

State of Florida
Division of Administrative Hearings

Rick Scott
Governor

Robert S. Cohen
Director and Chief Judge

Claudia Lladó
Clerk of the Division



David M. Maloney
Deputy Chief
Administrative Law Judge

David W. Langham
Deputy Chief Judge
Judges of Compensation Claims

LONG RANGE PROGRAM PLAN

September 30, 2015

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

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

Cynthia Kynoch, Staff Director
Senate Budget Committee
201 Capitol
Tallahassee, Florida 32399-1300

Dear Directors,

Pursuant to Chapter 216, *Florida Statutes*, our Long Range Program Plan (LRPP) for the Division of Administrative Hearings is submitted in the format prescribed in the LRPP instructions. The information provided electronically and contained herein is a true and accurate presentation of our mission, goals, objectives and measures for Fiscal Year 2016-17 through Fiscal Year 2020-2021. The link to the LRPP, located on the Florida Fiscal Portal, may be found on the Division's web site at: <http://www.doah.state.fl.us/ALJ/Reports.asp>

Sincerely,

Robert S. Cohen
Director and Chief Judge

/cja

DIVISION OF ADMINISTRATIVE HEARINGS



LONG RANGE PROGRAM PLAN

**FISCAL YEAR 2016-2017 THROUGH
FISCAL YEAR 2020-2021**

September 30, 2015

**MISSION OF THE
DIVISION OF ADMINISTRATIVE HEARINGS**

Impartially Adjudicate Disputes

To provide a uniform and impartial forum for the trial and resolution of disputes between private citizens and organizations and agencies of the state in an efficient and timely manner.

To maintain a statewide mediation and adjudication system for the efficient and timely resolution of disputed workers' compensation claims.

**GOAL OF THE
DIVISION OF ADMINISTRATIVE HEARINGS**

Improve the statewide adjudication and mediation processes.

OBJECTIVES OF THE DIVISION OF ADMINISTRATIVE HEARINGS

GOAL 1: Improve the statewide adjudication and mediation processes.

OBJECTIVE 1A: To increase the number of administrative law cases that can reasonably be closed within 120 days after filing to a rate greater than the baseline year rate and maintain that rate increase throughout the planning period.

OBJECTIVE 1B: To increase the number of petitions for benefits that can reasonably be closed within the statutory timeframe to a rate greater than the baseline year rate and maintain that rate increase throughout the planning period.

SERVICE OUTCOMES AND PERFORMANCE PROJECTIONS TABLES OF THE DIVISION OF ADMINISTRATIVE HEARINGS

GOAL 1: Improve the statewide adjudication and mediation processes.

OBJECTIVE 1A: To increase the number of administrative law cases that can reasonably be closed within 120 days after filing to a rate greater than the baseline year rate and maintain that rate increase throughout the planning period.

OUTCOME: Percent of cases closed within 120 days after filing.

| Baseline FY 1998-99 | FY 2016-17 | FY 2017-18 | FY 2018-19 | FY 2019-20 | FY 2020-21 |
|--------------------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|
| 61% | 76% | 76% | 76% | 76% | 76% |

OBJECTIVE 1B: To increase the number of petitions for benefits that can reasonably be closed within the statutory timeframe to a rate greater than the baseline year rate and maintain that rate increase throughout the planning period.

OUTCOME: Percent of petitions closed within the statutory timeframe.

| Baseline FY 2003-04 | FY 2016-17 | FY 2017-18 | FY 2018-19 | FY 2019-20 | FY 2020-21 |
|--------------------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|
| 40% | 80% | 80% | 80% | 80% | 80% |

DIVISION OF ADMINISTRATIVE HEARINGS

TRENDS AND CONDITIONS STATEMENT

The Division of Administrative Hearings (DOAH) is unique because it is a small, independent, quasi-judicial agency established within the Department of Management Services for the provision of support services only. The Division has only two programs (services): Adjudication of Disputes and Workers' Compensation Appeals. These programs are mutually exclusive and equally important to the State of Florida. Hence, they are equally weighted as the Division's "number one" priority. No substantive revisions to the Division's programs or current structure are recommended over the five-year planning period.

With regard to the Adjudication of Disputes program, the Division of Administrative Hearings provides independent Administrative Law Judges (ALJs) to conduct hearings pursuant to Sections 120.569 and 120.57(1), Florida Statutes, pursuant to other law, and under contract with governmental entities. The judges are not subject to control, supervision, or direction by any party or any department or commission of state government.

On October 1, 2001, the Workers' Compensation Appeals Program, Office of the Judges of Compensation Claims (OJCC), was transferred to the Division of Administrative Hearings from the Department of Labor and Employment Security. The primary responsibility of this program is to dispose of disputed workers' compensation claims through mediation and adjudication. The Office of the Judges of Compensation Claims is created in Section 440.45(1), Florida Statutes. The conducting of pre-trial and final hearings is mandated in Section 440.25, Florida Statutes, and the mandatory mediation program is outlined also in Section 440.25, Florida Statutes. Other duties of the Office of the Judges of Compensation Claims are detailed throughout Chapter 440, Florida Statutes.

In order to facilitate the Division's response to public records requests for emails, an improved enterprise email archiving solution was implemented in August 2014. This solution, based on Microsoft Exchange 2010 technology, features journaling, archiving, and long-term retention of all Division emails. Electronic Filing Electronic service of incoming pleadings to registered parties was implemented for the Adjudication of Disputes (eALJ) cases in December 2014. For calendar year 2014, there were 34,494 documents uploaded via the eALJ filing portal; 47,052 documents were served (via email) to parties of record. For the OJCC, 540,719 documents were uploaded via the eJCC filing portal; 1,362,358 documents were electronically served.

Beginning July 1, 2015 pursuant to Chapter 2015-155, Laws of Florida, all agencies must electronically transmit their agency orders to the Division's website for indexing purposes. The Division is now receiving orders from twenty-one agencies and commissions.

In August 2014, a single circuit judge from the State's 11th Judicial Circuit Court issued an opinion declaring section 440.11, Florida Statutes, unconstitutional. In June 2015, the Florida Third District Court of Appeal reversed the decision. It is not known at this time if the case will end up before the Florida Supreme Court.

The primary outcome measure for the Adjudication of Disputes service relates to the timeliness of the adjudication process. In Fiscal Year (FY) 2014-15, timeliness improved from the previous fiscal year. The Division closed 88% of its cases within 120 days after filing, and scheduled for hearing 93% of its cases within 90 days after filing. This program continues to supply high-quality adjudication of disputes pursuant to the Administrative Procedure Act, and cases move through the Division at a far faster rate than through the state court system. This program met or exceeded all of its performance goals for FY 2014-15. The FY 2016-17 requested standards equal prior-year approved standards.

The primary outcome measure for the Workers' Compensation Appeals service also relates to the timeliness of the adjudication process. In FY 2014-15, the OJCC closed 91% of petitions within the statutory timeframe of 210 days. Due to continued efforts in data maintenance, timely docketing of orders, and added database functionality, this program's performance has significantly improved over the last few years. This program met or exceeded all of its true performance goals for FY 2014-15. The two goals that were not met were number of mediations held and number of petitions closed. These are entirely dependent upon incoming caseload, which is beyond the Division's control. The FY 2016-17 requested standards equal prior-year approved standards.

In FY 2014-15 the resolution rate for state mediations decreased slightly to 54%. Mediation timeliness remained constant; 97% of mediations were held within 130 days, and all of the mediators achieved the goal of holding mediations within an average of 130 days.

The Workers' Compensation Appeals program achieved all of its performance goals except for the two measures which are directly related to the number of incoming petitions – number of petitions closed

Funds and positions appropriated to the Division do not impact demand. Demand for the Adjudication of Disputes program is defined as the number of cases filed by the parties to administrative proceedings, including those cases that are carried forward from the preceding fiscal year. Demand for the Workers' Compensation Appeals program is defined as the number of petitions for benefits filed, including those petitions that are carried forward from the preceding fiscal year. Parties will continue to file cases at a rate independent of the Division's funding and workforce levels. The Division has no control over the demand for its services.

The Division is not aware of any significant policy changes that could affect its FY 2016-17 Legislative Budget Request (LBR). There are no requested changes in the Division's

approved programs, services or activities that would require substantive legislative action, including elimination of or combining its programs, services, or activities.

The Division is not aware of any audits, studies or task forces in progress that are related to either of its services.

DIVISION OF ADMINISTRATIVE HEARINGS

PERFORMANCE MEASURES AND STANDARDS - LRPP EXHIBIT II

LRPP Exhibit II - Performance Measures and Standards

| | |
|---|--------------------------|
| Department: DMS/Division of Administrative Hearings | Department No.: 72970000 |
|---|--------------------------|

| | |
|---|----------------|
| Program: Adjudication of Disputes | Code: 72970100 |
| Service/Budget Entity: Adjudication of Disputes | Code: 72970100 |

NOTE: Approved primary service outcomes must be listed first.

| Approved Performance Measures for FY 2015-16 (Words) | Approved Prior Year Standard FY 2014-15 (Numbers) | Prior Year Actual FY 2014-15 (Numbers) | Approved Standards for FY 2015-16 (Numbers) | Requested FY 2016-17 Standard (Numbers) |
|--|--|--|--|--|
| Percent of cases closed within 120 days after filing | 76% | 88% | 76% | 76% |
| Percent of cases scheduled for hearing within 90 days after filing | 90% | 93% | 90% | 90% |
| Number of cases closed | 6,000 | 6,060 | 6,000 | 6,000 |
| Percent of professional licensure cases closed within 120 days after filing | 77% | 77% | 77% | 77% |
| Percent of professional licensure cases scheduled for hearing within 90 days after filing | 95% | 99% | 95% | 95% |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |

LRPP Exhibit II - Performance Measures and Standards

| | |
|---|--------------------------|
| Department: DMS/Division of Administrative Hearings | Department No.: 72970000 |
|---|--------------------------|

| | |
|---|----------------|
| Program: Worker Comp/Judges | Code: 72970200 |
| Service/Budget Entity: Worker Comp/Judges | Code: 72970200 |

NOTE: Approved primary service outcomes must be listed first.

| Approved Performance Measures for FY 2015-16 (Words) | Approved Prior Year Standard FY 2014-15 (Numbers) | Prior Year Actual FY 2014-15 (Numbers) | Approved Standards for FY 2015-16 (Numbers) | Requested FY 2016-17 Standard (Numbers) |
|--|--|--|--|--|
| Percent of petitions closed within the statutory timeframe | 80% | 91% | 80% | 80% |
| Number of petitions closed | 65,000 | 60,825 | 65,000 | 65,000 |
| Average number of days from date petition filed to date petition closed | 210 | 138 | 210 | 210 |
| Percent of timely held mediations (130 days) | 86% | 97% | 86% | 86% |
| Number of mediations held | 20,000 | 15,421 | 20,000 | 20,000 |
| Percent of concluded mediations resulting in resolution (all issues except attorneys fees) | 52% | 54% | 52% | 52% |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |

DIVISION OF ADMINISTRATIVE HEARINGS

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

LRPP Exhibit III: PERFORMANCE MEASURE ASSESSMENT

Department: DMS/Division of Administrative Hearings
Program: Workers' Compensation Appeals - Judges of Compensation Claims
Service/Budget Entity: Workers' Compensation Appeals - Judges of Compensation Claims
Measure: Number of Petitions Closed

Action:

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

| Approved Standard | Actual Performance Results | Difference (Over/Under) | Percentage Difference |
|-------------------|----------------------------|-------------------------|-----------------------|
| 65,000 | 60,825 | (4,175) | (6%) |

Factors Accounting for the Difference:

Internal Factors (check all that apply):

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

Explanation:

The approved standard for FY 2014-15 was based on data from previous fiscal years, when the number of incoming petitions for benefits was higher.

External Factors (check all that apply):

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

Explanation:

In FY 2014-15, the number of petitions filed increased from 59,292 to 60,021. However, there has been an overall decrease of (60%) in the number of petitions for benefits filed since FY 2002-03.

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

- Training
 Personnel

- Technology
 Other – Evaluate Standard

Recommendations:

The Office of the Judges of Compensation Claims requests that the FY 2016-17 remain at 65,000. Due to changes made to the workers' compensation statute in October 2003, the number of incoming petitions has fallen dramatically from 150,801 in FY 2002-03 to 60,021 in FY 2013-14.

The OJCC will continue to monitor the number of incoming petitions in 2015-16 and may submit a budget amendment to change this standard to an achievable level.

LRPP Exhibit III: PERFORMANCE MEASURE ASSESSMENT

Department: DMS/Division of Administrative Hearings
Program: Workers' Compensation Appeals - Judges of Compensation Claims
Service/Budget Entity: Workers' Compensation Appeals - Judges of Compensation Claims
Measure: Number of Mediations Held

Action:

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

| Approved Standard | Actual Performance Results | Difference (Over/Under) | Percentage Difference |
|-------------------|----------------------------|-------------------------|-----------------------|
| 20,000 | 16,421 | (4,579) | (23%) |

Factors Accounting for the Difference:

Internal Factors (check all that apply):

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

Explanation:

The approved standard for FY 2014-15 was based on data from previous fiscal years, when the number of incoming petitions for benefits was higher.

External Factors (check all that apply):

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

Explanation:

In FY 2014-15, the number of petitions filed increased from 59,292 to 60,021. However, there has been an overall decrease of (60%) in the number of petitions for benefits filed since FY 2002-03.

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

- Training
- Personnel

- Technology
- Other – Evaluate Standard

Recommendations:

The Office of the Judges of Compensation Claims requests that the FY 2016-17 remain at 20,000. Due to changes made to the workers' compensation statute in October 2003, the number of incoming petitions has fallen dramatically from 150,801 in FY 2002-03 to 60,021 in FY 2014-15.

The OJCC will continue to monitor the number of incoming petitions in 2015-16 and may submit a budget amendment to change this standard to an achievable level.

DIVISION OF ADMINISTRATIVE HEARINGS

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

LRPP EXHIBIT IV: Performance Measure Validity and Reliability

Department: DMS/Division of Administrative Hearings

Program: Adjudication of Disputes

Service/Budget Entity: Adjudication of Disputes

Measure: Percent of Cases Closed Within 120 Days After Filing

Action (check one):

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

Data Sources and Methodology:

The Division's electronic database, entitled the "Case Management System" (CMS), is the data source for this measure, and an automated computer program is utilized to provide the data for calculating the standard. The percentage is calculated by dividing the number of cases closed within 120 days after filing in a specified year by the total number of cases filed during that same period.

The FY 2014-15 standard of 88% was calculated by dividing the number of cases closed within 120 days after filing (5,544) by the total number of cases filed (6,315) during the period March 1, 2014 through February 28, 2015. This time period is used to determine all of the output and outcome standards for this service so that all indicators are based on the same group of cases. If data were collected for the most recently completed fiscal year (FY 2014-15) instead, some cases filed during the last four months of that year that also closed within 120 days, but after June 30, would not be captured. For example, a case filed on June 29 that was closed on October 19 (within 120 days) would not be counted (even though it met the criterion) because it was closed after the fiscal year ended on June 30 and after submission of the Long Range Program Plan in September, 2015.

Validity:

Validity refers to the fit between an operational definition and the concept it is purported to measure. This indicator is a valid measure of the outcome because it meets the criteria of two of the three types of statistical validation: (1) subjective validation (face validity), and (2) criterion-related validation. First, on the face of it, this indicator appears to measure the concept it is intended to measure (face validity). Second, the content or apparent meaning of this measure is not as important as its usefulness as an indicator of the outcome (criterion-related validity). The test of this type of validity is the ability of this measure to classify or group data in terms of a single criterion (percent of cases closed within 120 days after filing).

This indicator is a valid measure of how timely the Division is closing its cases. Most citizens and agencies of the state are interested in resolving their disputes as quickly as

possible. Hence, this is a reasonable and sensible method of assessing performance against targeted time frames.

The Division's CMS database, the data source for this measure, is also valid. It has evolved to its present state over the last 31 years, and is the basis for the generation of numerous statistical reports on the Division's operations. To validate the accuracy of the CMS database, a statistically valid sample could be drawn from the case files. For example, a systematic random sample of computerized data on cases could be validated against the actual case files.

Reliability:

Reliability assessment is essentially a matter of checking for consistency; if a measure yields the same result time after time, then it is free of random error. This indicator is a reliable measure of the Division's outcome because of its test-retest and intercoder reliability. The test-retest procedure is the simplest method for assessing reliability and involves measuring the outcome (the percent of cases closed within 120 days after filing) on two separate occasions. The intercoder method involves examining the extent to which different persons using the same measurement procedures get equivalent results.

When any action is taken on a case (including case filing and closure), or when any case-related documentation is received or disseminated, an entry is made on the case's official docket, which is part of the CMS database. The Clerk's Office has incorporated a comprehensive system of checks and balances to insure that the Division's electronic and hard copy case files are up-to-date, accurate, and complete. Hence, this reliable outcome measure will not vary over time. Each time a measurement is taken, the quality of the results will be consistent.

LRPP EXHIBIT IV: Performance Measure Validity and Reliability

Department: DMS/Division of Administrative Hearings

Program: Adjudication of Disputes

Service/Budget Entity: Adjudication of Disputes

Measure: Percent of Cases Scheduled for Hearing Within 90 Days After Filing

Action (check one):

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

Data Sources and Methodology:

The Division's electronic database, entitled the "Case Management System" (CMS), is the data source for this measure, and an automated computer program is utilized to provide the data for calculating the standard. The percentage is calculated by dividing the number of cases scheduled for hearing within 90 days after filing in a specified year by the total number of cases filed during that same period.

The FY 2014-15 standard of 93% was calculated by dividing the number of cases scheduled for hearing within 90 days after filing (5,844) by the total number of cases filed (6,315) during the period March 1, 2014 through February 28, 2015. This time period is used to determine all of the output and outcome standards for this service so that all indicators are based on the same group of cases. See the Exhibit IV for the outcome measure entitled "*Percent of Cases Closed Within 120 Days After Filing*" for the rationale supporting selection of this date range.

Validity:

Validity refers to the fit between an operational definition and the concept it is purported to measure. This indicator is a valid measure of the outcome because it meets the criteria of two of the three types of statistical validation: (1) subjective validation (face validity), and (2) criterion-related validation. First, on the face of it, this indicator appears to measure the concept it is intended to measure (face validity). Second, the content or apparent meaning of this measure is not as important as its usefulness as an indicator of the outcome (criterion-related validity). The test of this type of validity is the ability of this measure to classify or group data in terms of a single criterion (percent of cases scheduled for hearing within 90 days after filing).

This indicator is a valid measure of how timely the Division is scheduling hearings. Most citizens and agencies of the state are interested in resolving their disputes as quickly as possible. Hence, this is a reasonable and sensible method of assessing performance against targeted time frames.

The Division's CMS database, the data source for this measure, is also valid. It has evolved to its present state over the last 31 years, and is the basis for the generation of numerous statistical reports on the Division's operations. To validate the accuracy of the CMS database, a statistically valid sample could be drawn from the case files. For example, a systematic random sample of computerized data on cases could be validated against the actual case files.

Reliability:

Reliability assessment is essentially a matter of checking for consistency; if a measure yields the same result time after time, then it is free of random error. This indicator is a reliable measure of the Division's outcome because of its test-retest and intercoder reliability. The test-retest procedure is the simplest method for assessing reliability and involves measuring the outcome (the percent of cases scheduled for hearing within 90 days after filing) on two separate occasions. The intercoder method involves examining the extent to which different persons using the same measurement procedures get equivalent results.

When any action is taken on a case (including the scheduling of hearings), or when any case-related documentation is received or disseminated, an entry is made on the case's official docket, which is part of the CMS database. The Clerk's Office has incorporated a comprehensive system of checks and balances to insure that the Division's electronic and hard copy case files are up-to-date, accurate, and complete. Hence, this reliable outcome measure will not vary over time. Each time a measurement is taken, the quality of the results will be consistent.

LRPP EXHIBIT IV: Performance Measure Validity and Reliability

Department: DMS/Division of Administrative Hearings

Program: Adjudication of Disputes

Service/Budget Entity: Adjudication of Disputes

Measure: Number of Cases Closed

Action (check one):

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

Data Sources and Methodology:

The Division's electronic database, entitled the "Case Management System" (CMS), is the data source for this measure. An automated computer program is utilized to provide a count of all cases closed during a given year (or any other time period specified).

For the FY 2014-15 standard, data was collected for the period March 1, 2014 through February 28, 2015. This time period is used to determine all of the output and outcome standards for this service so that all indicators are based on the same group of cases. See the Exhibit IV for the outcome measure entitled "*Percent of Cases Closed Within 120 Days After Filing*" for the rationale supporting selection of this date range. The CMS program provided the count of 6,060 cases closed.

Validity:

Validity refers to the fit between an operational definition and the concept it is purported to measure. This indicator is a valid measure of the Division's output because it meets the criteria of two of the three types of statistical validation: (1) subjective validation (face validity), and (2) criterion-related validation. First, on the face of it, this indicator appears to measure the concept it is intended to measure (face validity). Second, the content or apparent meaning of this measure is not as important as its usefulness as an indicator of output (criterion-related validity). The test of this type of validity is the ability of this measure to classify or group data in terms of a single criterion (number of cases closed).

The Division's CMS database, the data source for this measure, is also valid. It has evolved to its present state over the last 31 years, and is the basis for the generation of numerous statistical reports on the Division's operations. To validate the accuracy of the CMS database, a statistically valid sample could be drawn from the case files. For example, a systematic random sample of computerized data on cases could be validated against the actual case files.

Reliability:

Reliability assessment is essentially a matter of checking for consistency; if a measure yields the same result time after time, then it is free of random error. This indicator is a reliable measure of the Division's output because of its test-retest and intercoder reliability. The test-retest procedure is the simplest method for assessing reliability and involves measuring output (the number of cases closed) on two separate occasions. The intercoder method involves examining the extent to which different persons using the same measurement procedures get equivalent results.

When any action is taken on a case (including case closure), or when any case-related documentation is received or disseminated, an entry is made on the case's official docket, which is part of the CMS database. The Clerk's Office has incorporated a comprehensive system of checks and balances to insure that the Division's electronic and hard copy case files are up-to-date, accurate, and complete. Hence, this reliable output measure will not vary over time. Each time a measurement is taken, the quality of the results will be consistent.

LRPP EXHIBIT IV: Performance Measure Validity and Reliability

Department: DMS/Division of Administrative Hearings
Program: Adjudication of Disputes
Service/Budget Entity: Adjudication of Disputes
Measure: Percent of Professional Licensure (PL) Cases Closed
Within 120 Days After Filing

Action (check one):

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

Data Sources and Methodology:

The Division's electronic database, entitled the "Case Management System" (CMS), is the data source for this measure, and an automated computer program is utilized to provide the data for calculating the standard. The percentage is calculated by dividing the number of professional licensure (PL) cases closed within 120 days after filing in a specified year by the total number of PL cases filed during that same period.

The FY 2014-15 standard of 77% was calculated by dividing the number of PL cases closed within 120 days after filing (174) by the total number of PL cases filed (225) during the period March 1, 2014 through February 28, 2015. This time period is used to determine all of the output and outcome standards for this service so that all indicators are based on the same group of cases. See the Exhibit IV for the outcome measure entitled "*Percent of Cases Closed Within 120 Days After Filing*" for the rationale supporting selection of this date range.

Validity:

Validity refers to the fit between an operational definition and the concept it is purported to measure. This indicator is a valid measure of the outcome because it meets the criteria of two of the three types of statistical validation: (1) subjective validation (face validity), and (2) criterion-related validation. First, on the face of it, this indicator appears to measure the concept it is intended to measure (face validity). Second, the content or apparent meaning of this measure is not as important as its usefulness as an indicator of the outcome (criterion-related validity). The test of this type of validity is the ability of this measure to classify or group data in terms of a single criterion (percent of PL cases closed within 120 days after filing).

This indicator is a valid measure of how timely the Division is closing its cases. Most citizens and agencies of the state are interested in resolving their disputes as quickly as possible. Hence, this is a reasonable and sensible method of assessing performance against targeted time frames.

The Division's CMS database, the data source for this measure, is also valid. It has evolved to its present state over the last 31 years, and is the basis for the generation of numerous statistical reports on the Division's operations. To validate the accuracy of the CMS database, a statistically valid sample could be drawn from the case files. For example, a systematic random sample of computerized data on cases could be validated against the actual case files.

Reliability:

Reliability assessment is essentially a matter of checking for consistency; if a measure yields the same result time after time, then it is free of random error. This indicator is a reliable measure of the Division's outcome because of its test-retest and intercoder reliability. The test-retest procedure is the simplest method for assessing reliability and involves measuring the outcome (the percent of PL cases closed within 120 days after filing) on two separate occasions. The intercoder method involves examining the extent to which different persons using the same measurement procedures get equivalent results.

When any action is taken on a case (including case filing and closure), or when any case-related documentation is received or disseminated, an entry is made on the case's official docket, which is part of the CMS database. The Clerk's Office has incorporated a comprehensive system of checks and balances to insure that the Division's electronic and hard copy case files are up-to-date, accurate, and complete. Hence, this reliable outcome measure will not vary over time. Each time a measurement is taken, the quality of the results will be consistent.

LRPP EXHIBIT IV: Performance Measure Validity and Reliability

Department: DMS/Division of Administrative Hearings
Program: Adjudication of Disputes
Service/Budget Entity: Adjudication of Disputes
Measure: Percent of Professional Licensure (PL) Cases Scheduled for Hearing Within 90 Days After Filing

Action (check one):

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

Data Sources and Methodology:

The Division's electronic database, entitled the "Case Management System" (CMS), is the data source for this measure, and an automated computer program is utilized to provide the data for calculating the standard. The percentage is calculated by dividing the number of professional licensure (PL) cases scheduled for hearing within 90 days after filing in a specified year by the total number of PL cases filed during that same period.

The FY 2014-15 standard of 99% was calculated by dividing the number of PL cases scheduled for hearing within 90 days after filing (224) by the total number of PL cases filed (225) during the period March 1, 2014 through February 28, 2015. This time period is used to determine all of the output and outcome standards for this service so that all indicators are based on the same group of cases. See the Exhibit IV for the outcome measure entitled "*Percent of Cases Closed Within 120 Days After Filing*" for the rationale supporting selection of this date range.

Validity:

Validity refers to the fit between an operational definition and the concept it is purported to measure. This indicator is a valid measure of the outcome because it meets the criteria of two of the three types of statistical validation: (1) subjective validation (face validity), and (2) criterion-related validation. First, on the face of it, this indicator appears to measure the concept it is intended to measure (face validity). Second, the content or apparent meaning of this measure is not as important as its usefulness as an indicator of the outcome (criterion-related validity). The test of this type of validity is the ability of this measure to classify or group data in terms of a single criterion (percent of PL cases scheduled for hearing within 90 days after filing).

This indicator is a valid measure of how timely the Division is scheduling hearings. Most citizens and agencies of the state are interested in resolving their disputes as quickly as possible. Hence, this is a reasonable and sensible method of assessing performance against targeted time frames.

The Division's CMS database, the data source for this measure, is also valid. It has evolved to its present state over the last 31 years, and is the basis for the generation of numerous statistical reports on the Division's operations. To validate the accuracy of the CMS database, a statistically valid sample could be drawn from the case files. For example, a systematic random sample of computerized data on cases could be validated against the actual case files.

Reliability:

Reliability assessment is essentially a matter of checking for consistency; if a measure yields the same result time after time, then it is free of random error. This indicator is a reliable measure of the Division's outcome because of its test-retest and intercoder reliability. The test-retest procedure is the simplest method for assessing reliability and involves measuring the outcome (the percent of PL cases scheduled for hearing within 90 days after filing) on two separate occasions. The intercoder method involves examining the extent to which different persons using the same measurement procedures get equivalent results.

When any action is taken on a case (including the scheduling of hearings), or when any case-related documentation is received or disseminated, an entry is made on the case's official docket, which is part of the CMS database. The Clerk's Office has incorporated a comprehensive system of checks and balances to insure that the Division's electronic and hard copy case files are up-to-date, accurate, and complete. Hence, this reliable outcome measure will not vary over time. Each time a measurement is taken, the quality of the results will be consistent.

LRPP EXHIBIT IV: Performance Measure Validity and Reliability

Department: DMS/Division of Administrative Hearings
Program: Workers' Compensation Appeals - Judges of Compensation Claims
Service/Budget Entity: Workers' Compensation Appeals - Judges of Compensation Claims
Measure: Percent of Petitions Closed Within the Statutory Timeframe

Action (check one):

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

Data Sources and Methodology:

The Division's electronic database, entitled the "Case Management System" (CMS), is the data source for this measure. An automated computer program is utilized to provide the data for calculating the standard. The percentage is calculated by dividing the number of petitions closed within the statutory timeframe in a specified year by the total number of petitions closed during that year.

Petitions for benefits are entered into the CMS upon receipt by the Clerk's Office. Data is recorded from the petition including the date it was filed. A petition can be closed several different ways: (1) voluntarily dismissed by the claimant, (2) dismissed by the judge, or (3) addressed by a disposition order (i.e. final merit, settlement, stipulation). As petitions are closed, staff enter the closing date into CMS. The FY 2014-15 standard of 91% was calculated by dividing the number of petitions closed within the statutory timeframe (55,401) by the number of petitions closed that year (60,825).

Validity:

Validity refers to the fit between an operational definition and the concept it is purported to measure. This indicator is a valid measure of the outcome because it meets the criteria of two of the three types of statistical validation: (1) subjective validation (face validity), and (2) criterion-related validation. First, on the face of it, this indicator appears to measure the concept it is intended to measure (face validity). Second, the content or apparent meaning of this measure is not as important as its usefulness as an indicator of the outcome (criterion-related validity). The test of this type of validity is the ability of this measure to classify or group data in terms of a single criterion (Percent of petitions closed within the statutory timeframe). This indicator is a valid measure of how timely the Office of the Judges of Compensation Claims is closing its cases.

Reliability:

Reliability assessment is essentially a matter of checking for consistency; if a measure yields the same result time after time, then it is free of random error. This indicator is a reliable measure of the Division's outcome because of its test-retest and intercoder reliability. The test-retest procedure is the simplest method for assessing reliability and involves measuring the outcome (the percent of petitions closed within the statutory timeframe) on two separate occasions. The intercoder method involves examining the extent to which different persons using the same measurement procedures get equivalent results.

As petitions are closed, judges' staff enter this data into the CMS database and it becomes a permanent part of the record. Data are collected in a consistent manner, applying the same methodology and can be duplicated to achieve the same results.

LRPP EXHIBIT IV: Performance Measure Validity and Reliability

Department: DMS/Division of Administrative Hearings

Program: Workers' Compensation Appeals - Judges of Compensation Claims

Service/Budget Entity: Workers' Compensation Appeals - Judges of Compensation Claims

Measure: Number of Petitions Closed

Action (check one):

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

Data Sources and Methodology:

The Division's electronic database, entitled the "Case Management System" (CMS), is the data source for this measure. An automated computer program is utilized to provide a count of all petitions for benefits closed during a given year (or any other time period specified).

Petitions for benefits are entered into the "Case Management System" upon receipt by the Clerk's Office. Data from the petition is recorded including the filing date. A petition can be closed several different ways: (1) voluntarily dismissed by the claimant, (2) dismissed by the judge, or (3) addressed by a disposition order (i.e. final merit, settlement, stipulation). As petitions are closed, staff enter the data into CMS.

The CMS database provided the count of 60,825 petitions closed in FY 2014-15.

Validity:

For every workers' compensation dispute, one or more petitions for benefits may be filed, and these petitions request one or more benefits. The petition is closed when it is voluntarily dismissed by the claimant, dismissed by the judge, or addressed by a disposition order (i.e. final merit, settlement, stipulation). This measure evaluates the productivity of the process. Petitions for benefits represent the demand for the Judges of Compensation Claims service. The number of petitions for benefits closed is a valid measure to use in calculating unit costs.

Reliability:

Reliability assessment is essentially a matter of checking for consistency; if a measure yields the same result time after time, then it is free of random error. This indicator is a reliable measure of the Division's output because of its test-retest and intercoder reliability. The test-retest procedure is the simplest method for assessing reliability and involves measuring the output (the number of petitions for benefits closed) on two

separate occasions. The intercoder method involves examining the extent to which different persons using the same measurement procedure get equivalent results.

As petitions for benefits are closed, judges' staff enter this data into the database and it becomes a permanent part of the record. Data are collected in a consistent manner, applying the same methodology and can be duplicated to achieve the same results.

LRPP EXHIBIT IV: Performance Measure Validity and Reliability

Department: DMS/Division of Administrative Hearings
Program: Workers' Compensation Appeals - Judges of Compensation Claims
Service/Budget Entity: Workers' Compensation Appeals - Judges of Compensation Claims
Measure: Average Number of Days From Date Petition Filed to Date Petition Closed

Action (check one):

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

Data Sources and Methodology:

The Division's electronic database, entitled the "Case Management System" (CMS), is the data source for this measure. An automated computer program is utilized to calculate the average number of days from the petition filed date to the petition closed date.

Petitions for benefits are entered into the "Case Management System" upon receipt by the Clerk's Office. Data is recorded from the petition including the filing date. A petition can be closed several different ways: (1) voluntarily dismissed by the claimant, (2) dismissed by the judge, or (3) addressed by a disposition order (i.e. final merit, settlement, stipulation). As petitions are closed, staff enter the data into CMS.

The CMS program calculated the FY 2014-15 standard of 138 days, which is a slight decrease from the FY 2013-14 standard of 118 days.

Validity:

Validity refers to the fit between an operational definition and the concept it is purported to measure. This indicator is a valid measure of the outcome because it meets the criteria of two of the three types of statistical validation: (1) subjective validation (face validity), and (2) criterion-related validation. First, on the face of it, this indicator appears to measure the concept it is intended to measure (face validity). Second, the content or apparent meaning of this measure is not as important as its usefulness as an indicator of the outcome (criterion-related validity). The test of this type of validity is the ability of this measure to classify or group data in terms of a single criterion (the average number of days from petition filed to petition closed).

For every workers' compensation dispute, one or more petitions for benefits may be filed, and these petitions request one or more benefits. The petition is closed when it is voluntarily dismissed by the claimant, dismissed by the judge, or addressed by a disposition order (i.e. final merit, settlement, stipulation). This indicator is a valid

measure of how timely the Judges of Compensation Claims are closing petitions for benefits. The statutory timeframes begin with the filing of the petition for benefits.

Reliability:

Reliability assessment is essentially a matter of checking for consistency; if a measure yields the same result time after time, then it is free of random error. This indicator is a reliable measure of the Division's outcome because of its test-retest and intercoder reliability. The test-retest procedure is the simplest method for assessing reliability and involves measuring the outcome (the average number of days from petition filed to petition closed) on two separate occasions. The intercoder method involves examining the extent to which different persons using the same measurement procedures get equivalent results.

As petitions are closed, judges' staff enter this data into the database and it becomes a permanent part of the record. Data are collected in a consistent manner, applying the same methodology and can be duplicated to achieve the same results.

LRPP EXHIBIT IV: Performance Measure Validity and Reliability

Department: DMS/Division of Administrative Hearings

Program: Workers' Compensation Appeals - Judges of Compensation Claims

Service/Budget Entity: Workers' Compensation Appeals - Judges of Compensation Claims

Measure: Percent of Timely Held Mediations (130 days)

Action (check one):

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

Data Sources and Methodology:

The Division's electronic database, entitled the "Case Management System" (CMS), is the data source for this measure. The percentage is calculated by dividing the number of petitions mediated within the statutory timeframe in a specified year by the total number of petitions mediated during that year.

Petitions for benefits are entered into the CMS upon receipt by the Clerk's Office. Data is recorded from the petition including the date it was filed. Multiple petitions are addressed in each mediation. The FY 2014-15 performance standard of 97% was calculated by dividing the number of petitions mediated within 130 days after filing (21,416) by the number of petitions mediated that year (22,004).

Validity:

Validity refers to the fit between an operational definition and the concept it is purported to measure. This indicator is a valid measure of the outcome because it meets the criteria of two of the three types of statistical validation: (1) subjective validation (face validity), and (2) criterion-related validation. First, on the face of it, this indicator appears to measure the concept it is intended to measure (face validity). Second, the content or apparent meaning of this measure is not as important as its usefulness as an indicator of the outcome (criterion-related validity). The test of this type of validity is the ability of this measure to classify or group data in terms of a single criterion (the percent of mediations held within 130 days).

For every workers' compensation dispute, state mediators hold one or more mediation conferences unless the parties utilize private mediation or if the Deputy Chief Judge of Compensation Claims waives the mediation requirement. Each mediation conference addresses one or more petitions for benefits. Chapter 440.25, F.S. requires that if the Judges of Compensation Claims cannot mediate a petition within 130 days then a private mediation must take place. However, in the case where the Judges of Compensation Claims mediators were able to mediate the petition in a timely fashion but the parties

were not ready for mediation, the parties can request a continuance. This measure is a valid indicator of how many petitions were mediated beyond 130 days of their filed date.

Reliability:

Reliability assessment is essentially a matter of checking for consistency; if a measure yields the same result time after time, then it is free of random error. This indicator is a reliable measure of the Division's outcome because of its test-retest and intercoder reliability. The test-retest procedure is the simplest method for assessing reliability and involves measuring the outcome (the percent of mediations held within 130 days) on two separate occasions. The intercoder method involves examining the extent to which different persons using the same measurement procedures get equivalent results.

As mediation conferences are scheduled, rescheduled, held, etc. this information is kept on the mediators' computerized calendars. Any information remains in the database and can be replicated at any time. Data are collected in a consistent manner, compiled on a monthly and annual basis, using the same data sources, applying the same methodology and can be duplicated to achieve the same result.

LRPP EXHIBIT IV: Performance Measure Validity and Reliability

Department: DMS/Division of Administrative Hearings
Program: Workers' Compensation Appeals - Judges of Compensation Claims
Service/Budget Entity: Workers' Compensation Appeals - Judges of Compensation Claims
Measure: Number of Mediations Held

Action (check one):

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

Data Sources and Methodology:

The data source is the Division's electronic database, entitled the "Case Management System" (CMS). This measure is a simple count of the number of mediation conferences held by state mediators throughout the state of Florida on a fiscal year basis. In FY 2014-15, 15,421 mediations were held.

Validity:

Validity refers to the fit between an operational definition and the concept it is purported to measure. This indicator is a valid output measure because it meets the criteria of two of the three types of statistical validation: (1) subjective validation (face validity), and (2) criterion-related validation. First, on the face of it, this indicator appears to measure the concept it is intended to measure (face validity). Second, the content or apparent meaning of this measure is not as important as its usefulness as an indicator of output (criterion-related validity). The test of this type of validity is the ability of this measure to classify or group data in terms of a single criterion (the number of mediations held.)

For every workers' compensation dispute, state mediators hold one or more mediation conferences unless the parties utilize private mediation or if the Deputy Chief Judge of Compensation Claims waives the mediation requirement. The number of mediations held by state mediators is necessary in evaluating the productivity of the mediation process, and is also used as the unit cost measure for this activity.

Reliability:

Reliability assessment is essentially a matter of checking for consistency; if a measure yields the same result time after time, then it is free of random error. This indicator is a reliable measure of the Division's output because of its test-retest and intercoder reliability. The test-retest procedure is the simplest method for assessing reliability and involves measuring output (the number of mediations held) on two separate occasions. The intercoder method involves examining the extent to which different persons using the same measurement procedures get equivalent results.

As mediation conferences are scheduled, rescheduled, held, etc. this information is kept on the mediators' computerized calendars. Any information remains in the database and can be replicated at any time. Data are collected in a consistent manner, compiled on a monthly and annual basis, using the same data sources, applying the same methodology and can be duplicated to achieve the same result.

LRPP EXHIBIT IV: Performance Measure Validity and Reliability

Department: DMS/Division of Administrative Hearings

Program: Workers' Compensation Appeals - Judges of Compensation Claims

Service/Budget Entity: Workers' Compensation Appeals - Judges of Compensation Claims

Measure: Percent of Concluded Mediations Resulting in Resolution (all issues except attorneys fees)

Action (check one):

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

Data Sources and Methodology:

The data source is the Division's electronic database, entitled the "Case Management System" (CMS). The FY 2014-15 standard of 54% was calculated by dividing the number of mediations resulting in resolution (7,579) by the number of mediations concluded (14,055).

This measure is a percentage of mediations that concluded with one of the following results: (1) lump sum settlement; (2) all pending issues resolved; or (3) all pending issues resolved except attorneys fees. This percentage is compiled on a fiscal year basis.

Validity:

Validity refers to the fit between an operational definition and the concept it is purported to measure. This indicator is a valid measure of the outcome because it meets the criteria of two of the three types of statistical validation: (1) subjective validation (face validity), and (2) criterion-related validation. First, on the face of it, this indicator appears to measure the concept it is intended to measure (face validity). Second, the content or apparent meaning of this measure is not as important as its usefulness as an indicator of the outcome (criterion-related validity). The test of this type of validity is the ability of this measure to classify or group data in terms of a single criterion (the percent of concluded mediations resulting in resolution).

This indicator is a valid measure of how effectively the state mediation program is resolving disputed workers' compensation claims. The percentage of concluded mediations that result in resolution is a valid measure of the effectiveness of the mediation process.

Reliability:

Reliability assessment is essentially a matter of checking for consistency; if a measure yields the same result time after time, then it is free of random error. This indicator is a reliable measure of the Division's outcome because of its test-retest and intercoder

reliability. The test-retest procedure is the simplest method for assessing reliability and involves measuring the outcome (the percent of concluded mediations resulting in resolution) on two separate occasions. The intercoder method involves examining the extent to which different persons using the same measurement procedures get equivalent results.

As mediation conferences are concluded, the mediator records the results into the CMS for future retrieval and places those results in the case file. Any information remains in the database and the file and can be replicated at any time. Data are collected in a consistent manner, compiled on an annual basis using the same data sources, applying the same methodology and can be duplicated to achieve the same results.

DIVISION OF ADMINISTRATIVE HEARINGS

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

LRPP Exhibit V: Identification of Associated Activity Contributing to Performance Measures

| Measure Number | Approved Performance Measures for FY 2015-16 (Words) | | Associated Activities Title |
|----------------|---|--|---|
| 1 | Percent of cases closed within 120 days after filing | | Conduct Administrative Hearings and Proceedings |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| 2 | Percent of cases scheduled for hearing within 90 days after filing | | Conduct Administrative Hearings and Proceedings |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| 3 | Number of cases closed | | Conduct Administrative Hearings and Proceedings |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| 4 | Percent of professional licensure cases closed within 120 days after filing | | Conduct Administrative Hearings and Proceedings |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| 5 | Percent of professional licensure cases scheduled for hearing within 90 days after filing | | Conduct Administrative Hearings and Proceedings |
| | | | |
| | | | |

LRPP Exhibit V: Identification of Associated Activity Contributing to Performance Measures

| Measure Number | Approved Performance Measures for FY 2015-16 (Words) | | Associated Activities Title |
|----------------|---|--|--|
| 1 | Percent of petitions closed within the statutory timeframe | | Adjudicate and Hear Workers' Compensation Disputes |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| 2 | Number of petitions closed | | Adjudicate and Hear Workers' Compensation Disputes |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| 3 | Average number of days from date petition filed to date petition closed | | Adjudicate and Hear Workers' Compensation Disputes |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| 4 | Percent of timely held mediations (130 days) | | Facilitate Mediation of Workers' Compensation Disputes |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| 5 | Number of mediations held | | Facilitate Mediation of Workers' Compensation Disputes |
| | | | |
| | | | |

ACTIVITY ISSUE CODES SELECTED:

TRANSFER-STATE AGENCIES ACTIVITY ISSUE CODES SELECTED:

1-8:

AID TO LOCAL GOVERNMENTS ACTIVITY ISSUE CODES SELECTED:

1-8:

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

*** NO ACTIVITIES FOUND ***

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

*** NO OPERATING CATEGORIES FOUND ***

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

*** NO ACTIVITIES FOUND ***

TOTALS FROM SECTION I AND SECTIONS II + III:

| DEPARTMENT: 7297 | EXPENDITURES | FCO |
|--|--------------|-------|
| FINAL BUDGET FOR AGENCY (SECTION I): | 25,787,863 | |
| TOTAL BUDGET FOR AGENCY (SECTION III): | 25,787,873 | |
| | ----- | ----- |
| DIFFERENCE: | 10- | |
| (MAY NOT EQUAL DUE TO ROUNDING) | ===== | ===== |

Glossary of Terms and Acronyms

ALJ – Administrative Law Judge

CMS - Case Management System

DOAH - Division of Administrative Hearings

FTE -Full Time Equivalent Position

FY - Fiscal Year

OJCC - Office of the Judges of Compensation Claims

PL – Professional Licensure Case