



Mike Prendergast
Executive Director

State of Florida
DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS' AFFAIRS
Office of the Executive Director
Suite 311 K
11351 Ulmerton Road
Largo, Florida 33778-1630
Phone: (727) 518-3202 Ext.5594 Fax: (850) 488-4001
www.FloridaVets.org

Rick Scott
Governor
Pam Bondi
Attorney General
Jeff Atwater
Chief Financial Officer
Adam Putnam
Commissioner of Agriculture

November 25, 2015

MEMORANDUM

TO: Honorable Rick Scott
Honorable Pam Bondi
Honorable Jeff Atwater
Honorable Adam Putnam

FROM: Florida Department of Veterans' Affairs
Mike Prendergast, Executive Director

SUBJECT: Agenda – Cabinet Meeting of December 8, 2015

The next public meeting of the Governor and Cabinet to transact the business of the Department of Veterans' Affairs will be at 9:00 a.m. (EST), December 8, 2015 in Tallahassee, Florida.

The Agenda and all required back-up materials are attached for your review.

If you have any questions, please call my Acting Cabinet Affairs Officer Jessica Kraynak, at (850) 487-1533 x7712.

cc: Monica Russell, Director of Cabinet Affairs
Executive Office of the Governor

Cynthia Kelly, Director
Governor's Office of Policy and Budget

Attachments

AGENDA
FLORIDA DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS' AFFAIRS
Meeting materials for the following items are available on the web at:
<http://floridavets.org/2015-public-notice/>

MEMBERS

Governor Rick Scott
Attorney General Pam Bondi
Chief Financial Officer Jeff Atwater
Commissioner Adam Putnam

December 8, 2015
9:00 A.M. (EST)
LL-03, The Capitol
Tallahassee, Florida

Contact: Jessica Kraynak, Acting Director, Legislative & Cabinet Affairs
(850) 487-1533

ITEM	SUBJECT	RECOMMENDATION
1.	Respectfully request approval of the minutes of the November 10, 2015 meeting. (ATTACHMENT 1)	RECOMMEND APPROVAL
2.	Respectfully submit the Agency's Performance Measures. (ATTACHMENT 2)	RECOMMEND APPROVAL
3.	Respectfully submit the Agency's Annual Report. (ATTACHMENT 3)	RECOMMEND APPROVAL

1 DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS

2

3 GOVERNOR SCOTT: Next I'd like to
4 recognize Mike Prendergast with the Department
5 of Veterans Affairs.

6 EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR PRENDERGAST: Good
7 morning, again, Governor Scott, Attorney
8 General Bondi, CFO Atwater and Commissioner
9 Putnam.

10 With tomorrow being Veterans Day, it's
11 appropriate that we get up and talk about the
12 veteran's issues across the state. We've got a
13 couple of items on the agenda, but I'd like to
14 come back to what our colleague, Jesse Panuccio
15 was talking about.

16 Florida has done a remarkable job in
17 helping veterans find employment in the
18 Sunshine State over the past four years. And
19 it's been due in partnership to us working very
20 closely with the Department of Economic
21 Opportunity and being a participant in
22 Paychecks for Patriots, but also working with
23 our colleagues like Secretary Ken Lawson at the
24 Department of Business and Professional
25 Regulation, who's worked tirelessly to make

1 sure that our veterans and their family
2 members, who'd like to get a business license
3 in Florida, have a streamlined process to go
4 and get a business license in Florida and join
5 the workforce that way.

6 In addition, folks like our Surgeon
7 General, Dr. John Armstrong, has worked as well
8 tirelessly to ensure that those veterans who
9 come back with medical licenses and other
10 licenses to practice medicine in the state or
11 nursing in the state, they found an opportunity
12 to get into the workforce very quickly. And
13 what's one of the reasons why our unemployment
14 rate in the veterans community is lower than
15 overall state population's unemployment rate,
16 with us also, that we're one out of the leaders
17 in the state.

18 And we are coming close to eclipsing
19 taxes, Governor Scott, when it comes to veteran
20 unemployment and we look forward to coming back
21 at a future cabinet meeting and telling you
22 about that as well.

23 The Department of Veterans Affairs has
24 three agenda items for your attention today.
25 Agenda Item 1, is the minutes of the

1 September 29th, 2015 cabinet meeting. We
2 respectfully request approval.

3 **GOVERNOR SCOTT:** Is there a motion on the
4 item?

5 **ATTORNEY GENERAL BONDI:** So moved.

6 **GOVERNOR SCOTT:** Is there a second?

7 **COMMISSIONER PUTNAM:** Second.

8 **GOVERNOR SCOTT:** Any comments or
9 objections?

10 (NO RESPONSE):

11 **GOVERNOR SCOTT:** Hearing none, the motion
12 carries.

13 **EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR PRENDERGAST:** Thank
14 you. Agenda Item 2 is the agency's first
15 quarter report for fiscal year 2015/2016. And
16 I'd like to just provide a couple of highlights
17 for you next.

18 Last quarter the agency was hosting the
19 National Association of State Directors of
20 Veterans Affairs Conference in Orlando. Many
21 of our nation's 55 state and territory Veterans
22 Affairs agency heads, along with some other key
23 leaders from other states, attended the
24 conference to provide a forum to discuss
25 nationwide issues that are confronting our

1 veterans and their family members. And also to
2 have a forum with our colleagues at the US
3 Department of Veterans Affairs to share the
4 cutting edge practices that they're using, but
5 also share some of the best practices that our
6 state colleagues are embracing or actually
7 learning from.

8 Like the outreach and branding campaign
9 that our own agency did, that won a national
10 award this year where Allan and Steve were up
11 in Washington DC for the meeting with Secretary
12 McDonald.

13 That forum has been around since 1947 and
14 it's been a real opportunity for our leaders in
15 the Veterans Affairs community to participate
16 in that. And we look forward to more
17 opportunities to learn and grow and develop
18 professionally from future conferences with our
19 colleagues.

20 In our Homes Divisions, we continue to
21 meet many positive milestones this quarter with
22 respect to the Ardie R. Copas State Veterans
23 Nursing Home, our Seventh State Veterans
24 Nursing Home, which will be located in Port St.
25 Lucie. This includes the approval of the

1 Historical Preservation and the Phase 1
2 Environmental Survey, which will take us into
3 the Phase 2 Environmental Assessment.

4 Turning now to our Homes Division overall.
5 Our nursing home occupancy trends remain steady
6 at 98 percent or greater. And occupancy rates
7 across the board for our homes show a great
8 trend and an opportunity to provide more bed
9 space into the communities around the state
10 that they are presently unserved by our nursing
11 home capacity.

12 We remain a leader in providing great
13 quality care for our veterans. And to continue
14 to better serve our veterans and our staff, we
15 briefed you last August that we're in the
16 requisition process for a grant to obtain the
17 safety lift systems in the amount of just over
18 \$6 million. 4 million in a federal matching
19 grant and 2.1 million from our own Operations
20 and Maintenance Trust Fund.

21 These systems will increase the safe and
22 efficient lifting and transfer of residents
23 from their beds to a wheelchair, while reducing
24 the risk of injury to residents and staff. And
25 we're just in the final elements of the

1 negotiation for the contract and we look
2 forward to announcing that in the not too
3 distant future.

4 In our Division of Benefits and
5 Assistance, our claims examiners advocated for
6 over 70,000 veterans and their families. And
7 at the same time they reviewed and processed
8 over 4,000 claims for disability benefits.
9 Overall dollars and retroactive compensation
10 for the year totaled \$134 million last year for
11 veterans. And we look forward to our report on
12 additional dollars in the quarters ahead.

13 We will continue to meet the high
14 operational temple of supporting our veterans.
15 And although we've had some loss of experienced
16 claims examiners in the field, which places a
17 heavier burden on some of our remaining claims
18 examiners. However, we've brought on five new
19 claims examiners in September, beginning their
20 one year period of probationary training, so
21 that they can be the world class pentathletes
22 that help us whenever they've completed their
23 training in probationary period.

24 In other news regarding customer service
25 to our veterans. The Benefits and Assistance

1 Division has transitioned to a new VetraSpec
2 veterans benefits software package starting in
3 mid-August. And we were able to successfully
4 transfer more than 600,000 records over from
5 our legacy system onto the new system since
6 that time.

7 And from this new system, we anticipate a
8 greater reporting ability pertaining to
9 veterans, once the agency is fully transitioned
10 into the new VetraSpec system.

11 One of our bureaus assisted nearly 18,200
12 veterans who walked across the agency's doors
13 and supported of the 149 veterans outreach
14 events, including Two Governors Record Service
15 Board Ceremonies for the quarter and
16 disseminated over 6,000 packets of information
17 to veterans and their families at these events
18 when they attended them.

19 The Division also conducted another
20 statutorily mandated certification course to
21 allow our county veterans service officers in
22 our 67 counties to assist veterans with getting
23 the access to their own services and benefits.
24 We respectfully request approval of the
25 agency's third quarter report.

1 **GOVERNOR SCOTT:** Any questions?

2 (NO RESPONSE):

3 **GOVERNOR SCOTT:** All right. Is there a
4 motion to accept?

5 **ATTORNEY GENERAL BONDI:** So moved.

6 **GOVERNOR SCOTT:** Is there a second?

7 **COMMISSIONER PUTNAM:** Second.

8 **GOVERNOR SCOTT:** Any comments or
9 objections?

10 (NO RESPONSE):

11 **GOVERNOR SCOTT:** Hearing none, the motion
12 carries.

13 **EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR PRENDERGAST:** Thank
14 you. Agenda Item 3 is the agency's State
15 Veterans Nursing Home Site Selection workshop
16 results.

17 I will now turn the microphone over to Al
18 Carter, our Deputy Executive Director and also
19 the chair of the Site Selection Workshop
20 Committee to present the workshop results.

21 **GOVERNOR SCOTT:** Good morning, Al.

22 **DEPUTY EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR CARTER:** Good
23 morning, sir. Governor Scott, General Bondi,
24 CFO Atwater and Commissioner Putnam.

25 Thank you for your leadership and the

1 opportunity to brief agenda Item No. 3. Agenda
2 Item No. 3 is a report on the results and
3 recommendation of the State Veterans Nursing
4 Home Site Selection Workshop.

5 Following last years selection of
6 Port St. Lucie as the site for the Seventh
7 State Veteran Nursing Home and taking into
8 account the Governor's January 2015 budget
9 recommendation to fund the development of
10 nursing home No. 8 and 9, the Florida
11 Department of Veteran Affairs held a Site
12 Selection Process Workshop on February 19th,
13 2015, at our headquarters in the Mary Grizzle
14 building in Largo.

15 The purpose of the workshop was to analyze
16 and assess the existing State Veteran Nursing
17 Home Site Selection Process, to ensure our
18 current criteria is, in fact, valid and useful
19 for future nursing home site selections.

20 The current criteria was used to select
21 our network of seven State Veteran Nursing
22 Homes, including our newest, the Ardie R. Copas
23 Home in Port St. Lucie, which is under
24 development.

25 Our workshop, which was publicly noticed

1 and attended by Florida legislators, county and
2 state agencies and public participants. And we
3 appreciate their insights and support.

4 Attendees were afforded the opportunity to
5 attend in person or via teleconference and
6 supporting documents were provided at the
7 workshop and available on our website.

8 The workshop discussions centered around
9 four key issues; selection of counties,
10 selection of site, selection of committee
11 members, site selection criteria and
12 application, and finally, proposal scoring
13 methodology.

14 The main takeaway from the workshop was
15 that the attendees did not seek to change the
16 application or the process itself, but mainly
17 focused on the inclusion of under-represented
18 counties and the clarification of the scoring.
19 Let's quickly review the four key issues and
20 review the administrative changes for
21 consideration.

22 The first key issue centered on the
23 process of including more counties in the
24 application process. The US Department of
25 Veterans Affairs will not approve projects that

1 do not have a high population of veterans. A
2 concern of workshop participants was the
3 exclusion of counties due to the local veteran
4 population and size and distance to
5 infrastructure and services, which is an
6 application criteria.

7 The workshop recommendation was to allow
8 adjoining counties to combine and submit a
9 single application, a solution which is
10 feasible.

11 Another concern of the committee was that
12 criteria waiting excluded smaller counties,
13 based on population and income. Here the
14 workshop recommendation was to revise the
15 waiting of the application criteria to account
16 for the large spread-out areas without nursing
17 homes currently.

18 Part 2 of this issue was to outline
19 weighted factors in the application, so
20 counties can determine the best site to submit
21 an application. FDVA has already revised the
22 score sheet criteria and we'll hear a little
23 more about that in few moments.

24 The final issue under the selection
25 counties area focused on counties submitting of

1 multiple proposals. Allowing counties to
2 submit multiple proposals limits their
3 abilities to apply resources to put their best
4 location forward. And it was recommended that
5 only one application per county be accepted.

6 The second of four key issues discussed
7 during the workshop, concerned the makeup of
8 the site selection committee. Essentially,
9 whether to change the selection committee
10 members.

11 Each committee member was selected based
12 on their expertise and experience in the
13 respective areas needed to build and operate a
14 State Veteran Nursing Home and their expertise
15 in veteran advocacy.

16 The workshop recommendation was to keep
17 the committee as is, but change the public's
18 point of contact on the committee to nonvoting
19 member. The impact of this change is
20 negligible and easily accomplished by casting
21 that member as a nonvoting member when future
22 selection committees are established. FDVA can
23 easily institute this recommendation.

24 The third key issue involved the site
25 selection criteria and the online application.

1 The previous application, online application,
2 was a word document that applicants had to
3 cut-and-paste information into, and add
4 supporting annexes and addendums.

5 The workshop recommendation was to
6 redesign the application form and make it more
7 user-friendly by supporting online submission
8 of the narrative and instituting a fill in the
9 blank form structure. This new process -- I
10 should say, in this new process, attachments
11 will still have to be added by the counties to
12 support the narrative inserted into the
13 fillable form, but it will make the process
14 much more streamlined and efficient.

15 The fourth and final area issue discussed
16 the scoring methodology. There were two items
17 of note in this area. The first centered on
18 scoring itself.

19 In short, the workshop attendees indicated
20 that the scoring by voting members varied and
21 that a more detailed scoring criteria sheet
22 would help them better understand the overall
23 scoring. Also, the additional training of the
24 committee members on the scoring criteria would
25 decrease the disparity in the scoring.

1 The workshop recommendation was that the
2 scoresheet needed to be further defined in
3 detail, such as implementing a scoring scale
4 within each category. As a result, FDVA has
5 revised that scoresheet to create a scale
6 scoresheet within each category, based on the
7 current application. FDVA will implement also,
8 additional training of the site selection
9 committee members at the onset of each site
10 selection process. We consider the
11 recommendation feasible and the revised
12 scoresheet has been provided for your review.

13 Workshop attendees also discussed the
14 scoring results. They wanted to allow
15 top-rated sites to be used as automatic
16 alternates in the event that the primary
17 selectee was disqualified for some reason.

18 The workshop recommendation was to allow
19 the runner-up sites to become alternates, if
20 funding was available. This means the awarding
21 of subsequent nursing homes as funding becomes
22 approved and available to runner-up sites in
23 scoring priority. For example, Site No. 1
24 would be awarded the first home, which will be
25 home No. 8. Site No. 2 in priority, Site No. 9

1 and so on.

2 The workshop recommendation was to rank
3 order sites from one through four for the next
4 three homes, following the next site selection
5 process. The fourth home, however, is only an
6 alternate if the No. 3 site is disqualified for
7 acceptance by the State of Florida or the US
8 Department of Veteran Affairs. This course of
9 action would allow the results of next site
10 selection process to designate recipient
11 counties for homes No. 8, No. 9 and No. 10 and
12 eliminate the need for yearly site selection
13 process.

14 Important, is that the counties would be
15 advised as part of the application process,
16 that their land could be tied up for up to
17 seven years by the current time line of five
18 years, while awaiting the US Department of
19 Veterans Affairs and/or legislative funding.

20 Awarding sites in this manner provides
21 realistic limits to the amount of time that
22 county land is unavailable while awaiting
23 approval of VA funding. And FDVA, of course,
24 sees this as a feasible solution as long as
25 funding is available.

1 So in summary, the need for additional
2 State Veteran Nursing Homes has been
3 well-documented and discussions in previous
4 cabinet meeting have gone on unnoticed that the
5 need is very great. Improving our process will
6 move us further along on the path to meeting
7 those needs. Thank you for your time and
8 consideration of these changes to the Site
9 Selection Process and I standby for any
10 questions.

11 **GOVERNOR SCOTT:** Are there any questions?
12 Commissioner?

13 **COMMISSIONER PUTNAM:** Thank you Governor.
14 I remember this issue well and so we get
15 another shot at doing it better. The friction,
16 as I recall, was that the site selection study
17 recommendations and the committee
18 recommendations did not align. So we
19 commissioned the study, the study recommended
20 the sites. Obviously the sites that were
21 No. 1 according to that study through a pep
22 rally got excited about having the next
23 veterans nursing home and then through the
24 committee process, there was a different
25 outcome. So that was one thing that sticks out

1 in my mind. It seems to me that with your
2 recommended changes that we are exacerbating
3 that problem.

4 And I also recall that those cities and
5 counties around the state that were not ranked
6 No. 1, specifically asked us to reopen the
7 process every time, because they're going to
8 get better at making their application, they're
9 going to learn from that process and be able to
10 refine their application.

11 And so, I say all of that to say that, my
12 concern with your recommended changes, would be
13 that we've not yet received funding for home
14 No. 7, but we're committing through this
15 process 8, 9 and 10. So we're committing many,
16 many years into the future. And given the
17 rapid growth of our state, the shifting
18 demographics of our state, potential future
19 Federal VA Hospitals or new populations that
20 may be veteran heavy, I would be reluctant to
21 adopt your recommendation No. 8, which would
22 commit this cabinet for years into the future
23 on unfunded homes.

24 The other recommendations I think are
25 solid recommendations. But out of fairness to

1 the communities who are applying, out of
2 recognition that there's going to be a big
3 change in demographics in our state in the
4 near-term, much less the medium and long-term
5 and my reluctance to commit us to four future
6 homes, when we haven't even gotten the funding
7 for the one we've already identified the site
8 for. So, could you walk me through or could
9 you respond to my concerns on No. 8?

10 **DEPUTY EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR CARTER:** Yes,
11 Commissioner Putnam. The challenge with the
12 site selection process is always timing. We're
13 always at the liberty of the US Department of
14 Veterans Affairs for funding and their time
15 line is something that, again, we have no
16 control over. So whether we do a selection
17 process up-front and commit those counties or
18 we do one each year and commit those counties,
19 we still follow -- we still have the same
20 challenge of those properties being tied up for
21 a five-year period of time.

22 As we've done selection processes in the
23 past and this last one to be no exception,
24 we've had the same counties submit the same
25 properties, because they're not growing any

1 more new land. So in allowing the counties
2 more opportunities to provide additional land,
3 will not help us when the actual population is
4 driven by the US Department of Veterans Affairs
5 for approval of the sites.

6 We can make a recommendation to the US
7 Department Of Veteran Affairs on any sites.
8 However, if it does not meet their criteria
9 they will not approve it. So our alignment of
10 our needs and allowing the homes to do a
11 repetitive -- or allowing the counties to do a
12 repetitive submission of applications, will not
13 fix our challenge, which is falling in line
14 with the department of -- the US Department of
15 Veteran Affairs requirements.

16 **COMMISSIONER PUTNAM:** Yeah, that was very
17 diplomatic. I don't like counting on Congress
18 either. But if you're a -- the last time this
19 was in front of us, I vividly remember Marion
20 County came in second and there was some
21 conversation about do you lock them in as the
22 next home. And we, as a matter of policy,
23 pointedly said, we're not doing that. We're
24 going to give everybody the opportunity to come
25 back and reapply. Because the difference

1 between being the 8th nursing home and 10th
2 nursing home is maybe a decade or more.

3 And I think that those applicants ought to
4 have the opportunity to learn from the process
5 and improve upon it. And frankly, if they want
6 to move up, to be able to be come back and
7 sweeten the pot.

8 They may have -- the county may decide
9 that they're going to make greater local
10 contribution or they may have a donor that
11 offers a different parcel of land.

12 A lot's going to change in the number of
13 years that we're talking about this process
14 stretching out. And so for us at this meeting
15 to lock in the next four homes, I'm not
16 comfortable with that.

17 I'm very comfortable with us proceeding
18 with using the 2014 study to determine home
19 No. 8. Let's keep pressuring DC to get us the
20 money for home No. 7 that you and your folks
21 have already sited and then let's -- there's
22 legislation by Representative Magor to direct
23 the legislature to conduct another study, which
24 I think is the recognition of shifting
25 demographics.

1 And so, I think awarding another home
2 based on the '14 data is appropriate. I don't
3 think that much has changed since '14. But I
4 think for future homes, it would make sense to
5 have those determined by the most recent data
6 that guides the decision-making about where
7 those homes are, so.

8 Governor, I mean -- you know, I don't want
9 to dominate the conversation here, but I think
10 they put a lot of work into this and I very
11 much appreciate the workshop that they held. I
12 think that all of their changes make a lot of
13 sense except for recommended change No. 8.

14 **GOVERNOR SCOTT:** If the cabinet votes on
15 this and said yes to everything, but we change
16 that. Would that -- you think that would have
17 a dramatic impact?

18 **DEPUTY EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR CARTER:** Governor
19 Scott, I don't think it will have a huge
20 impact. It just means that as Commissioner
21 Putnam indicates, we'll do a site selection
22 process each year and we would go forth and
23 allow all the counties to participate,
24 regardless how they came out on the site
25 selection study, which is what we did in the

1 previous home. Just the site selection study
2 as you all know, gives them a higher priority,
3 because that is -- that comes from the
4 information or partially from the information
5 that US Department of Veteran Affairs provides.

6 **GOVERNOR SCOTT:** So we would need to do
7 one every year, even though we're still waiting
8 on the Feds to fund seven?

9 **DEPUTY EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR CARTER:** Yes,
10 sir. The Federal Government or the US
11 Department of Veteran Affairs, we anticipate
12 the funding to come out in November or December
13 of this year. We're just waiting on the
14 priority list to drop. Once that list drops
15 and our homes are on that list, our successive
16 homes, then the funding becomes allocated and
17 then, of course, once we meet their
18 requirements, the funding is provided to us as
19 actual dollars.

20 **GOVERNOR SCOTT:** All right. Thank you.
21 Any other questions? Does anyone want to make
22 a motion then?

23 **COMMISSIONER PUTNAM:** Well, if --
24 Governor, with your indulgence, I would move
25 that we accept FDVA's recommended changes to

1 the site selection process with the exception
2 of recommendation No. 8.

3 **GOVERNOR SCOTT:** Okay. And the result of
4 that, is that you would do an annual survey?

5 **DEPUTY EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR CARTER:** Yes,
6 sir.

7 **GOVERNOR SCOTT:** Right. Okay. And that's
8 all doable?

9 **DEPUTY EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR CARTER:** Yes,
10 sir, it is.

11 **GOVERNOR SCOTT:** All right. So that's the
12 motion. Is there a second?

13 **ATTORNEY GENERAL BONDI:** Second.

14 **GOVERNOR SCOTT:** Okay. Any comments or
15 objections?

16 (NO RESPONSE):

17 **GOVERNOR SCOTT:** Hearing none, the motion
18 carries.

19 **DEPUTY EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR CARTER:** Thank
20 you.

21 **GOVERNOR SCOTT:** Thanks, Al.

22 **EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR PRENDERGAST:** Thank you
23 all.

24 **GOVERNOR SCOTT:** Thanks, Colonel.

25 * * * * *

Proposed FDVA Performance Measures

Number	Division	Objective	Weight	Range	Result	Score	Weighted Score	Objective Description
1	B&A	Retroactive Compensation	10%	5 = 95 - 100% 4 = 90 - 94% 3 = 80 - 89% 2 = 70 - 79% 1 = 69% - below	\$135,511,693	5	0.50	Baseline number is \$125,510,722 (based on the median for annual data from FY 05/06 through FY 14/15). Refers to a bulk award given to a veteran for those months when the claim was in process and dates back to the date of original claim. Year to year results can vary significantly depending on new VA legislation for disabilities (ex. Nehmer cases for Agent Orange)
2	B&A	Issue Resolutions	7.5%	5 = 95 - 100% 4 = 90 - 94% 3 = 80 - 89% 2 = 70 - 79% 1 = 69% - below	\$62,226,090	5	0.375	Baseline number is \$42,767,480 (based on the median for annual data from FY 05/06 through FY 14/15). Issue resolutions are based on services provided to veterans that can result in monthly monetary benefits or obtaining eligibility for medical treatment and equipment (e.g. wheelchairs). There were 21,946 veterans served for issue resolutions.
3	B&A	Number of Veterans Served	10%	5 = 95 - 100% 4 = 90 - 94% 3 = 80 - 89% 2 = 70 - 79% 1 = 69% - below	105,839	5	0.50	Baseline number is 102,190 (based on the median for annual data from FY 05/06 through FY 14/15). Measure is pulled from agency's database that captures veterans visiting FDVA's office for the first time during a given fiscal year. Otherwise termed "Unique Veterans."
4	B&A	Number of Claims Processed	10%	5 = 95 - 100% 4 = 90 - 94% 3 = 80 - 89% 2 = 70 - 79% 1 = 69% - below	32,816	5	0.50	Baseline number is 27,521 (based on the median for annual data from FY 05/06 through FY 14/15). Veterans Claims Examiners work with veterans to file a claim which is entered into V-BOLTS (Veterans Benefits On Line Tracking System). The claim is forwarded to the USDVA which gathers supporting documentation as needed. VA sends result to VCE and claimant.
5	B&A	Number of Services to Veterans	10%	5 = 95 - 100% 4 = 90 - 94% 3 = 80 - 89% 2 = 70 - 79% 1 = 69% - below	696,679	5	0.50	Baseline number is 552,561 (based on the median for annual data from FY 05/06 through FY 14/15). Total is tallied by adding the total number of all activity processes performed in support of a veteran. Includes phone calls, correspondence, etc.
6	B&A	SAA Programs Certified	7.50%	5 = 95 - 100% 4 = 90 - 94% 3 = 80 - 89% 2 = 70 - 79% 1 = 69% - below	120	5	0.375	Goal: 120 programs certified annually per VA Contract. Programs can vary annually and the number is determined by the USDVA. Ramifications for non compliance include a decrease in federal funding and staffing to state SAA programs. SAAs approve schools to participate in VA education programs, ensure compliance with state and federal laws, and are integral to the process for USDVA payment of benefits to student veterans.
7	Homes	Occupancy rate for homes in operation 2 years or longer	10%	5 = 95 - 100% 4 = 90 - 94% 3 = 80 - 89% 2 = 70 - 79% 1 = 69% - below	98%	5	0.50	The agency's ability to operate the SVNHs in a revenue-neutral capacity is dependent largely upon occupancy. Residents are charged daily rates. Therefore, empty beds generate no revenue.
8	Homes	Compliance with Quality of Care Regulations	7.5%	5 = No Class I or II deficiencies 4 = No more than 2 Class I or II deficiencies during inspection yr/home 3 = No more than 3 2 = No more than 4 1 = 5 or more deficiencies	5	5	0.375	FDVA facilities are inspected at four levels: Federal, State, local and internal. <i>Measures are based on AHCA's severity & scope deficiency ratings.</i>
9	EDSS	Percentage of qualifying invoices delivered to the Department of Financial Services for payment within 20 days of receipt of a valid invoice.	7.5%	5 = 99-100% 4 = 97.5-98.99% 3 = 96.0 - 97.49% 2 = 95.0 - 95.99% 1 = 94.99 % and below	99%	5	0.375	Agencies are required to comply with Florida Statutes Section 215.422 (1) – (3) which states that an agency has 20 days after receipt of a valid invoice to deliver qualifying invoices to the CFO for payment. Impact: Timely and consistent compliance with procurement operations support services to veterans and the agency's ability to support veterans.
		Total	80%				4.00	

Number	Division	Objective	Weight	Range	Result	Score	Weighted Score	Objective Description
--------	----------	-----------	--------	-------	--------	-------	----------------	-----------------------

Note: B&A performance measures are now taken from a new database. Establishing baselines may require reconciliation over the next one to two reporting periods.

Subjective Leadership Assessment			
Number		Measure	Ranking 1-5
1		How do you define success in your agency?	
2		What services does your agency provide that are most undervalued?	
3		What outcomes do you plan to accomplish as agency head as it relates to your short	
		a. Do your resources align with your priorities in order to achieve these outcomes?	
		b. How do your priorities align with the agency's legislative proposals and legislative	
		c. What are the drivers and resistors that will help or hinder you from meeting these	
		d. How does the agency organizational structure support these priorities?	
		e. How are you measuring progress toward outcomes?	
4		What program areas of your agency face challenges in achieving desired outcomes?	
		a. What major issues are contributing to each area's weaknesses?	
		b. What internal or external threats exist?	
		c. What are the strategies you have planned to address these issues?	
		d. What major changes need to occur to achieve the desired outcomes?	
5		What do you view as the greatest risk in the next fiscal year or calendar year?	
		a. How do you plan to mitigate the risk and address this issue?	
6		What current agency responsibilities do you consider unnecessary or obsolete, or	
7		Stakeholders:	
		a. Identify your stakeholder groups and opportunities for stakeholders to	
		b. What are the top issues communicated by stakeholders, and what plans are in place	
		c. How do you assess whether or not your stakeholder needs are met?	
Total Average of Rankings (20% Weight)			

Florida Department of Law Enforcement	Weight	Score	Weighted Score
Objective Performance Measures Score	80%		
Subjective Leadership Assessment Score	20%		
TOTAL			

Subjective Leadership Assessment Score Breakdown	
Governor	
Attorney General	
Chief Financial Officer	
Agriculture	
Governor & Cabinet Scores Added/4	
Total Score	

Weighted Average Scale	
Significantly Exceeds Expectations	4.6 and above
Exceeds Expectations	3.6 - 4.5
Meets Expectations	2.6 - 3.5
Does Not Meet Expectations	1.6 - 2.5
Fails Expectations	1.5 and below