General (OIG) as the entity responsible for such assessments and requires that the OIG "assess the reliability and validity of the information provided by the state agency on performance measures and standards, and make recommendations for improvement, if necessary, before submission of such information pursuant to s. 216.1827."

RESULTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Measure 1: *Number of intelligence reports/percentage of intelligence reports that address a priority information need.* (Investigations and Forensic Science)

This is a new measure. It compares the number of intelligence reports created in a given period to the number of intelligence reports that address a priority information need in that period. The FDLE Office of Statewide Intelligence (OSI) develops and maintains a list of FDLE Standing Information Needs (FSIN) to document the persistent intelligence needs of the agency. Priority Information Needs and Commissioner's Priority Needs, collectively "Priority Needs," are a subset of FSINs designated as having top priority.

FDLE members enter investigative reports into the Automated Information Management System (AIM). Reports in AIM can be flagged or "highlighted" based on the FSIN(s) to which they relate. Reports with FSIN highlights are considered intelligence reports. The LRPP methodology indicates that the number of reports will be calculated by taking the number of intelligence reports as derived by counting the number of investigative reports that have been

flagged in the AIM with a highlight of intelligence. The methodology does not specify how the percentage of intelligence reports that address a priority information need will be calculated.

Results

The OSI provided a list of all intelligence reports in AIM for March 2018 and a list of those intelligence reports that had also been highlighted as a priority need. Each report in AIM can have more than one highlight. When the report was generated from AIM, a separate record for each unique combination of case number, report number, and highlight was created. If a report was assigned more than one highlight, a separate record was created for each highlight assigned. This resulted in some reports being listed more than once. The OSI calculated the percentage based on the number of records in these spreadsheets, including any duplicate records created for reports with multiple highlights. This resulted in over stating both the number of intelligence reports and also the number of reports with priority needs.

In addition, the spreadsheet includes many records that have different start and end dates; however, all of the start and end dates are in March. It appears that the data may have been run to show only reports that both started and ended in March. The OSI indicated that year-to-date numbers would be generated by adding the current month's data to what was reported in the prior report. This will be problematic if data is filtered for start and end in the same month as it will never capture reports with a start date in one month and an end date in another.

The measure in the LRPP references the percentage of _intelligence_ reports addressing a priority need. The LRPP methodology calls for the percentage of _investigative_ reports addressing a priority need. The methodology the OSI is using addresses the actual measure by looking only at intelligence reports.

Using the information given, the auditor calculated the measure by taking the number of records highlighted with priority needs (297) and dividing it by the total number of records highlighted with FSINs (1,344) to arrive at 22%. This is the same percentage calculated by the OSI. Then the auditor filtered the data to remove duplicate records and recalculated the measure. The corrected data included 257 reports highlighted with priority needs out of 1,077 unique intelligence reports for a calculation of 24%.

The mathematical calculation used to calculate the percentage is correct and would be valid if based on accurate data. The OSI does have sufficient data to calculate the measure correctly. If the data were filtered to remove duplicate reports and care was taken with the date filters, the measure would be valid. The reliability of the measure cannot be tested because it is a new measure. If the measure continues to be calculated in the same manner over time, the measure would be reliable.

Recommendations

To make this measure valid, we recommend that IFS management implement the following recommendations:

1. Ensure that data is filtered in such a way as to preclude duplicate reporting of individual reports.

2. Ensure that data is filtered by only one of the date fields so that reports crossing months will be captured.

3. Update the methodology in the LRPP to reflect the percentage of intelligence reports instead of the percentage of investigative reports.

4. Update the methodology in the LRPP to describe the calculation to be used to generate the percentage.

5. Review the numeric goals given in the LRPP to determine if they will still be appropriate once the count of reports is limited to unique reports.

Measure 2: *Percentage of registered sex predator/offender case reviews completed.* (Investigations and Forensic Science)

This is a new measure. It is based on the number of case reviews marked as closed in the Sexual Offender/Predator System (SOPS) compared to the number of new cases added to the system during the period.

The LRPP methodology indicates that the measure will be calculated by searching the database for the number of case reviews completed during the fiscal year-to-date and comparing it to the number of intakes for the fiscal year-to-date. The methodology specifies that these figures are maintained by the Missing Persons and Offender Registration Analyst in an Excel spreadsheet titled "Case Tracking."

Results
The Missing Persons and Offender Registration Unit within the Investigations and Forensic Science (IFS) Division calculates this measure by searching the SOPS for the number of new cases and closed cases for the current month and adding those to previous months to generate a year-to-date total. The OIG reviewed the Excel spreadsheet titled "LRPP Measure - Case Reviews.xlsx" used to maintain and calculate the data for fiscal year 2017-2018.

The methodology in use varies slightly from that given in the LRPP. The LRPP methodology is to search the database for year-to-date information. The actual methodology is to search the database for monthly information and bring forward the previous year-to-date information to generate a new year-to-date total. While the methodology used to calculate the measure varies slightly from the LRPP, it is functionally equivalent and would arrive at the same result.

Overall, the measure appears to be valid. However, the reliability of the measure cannot be tested because it is a new measure. If the measure continues to be calculated in the same manner over time, the measure would be reliable.

Recommendation
We recommend that IFS management update the methodology in the LRPP to reflect current practice.

Measure 3: *Number of missing person intelligence checks conducted.* (Investigations and Forensic Science)

This is a new measure. It is based on the number of intelligence checks as recorded in the Missing Endangered Persons Information Clearinghouse (MEPIC) database. The LRPP methodology indicates that the measure will be calculated by querying the number of intelligence checks added to the database during the month and combining that number with the number of missing persons intelligence checks year-to-date brought forward from the previous month to generate a year-to-date total. The methodology specifies that these figures will be maintained in an Excel spreadsheet with the title "PBB measure."

Results

The Missing Persons and Offender Registration Unit within IFS calculates this measure by querying the MEPIC database for the number of intelligence checks added year-to-date. The OIG reviewed a copy of the query that they will use to run the data and the current year-to-date results. The spreadsheet referenced in the LRPP was not provided. The methodology in use varies slightly from that given in the LRPP. The LRPP methodology is to search the database for monthly information and bring forward the previous year-to-date information to generate a new year-to-date total. The actual methodology is to search the database for year-to-date information. While the methodology used to calculate the measure varies slightly from the LRPP, it is functionally equivalent and would arrive at the same result.

Overall, the measure appears to be valid. However, the reliability of the measure cannot be tested because it is a new measure. If the measure continues to be calculated in the same manner over time, the measure would be reliable.

Recommendation

We recommend that IFS management update the methodology in the LRPP to reflect current practice.

Measure 4: *Percentage of criminal history record checks responded to within defined timeframes.* (Criminal Justice Information Services)

This is a revised measure. It reports the number of Criminal History Record Checks (CHRC) that are responded to within the defined timeframes. The Firearm Eligibility Bureau (FEB) within the Criminal Justice Information Services (CJIS) Division processes record checks related to firearm purchases. The User Services Bureau (USB) of CJIS processes all other record checks. Allowable timeframes vary based on the source of the records request.

The methodology in the LRPP is as follows: "If all sections monthly average turnaround times are within their respective allowed response time, the overall USB percentage will be 100%. If any section did not complete work within the allowed average for the month, a proportionate average for the entire bureau will be calculated. To obtain this average, the number of requests for the section(s) that did meet the allowed turnaround time will be divided by the total number of requests. This will result in the percentage that achieved turnaround time."

Results

The FEB provided reports of monthly data for March and July and also the supporting documentation. The USB provided reports of monthly data for March and April and also the supporting documentation. Overall, data was adequate to support the information in the reports and to support the percentage reported for each month; however, the information for this measure in the LRPP is not accurate:

- USB is no longer the sole responsible entity for CHRC.
- Specific documents referenced in the methodology are not the documents actually used to calculate the measure.
- The methodology does not sufficiently explain and justify why averages are used instead of a straight calculation.
- The selected methodology does not provide a valid calculation for the measure as stated. The measure is the percentage of criminal history record checks responded to within defined timeframes. The methodology calculates the percentage of sections for which the average turnaround time was within the defined timeframes.
- The methodology for the "proportionate average" is misstated; it should use the number of timely requests for all sections divided by the total number of requests.

The FEB spreadsheet is adequate to support that, on average, FPP responded to all CHRC within the defined timeframe. The accuracy of some of the details could be improved. Specific issues include:

- Original source documentation was not provided. Reports provided as source documentation for the FEB spreadsheets for February and March 2018 were generated on June 20. Source documentation provided for the FEB spreadsheets for July 2018 was generated on September 7.
- Data entered on the spreadsheet for March 2018 ONLINE-USER HOLD and TX times did not consistently match the source documentation provided. The auditor was unable to determine whether this was caused by data entry errors or by differences between original source data and the reports generated for this review.
- The calculations on the spreadsheet to support the average turnaround time for March were incorrect as they were based on only March 1 through 28. Similarly, the July turnaround time was based on July 1 through 30. The auditor recalculated the average, and the revised calculations were still well within the defined timeframe.
- The source documentation provided did not match the source documentation required on the instructions tab of the spreadsheet. Instructions on the July FEB spreadsheet had been updated to reflect actual source documentation used.
- Hold times on the report are not entered consistently. Hold times for CHRC requested through the Automated Call Distribution (ACD) System are rounded to the nearest whole minute. Hold times for requests through the Firearm Eligibility System are reported as exact minutes and seconds. The instructions on the spreadsheet state that both should be rounded to the nearest full minute.

- The daily "Total Avg Tx Time" is used to populate the "STATS" tab. The Daily transaction times given on the "STATS" tab are averaged to give the Monthly Average transaction time. The "Total Avg Tx Time" is populated based on the online user hold time, not the combined hold time for ACD and online users. It is not clear why the total response time for all types of transactions is not used.

If any section does not meet the required timeframe, CJIS calculates an actual percentage using the number of timely transactions and the total number of transactions. This is slightly different than what is documented in the LRPP methodology.

Based on the information provided, the measure is reliable, as it is calculated the same way each month. However, the measure is not valid. The measure is the percentage of criminal history record checks responded to within defined timeframes. Based on the methodology in use, we are actually reporting the percentage of sections for which the average turnaround time was within the defined timeframes. This results in a misleading response. We are reporting that 100% of our CHRC were completed timely, when the turnaround time for some individual CHRC exceeded the allowable turnaround time.

Recommendations

To make this measure valid, we recommend that CJIS management implement the following recommendations:

1. Discontinue the use of averages to calculate the measure. Instead, calculate the percentage by taking the total number of CHRC that were completed timely and dividing by the total number of CHRC that were completed.

2. Revise the LRPP to reflect accurate information about the measure and how it is calculated. If CJIS management continues the use of averages to calculate the percentage, revise the LRPP to explain and justify the use of averages.

3. Maintain original source documentation for all data reported.

4. Review quality control processes to ensure that information reported on the spreadsheets is accurate, complete, and consistent between areas.

Measure 5: *Percentage of customers with positive service rating.* (Office of External Affairs)

The percentage of customers with a positive service rating refers to the percentage of customers, in the last 12 months, who have an overall positive experience with the services offered by the Department. To gather this information, the Office of External Affairs (OEA) distributes a survey to the Department's customers. For the purposes of this survey, customers are defined as police departments, sheriffs' offices and state attorneys. The measure is calculated using data gathered from Question #21 of the survey: "Overall, how satisfied are you with the performance of FDLE?" Respondents who answered "very satisfied" or "satisfied" were aggregated and compared to the total number of responses to this question to determine the percent with a positive rating.

Results

The OIG reviewed the data collected from the surveys distributed in 2017 and 2018. Using the methodology described, the OIG recalculated the measure for each year and arrived at the same percentage as the OEA.

The measure appears to be both reliable and valid.

Recommendation

None

Other Findings

The following are overall issues noted throughout this review:

The methodologies in the LRPP are not consistent with actual practice. The LRPP should be reviewed and revised to ensure it agrees with how measures are actually calculated. For ease of maintenance, the LRPP should not reference specific documents by name, responsible parties by title, or types of documents by software program unless essential for an accurate understanding of the measure.

The Performance Measures Guide is outdated. The OEA maintains a Performance Measures Guide that includes each measure reported by the Department and provides a definition, data sources, and methodology for calculating this measure. The current version of this document is for fiscal year 2016-2017 and is dated October 2016. Therefore, it does not include the new measures that have been added and may contain information that is out of date. It is recommended that the Performance Measures Guide be reviewed and updated annually.

DISTRIBUTION AND PROJECT TEAM

Distribution

Richard L. Swearingen, Commissioner
Tom Foy, Assistant Commissioner
Jennifer Pritt, Assistant Commissioner
Ron Draa, External Affairs Director
Charles Schaeffer, Criminal Justice Information Services Director
Sherri Gomez, Chief of Policy and Planning

Project Team

Engagement conducted by:
Melody Gillander, Senior Management Analyst II

Under the supervision of:
Lourdes Howell-Thomas, Inspector General

Approved by:

_____ for
Lourdes Howell-Thomas, Inspector General

9.17.18
_____
Date