

LOS ANGELES COUNTY AUDITOR-CONTROLLER

AGENDA ITEM: _____

John Naimo
AUDITOR-CONTROLLER

Arlene Barrera
CHIEF DEPUTY

Peter Hughes
ASSISTANT AUDITOR-CONTROLLER

Mike Pirolo
INTERIM DIVISION CHIEF

AUDIT DIVISION

November 8, 2018

Public Defender MANAGEMENT REVIEW - REVIEW OF STRATEGIC PLANNING, ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURE, AND SERVICE PERFORMANCE MEASUREMENT



BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

Hilda L. Solis
FIRST DISTRICT

Mark Ridley-Thomas
SECOND DISTRICT

Sheila Kuehl
THIRD DISTRICT

Janice Hahn
FOURTH DISTRICT

Kathryn Barger
FIFTH DISTRICT

REPORT #K18ES

LOS ANGELES COUNTY AUDITOR-CONTROLLER

John Naimo
AUDITOR-CONTROLLER

Arlene Barrera
CHIEF DEPUTY

Peter Hughes
ASSISTANT AUDITOR-CONTROLLER

Mike Pirolo
INTERIM DIVISION CHIEF

AUDIT DIVISION

November 8, 2018

FACT SHEET

Public Defender

MANAGEMENT REVIEW - REVIEW OF STRATEGIC PLANNING, ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURE, AND SERVICE PERFORMANCE MEASUREMENT

With the support and active participation of the Public Defender (PD or Department) we evaluated the Department's processes and controls over their strategic planning, organizational structure, and service performance measurement to determine whether they provide reasonable assurance to management that their operations are appropriate and in accordance with Department requirements and best practices.

Key Outcomes

We noted various opportunities to improve and strengthen PD's processes and controls, which management has agreed to implement. We will assess and report on management's corrective actions in our planned future follow-up review. Examples of corrective actions include:

- PD will develop an updated strategic plan that aligns with emerging priorities, goals, and additional strategic issues noted in this report, and will vet the strategic plan with the Board of Supervisors.
- PD will implement processes to centrally track and report all special projects and initiatives.
- PD will develop a policy on Deputy In-Charge and Resource Attorney positions, including the criteria for selection and length of appointment.

Impact

These enhancements will provide greater assurance that the Department's objectives are achieved in strategic planning, organizational structure, and service performance measurement.

FAST FACTS

The PD is the largest public defense office in the nation, and has over 1,000 employees who work among 33 locations throughout the County.

The PD has budgeted expenditures of \$230 million for Fiscal Year 2018-19.

The PD has won numerous awards, such as the National Association of Counties award for Felony Trial Training. In addition, several PD attorneys have won personal awards, such as the Los Angeles Commission for Women – Women of the Year award.



This report is also available online at auditor.lacounty.gov
Report Waste, Fraud, and Abuse: fraud.lacounty.gov

For questions regarding the contents of this report, please contact Mike Pirolo, Audit Interim Division Chief, at mpirolo@auditor.lacounty.gov or (213) 253-0100.

REPORT #K18ES



JOHN NAIMO
AUDITOR-CONTROLLER

**COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES
DEPARTMENT OF AUDITOR-CONTROLLER**

KENNETH HAHN HALL OF ADMINISTRATION
500 WEST TEMPLE STREET, ROOM 525
LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90012-3873
PHONE: (213) 974-8301 FAX: (213) 626-5427

November 8, 2018

TO: Supervisor Sheila Kuehl, Chair
Supervisor Hilda L. Solis
Supervisor Mark Ridley-Thomas
Supervisor Janice Hahn
Supervisor Kathryn Barger

FROM: John Naimo
Auditor-Controller

**SUBJECT: PUBLIC DEFENDER MANAGEMENT REVIEW - REVIEW OF
STRATEGIC PLANNING, ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURE, AND
SERVICE PERFORMANCE MEASUREMENT**

At the request of the Board of Supervisors (Board), the Auditor-Controller has performed a review of management practices of the Department of Public Defender (PD or Department) to assist the PD in identifying areas for improvement. Specifically, we reviewed PD's strategic planning (e.g., mission, vision, values, and goals), organizational structure, and service performance measurement (e.g., key performance indicators (KPIs), performance management, and industry measures). Our review included interviewing management and staff, examining procedures and controls, and determining departmental practices over these areas. In addition, we compared PD's operations to other counties with generally similar attorney positions and responsibilities (i.e., Alameda, Orange, Riverside, San Bernardino, San Diego, and San Francisco).

We conducted our review in conformance with the *International Standards for the Professional Practice of Internal Auditing*.

PUBLIC DEFENDER MANAGEMENT REVIEW

BACKGROUND

The PD was established in 1914 and is responsible for resolutely defending the liberty interests of indigent clients, to protect their rights, and to advocate for clients to access resources to be productive members of the community. The PD is also the largest public defense office in the nation with over 1,000 employees, approximately 700 of which are attorneys, who work among 33 offices throughout the County.

STRATEGIC PLANNING

Strategic Plan

The PD's most recent strategic plan, issued in March 2010, has not been revised since then to align with the Department's emerging priorities and goals (e.g., expand client representation to a holistic approach, including connection to mental health and social services, involvement in the Board's increased focus on homelessness programs, etc.). Developing an updated strategic plan that is inclusive of emerging priorities, goals, and strategic issues noted in this report, and vetted by the Board, would provide the Department with a clear strategy and direction and a means for accountability of the Department's accomplishments.

Recommendation

- 1. Public Defender management:**
 - a. Develop a strategic plan that aligns with emerging priorities and goals.**
 - b. Include additional strategic issues noted in this report.**
 - c. Delay the approval of a new strategic plan until after the onboarding of a new Public Defender to ensure the proposed plan aligns with the new Public Defender's priorities and goals, including vetting of proposed priorities and goals with the Board of Supervisors.**

Special Projects and Initiatives

The PD is involved in special projects and initiatives to respond to new legislation (e.g., outreach to former clients for potential felony record reduction under Proposition 47, collaborating with other County departments and agencies to determine the impacts of Statewide bail reform and changes in the County's pre-trial processes) and new Board and PD priorities (e.g., holistic representation as mentioned above). To address these special projects and initiatives, the PD generally forms teams with managers of various

levels, including Assistant PDs, Division Chiefs, etc., and in some cases, collaborates with other County departments.

We noted that the PD does not have a process in place to centrally track their special projects and initiatives. Tracking these projects and initiatives would assist the Department with planning resource allocation since these are generally beyond staff's and management's day-to-day duties, and would allow the Department to assess the impact on their resources and share the impact with other interested parties (e.g., Chief Executive Office).

Subsequent to our review, PD management indicated that they began using a cloud based service to centrally track special projects and initiatives and that this recommendation is implemented. We will review PD's implementation of this recommendation during our scheduled follow-up review.

Recommendation

- 2. Public Defender management develop a process to centrally track and report all special projects and initiatives.**

ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURE

The PD has four Assistant PDs who report to the Chief Deputy and oversee seven divisions related to legal and support services (e.g., Branch and Area, Central Felony Trials, Employee Relations). Within each division are courts/units that are managed by a Head Deputy who oversees the attorneys (i.e., Deputy Public Defenders (DPD)) and various support staff. The PD also has an Administrative Deputy who reports to the Chief Deputy and oversees the Department's human resources and fiscal functions.

Organization Chart and Responsibilities

While the Department has an official organizational structure that is used for budget and human resources purposes, they do not have an organization chart that is available Department-wide for all staff. A widely distributed organization chart will provide greater transparency for all staff regarding the Department's structure and the role of each division.

We also noted that PD does not have a matrix of responsibilities that clearly defines specific tasks and responsibilities for each staff and manager. While the Department does have policies in certain areas that provide some of the functionality of a matrix of responsibilities (e.g., a policy on employee reassignments), these policies do not cover all duties. A single matrix of responsibilities can be developed for all positions and tasks/functions, or separate matrices of responsibilities can be developed for specific tasks/functions (e.g., policies or desk procedures). These matrices will assist in clarifying

the specific duties of each staff and manager, and provide a mechanism for accountability of performance.

Recommendations

Public Defender management:

- 3. Consider developing an organization chart for Department-wide distribution, and update as needed.**
- 4. Consider developing a matrix of responsibilities to help clearly identify the duties of each staff and manager.**

Deputy In-Charge and Resource Attorney Assignments

The PD's Division Chiefs appoint certain DPD III and DPD IV attorneys to the role of Deputy In-Charge (DIC), who report to a Head Deputy and assist them in supervising a court location/unit. Supervising a court location/unit includes assigning and monitoring attorney caseloads, and monitoring staff performance in the courtrooms. DICs are not given additional compensation (i.e., supervising is part of the class specifications for DPD III and DPD IV attorneys) and do not carry a caseload during their term as DIC. The PD currently has 33 DICs.

The PD also appoints DPD III and DPD IV attorneys to the role of Resource Attorney, which performs various duties for juvenile clients, such as representing the Department in commission meetings, linking clients to other resources, etc. The PD currently has ten Resource Attorneys.

PD management indicated there are a limited number of DIC and Resource Attorney opportunities, but the role they serve expands and diversifies their experience and awareness of available resources beyond their caseloads. We noted that there is no policy that guides the Division Chiefs on the criteria for selection and the length of appointment. A policy on DICs and Resource Attorneys would help ensure consistency in the criteria used for selection and increase transparency.

Recommendation

- 5. Public Defender management develop a policy on Deputy In-Charge and Resource Attorney positions, including the criteria for selection and length of appointment.**

Succession Planning

The PD issued a five-phase schedule to develop a Departmental Leadership Development Plan (i.e., succession plan) in September 2017. The phases include

identifying development needs, constructing a succession plan, communicating the succession plan, implementing the succession plan, and assessing outcomes with full implementation of all phases by October 2018. We noted that as of May 2018, the PD should have completed the first three phases of the schedule. However, according to PD, the Department has only completed the first phase primarily due to other high priority projects and significant changes in management.

Recommendation

- Public Defender management immediately complete phases two and three of the Departmental Leadership Development Plan, and proceed with the additional phases as scheduled. Public Defender management also consider reevaluating the schedule, or the developed succession plan, to ensure it aligns with the priorities and goals of the incoming Public Defender once appointed.**

Comparison to Other Counties - Support Staff

We compared the PD's organizational structure for support staff (e.g., investigators and paralegals) to that of six other counties (i.e., Alameda, Orange, Riverside, San Bernardino, San Diego, and San Francisco). PD management expressed concerns that the Department may be understaffed in the support areas. See Table 1 for details.

Table 1 Organizational Structure Attorney and Support Staff Comparison to Other Counties							
	Los Angeles	Alameda	Orange	Riverside	San Bernardino	San Diego	San Francisco
Position:							
Attorney	690	111	211	140	115	242	102
Investigator	77	18	77	28	38	56	21
Paralegal	48	8	25	11	0	15	22
Social Worker	24	5	0	2	10	0	4
Other Support Staff	237	35	78	58	92	86	44
Total Employees	1052	176	391	239	255	399	193
Ratio:							
Investigator to Attorney	1:9	1:6	1:3	1:5	1:3	1:4	1:5
Paralegal to Attorney	1:14	1:14	1:8	1:13	N/A	1:16	1:5
Social Worker to Attorney	1:29	1:22	N/A	1:70	1:12	N/A	1:26
Other Support Staff to Attorney	1:3	1:3	1:3	1:2	1:1	1:3	1:2

Source: Provided by Public Defender management from each of the counties.

The PD generally has less investigators per attorney than the other counties (1:9 for PD compared to 1:3 to 1:6 in the other counties). We also noted the counties have a wide range of paralegals per attorney (1:5 to 1:16) and social workers per attorney (1:12 to

1:70) with PD having 1:14 paralegal and 1:29 social worker to attorney ratios, respectively. PD management can use this data, and consider additional information such as caseloads and case complexity, to address support staffing concerns, if needed.

We also noted that the other counties generally assigned investigators and paralegals to the various divisions to support the attorney needs of each location. However, PD's investigators and paralegals officially report to a single division, but are assigned to each location, as needed. While PD management did not indicate any concerns with the existing reporting structure, due to the differences noted with other counties, the Department should consider evaluating the reporting structure for investigators and paralegals.

Recommendation

- 7. Public Defender management consider evaluating the reporting structure for investigators and paralegals to ensure it aligns with best practices or with Public Defender management's goals and strategy for the Department.**

Comparison to Other Counties - Immigration Staff

We compared the PD's organizational structure for immigration attorneys to that of the six other counties mentioned above. PD management expressed concerns that the Department may be understaffed in immigration. See Table 2 for details.

Table 2 Organizational Structure Immigration Staff Comparison to Other Counties							
	<u>Los Angeles</u>	<u>Alameda</u>	<u>Orange</u>	<u>Riverside</u>	<u>San Bernardino</u>	<u>San Diego</u>	<u>San Francisco</u>
Representation or Consulting	Consult	Both	Consult	Consult	Consult	Consult	Both
Immigration Unit	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	No	Yes
Immigration Trained Attorneys	2	4.5	0	0	1	4	7
Dedicated Immigration Attorneys	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	No	Yes

Source: Provided by Public Defender management from each of the counties

Penal Code 1016.2 requires public defenders to provide their clients with consultation on the immigration impacts of their criminal case, if applicable. Public defenders are not required by the Penal Code to directly represent clients in immigration hearings. However, San Francisco and Alameda provide direct representation for their clients in immigration hearings. We also noted that only PD, San Francisco, and Alameda have a unit dedicated to immigration matters, with dedicated staffing ranging from two to seven. During the course of our audit, PD management reviewed their staffing needs in the

immigration area, and, as part of the Fiscal Year 2018-19 budget process, PD received Board approval for an additional four attorneys and one paralegal.

Recommendation

- 8. Public Defender management continue to monitor the immigration staffing of other counties and the Public Defender's immigration workload to ensure the Public Defender's staffing aligns with best practices and is commensurate to the workload.**

SERVICE PERFORMANCE MEASUREMENT

Key Performance Indicators (KPI) Implementation and Standards

The PD uses four KPIs to measure service performance, including case value (e.g., severity and complexity of the case), staff value (e.g., staff experience), court value (e.g., how many attorneys should be permanently assigned to a court), and client value (e.g., client demographics). While PD has developed and defined these KPIs, implementation is still in progress. For example, PD has not implemented KPIs for their juvenile attorneys/courts. PD management indicated that the implementation of their new Client Case Management System (CCMS), which is scheduled for completion in 2019, will aid the Department towards a more comprehensive implementation of KPIs.

In addition, the Department does not have a policy for updating KPI standards/thresholds (e.g., determining if the range of acceptable caseload per attorney is still appropriate). While PD management has at times updated KPI standards/thresholds, there is no policy on the frequency of review, staff responsible for the review, the criteria to use in determining acceptable ranges, and communication to relevant employees.

Recommendations

Public Defender management:

- 9. Continue implementing Key Performance Indicators Department-wide.**
- 10. Develop a policy for updating the Key Performance Indicators standards/thresholds, including the frequency of review, staff responsible for the review, the criteria to use in determining acceptable ranges, and communication to relevant employees.**

KPI Monthly Review Compliance

PD managers (e.g., Head Deputies), who are generally responsible for overseeing daily operations at the courts/units, are required to review monthly KPI reports as part of managing their court/unit. However, PD management does not have a process in place

to monitor compliance and ensure that the managers are reviewing the monthly KPI reports. Effective self-monitoring processes may include tests or observations examining an adequate number of monthly reports on a regular basis to ensure adherence. The monitoring process should also ensure material exceptions are elevated to upper management on a timely basis and that appropriate corrective actions are implemented.

Recommendation

- 11. Public Defender management develop a process to monitor the monthly review of Key Performance Indicator reports for compliance.**

Industry Best Practices

The National Legal Aid and Defender Association (NLADA) is a professional association that has published guides on certain industry best practices for public defenders. For example, the NLADA issued the “Practice Principles with Indicators of a Quality Public Defense Attorney” and “Basic Data Every Defender Program Needs to Track.” PD does perform extensive data collection, and is implementing CCMS for additional enhancements.

Recommendation

- 12. Public Defender management consider reviewing NLADA guidelines as part of their development of a strategic plan to ensure that the Department incorporates as many best practices as practical.**

Review of Report

We discussed our report with PD management. The Department indicated **general agreement** with our findings and recommendations.

We thank PD management and staff for their cooperation and assistance during our review. If you have any questions please call me, or your staff may contact Mike Pirolo at (213) 253-0100.

JN:AB:PH:MP:JU

Attachment

c: Sachi A. Hamai, Chief Executive Officer
Ricardo D. Garcia, Public Defender
Nicole Davis Tinkham, Assistant County Counsel
Audit Committee
Countywide Communications



NICOLE DAVIS TINKHAM
INTERIM PUBLIC DEFENDER

**LAW OFFICE OF THE PUBLIC DEFENDER
COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES**

CLARA SHORTRIDGE FOLTZ CRIMINAL JUSTICE CENTER
210 WEST TEMPLE STREET, 19TH FLOOR
LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90012

TEL (213) 974-2801 / FAX (213) 625-5031 / TDD (800) 801-5551

September 28, 2018

Mr. John Naimo, Auditor-Controller
Department of Auditor-Controller
Kenneth Hahn Hall of Administration
500 West Temple Street, Room 525
Los Angeles, California 90012

Mr. Naimo

Attached is the Los Angeles County Public Defender's (Department) response to the Auditor-Controller's Management Review – Review of Strategic Planning, Organizational Structure and Service Performance Measurement review for our Department. The Department is in agreement with each of your findings and in response, has developed the attached Departmental Action Plan to remedy the findings.

Should you have any questions, please contact Scott A. Wiles, Administrative Deputy at (213) 974-2807 or SWiles@pubdef.lacounty.gov.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read "Nicole Davis Tinkham".

Nicole Davis Tinkham
Interim Public Defender

Attachment

Cc: File

**PUBLIC DEFENDER - MANAGEMENT REVIEW
DEPARTMENT ACTION PLAN/RESPONSE**

ISSUE 1: STRATEGIC PLAN	
A/C Recommendation	<p>Public Defender management:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Develop a strategic plan that aligns with emerging priorities and goals. b. Include additional strategic issues noted in this report. c. Delay the approval of a new strategic plan until after the onboarding of a new Public Defender to ensure the proposed plan aligns with the new Public Defender's priorities and goals, including vetting of proposed priorities and goals with the Board of Supervisors.
Agree/Disagree	Agree
Department Action Plan¹	<p>The Public Defender completed the first of a series of engagements with the University of Southern California, Marshall School of Business graduate school to develop a new strategic plan. The first session consisted of foundational research on the department, associated laws, staffing, budget and industry trends. The next session is just beginning which will examine the department in a granular fashion to establish priorities and the desired future direction for the department.</p> <p>Moving forward and into formal planning process with Public Defender executives, focus groups and stakeholders, a consultant will need to be engaged to guide and manage the process to completion and to produce a meaningful work product.</p>
Planned Implementation Date	October 2018
Additional Information (optional)²	

ISSUE 2: SPECIAL PROJECTS AND INITIATIVES	
A/C Recommendation	Public Defender management develop a process to centrally track and report all special projects and initiatives.
Agree/Disagree	Agree
Department Action Plan¹	This Issue is complete. The department started using a cloud based service called Smart Sheet to track projects centrally in July 2018. Currently staff are updating the department's existing projects into the project management environment.
Planned Implementation Date	Complete
Additional Information (optional)²	

¹ In this section the Department should only describe the efforts they plan to take to implement the recommendation. Any other information should be included in the Additional Information section below.

² In this section the Department can provide any background or clarifying information they believe is necessary.

ISSUE 3: ORGANIZATION CHART AND RESPONSIBILITIES	
A/C Recommendation	Public Defender management consider developing an organization chart for Department-wide distribution, and update as needed.
Agree/Disagree	Agree
Department Action Plan ¹	The department is modifying its current org charts to develop a comprehensive org chart for department-wide distribution using item control as the authoritative data source and updating as staff are reassigned, hired or exit the department.
Planned Implementation Date	January 2019
Additional Information (optional) ²	The department is examining automated systems that other departments use to change their org charts, driven from their financial system based on pay location and employee numbers. Currently, org charts are generated manually by HR staff which is a time consuming process and ad hoc in nature due to lack of staffing.

ISSUE 4: ORGANIZATION CHART AND RESPONSIBILITIES	
A/C Recommendation	Public Defender management consider developing a matrix of responsibilities to help clearly identify the duties of each staff and manager.
Agree/Disagree	Agree
Department Action Plan ¹	The department is working with the DHR Impact Team to model County best practices to develop a matrix of responsibilities for the DPD series. As recommended, the matrix will included clear examples of the normal duties for each level of the DPD series as well as all specialized assignments.
Planned Implementation Date	December 2018
Additional Information (optional) ²	

ISSUE 5: DEPUTY IN-CHARGE AND RESOURCE ATTORNEY ASSIGNMENTS	
A/C Recommendation	Public Defender management develop a policy on Deputy In-Charge and Resource Attorney positions, including the criteria for selection and length of appointment.
Agree/Disagree	Agree
Department Action Plan ¹	The department understands the rationale behind this finding and will craft a policy for these specialized assignments to memorialize the qualification requirements, establish a uniform selection process and to set expectations for the duration of the assignments.
Planned Implementation Date	April 2019
Additional Information (optional) ²	

¹ In this section the Department should only describe the efforts they plan to take to implement the recommendation. Any other information should be included in the Additional Information section below.

² In this section the Department can provide any background or clarifying information they believe is necessary.

ISSUE 6: SUCCESSION PLANNING	
A/C Recommendation	Public Defender management immediately complete phases two and three of the Departmental Leadership Development Plan, and proceed with the additional phases as scheduled. Public Defender management also consider reevaluating the schedule, or the developed succession plan, to ensure it aligns with the priorities and goals of the incoming Public Defender once appointed.
Agree/Disagree	Agree
Department Action Plan ¹	The department is actively implementing phase two with the assignment of staff to the MDP and ELDP during the last two cohorts. Moving forward, attendance in the ELDP and MDP will be 2018-19 MAPP goals for Division Chiefs and Head Deputies, respectively and the LDP will be communicated to staff.
Planned Implementation Date	June 2019
Additional Information (optional) ²	

ISSUE 7: COMPARISON TO OTHER COUNTIES - SUPPORT STAFF	
A/C Recommendation	Public Defender management consider evaluating the reporting structure for investigators and paralegals to ensure it aligns with best practices or with Public Defender management's goals and strategy for the Department.
Agree/Disagree	Agree
Department Action Plan ¹	The Public Defender will conduct an analysis of the various staffing models listed in the report and assess the efficiency and feasibility against the models current employed. This analysis will be included as part of the strategic planning effort for the department.
Planned Implementation Date	January 2019 and completed by July 2019.
Additional Information (optional) ²	

ISSUE 8: COMPARISON TO OTHER COUNTIES - IMMIGRATION STAFF	
A/C Recommendation	Public Defender management continue to monitor the immigration staffing of other counties and the Public Defender's immigration workload to ensure the Public Defender's staffing aligns with best practices and is commensurate to the workload.
Agree/Disagree	Agree
Department Action Plan ¹	The Public Defender will closely monitor the caseload and immigration staffing of comparable offices to establish a normalized best practice staffing matrix.

¹ In this section the Department should only describe the efforts they plan to take to implement the recommendation. Any other information should be included in the Additional Information section below.

² In this section the Department can provide any background or clarifying information they believe is necessary.

Planned Implementation Date	January 2019 and every six months thereafter.
Additional Information (optional) ²	

ISSUE 9: KEY PERFORMANCE INDICATORS IMPLEMENTATION AND STANDARDS	
A/C Recommendation	Public Defender management continue implementing Key Performance Indicators Department-wide.
Agree/Disagree	Agree
Department Action Plan ¹	Currently PDSS with KPIs are being used in adult misdemeanors and felonies. Juvenile has developed KPIs specific to juvenile cases. Mental Health is also establishing KPIs specific to the MH cases. All of standards will be incorporated into CCMS which is slated for deployment in 2019.
Planned Implementation Date	September 2018 and completed by December 2019.
Additional Information (optional) ²	

ISSUE 10: KEY PERFORMANCE INDICATORS IMPLEMENTATION AND STANDARDS	
A/C Recommendation	Public Defender management develop a policy for updating the Key Performance Indicators standards/thresholds, including the frequency of review, staff responsible for the review, the criteria to use in determining acceptable ranges, and communication to relevant employees.
Agree/Disagree	Agree
Department Action Plan ¹	Currently, the Executive management team meets for regular review of KPIs standards and specific usage of KPIs for distribution of workload and allocation of staff. This includes weekly usage of the KPIs in reassignment sessions. Additionally Executive staff and local branch managers meet twice a year to review specific KPI standards. This includes court/staff values to ensure the effective processing of cases through the justice system and review of specific KPI ranges used in evaluating workload. The department will memorialize the existing procedure inclusive of the key points identified by this review in a formal policy
Planned Implementation Date	January 2019

¹ In this section the Department should only describe the efforts they plan to take to implement the recommendation. Any other information should be included in the Additional Information section below.

² In this section the Department can provide any background or clarifying information they believe is necessary.

Additional Information (optional) ²	
--	--

ISSUE 11: KPI MONTHLY REVIEW COMPLIANCE	
A/C Recommendation	Public Defender management develop a process to monitor the monthly review of Key Performance Indicator reports for compliance.
Agree/Disagree	Agree
Department Action Plan ¹	At the weekly reassignment meetings the Division Chiefs review the reports looking for discrepancies between data reported and numbers reported locally by branch managers. Additionally there is a monthly confirmation of cases numbers reported by the tracking system by case carrying attorneys.
Planned Implementation Date	November 2019: The department will memorialize a procedure to review the use of KPI's reports in a formal policy.
Additional Information (optional) ²	

ISSUE 12: INDUSTRY BEST PRACTICES	
A/C Recommendation	Public Defender management consider reviewing NLADA guidelines as part of their development of a strategic plan to ensure that the Department incorporates as many best practices as practical.
Agree/Disagree	Agree
Department Action Plan ¹	As suggested, the Department will use the NLADA and their published guidelines during the development of a new strategic plan.
Planned Implementation Date	June 2019: The department intends to obtain the services of a consultant next spring to lead the final and most critical phases of the strategic planning effort.
Additional Information (optional) ²	

¹ In this section the Department should only describe the efforts they plan to take to implement the recommendation. Any other information should be included in the Additional Information section below.

² In this section the Department can provide any background or clarifying information they believe is necessary.