

LOUISIANA COMMISSION ON LAW ENFORCEMENT

AND

ADMINISTRATION OF CRIMINAL JUSTICE

(LCLE)



STRATEGIC PLAN

FY 2023–2024 THROUGH FY 2027–2028

LCLE VISION:

To provide visionary leadership and resources necessary to empower the components of the state's criminal justice community (including juvenile justice and victim services communities) in the state to achieve the highest possible levels of excellence, professionalism, and ethical conduct, so as to provide a safe and secure community for all Louisiana citizens.

LCLE MISSION:

The Mission of the Louisiana Commission on Law Enforcement (LCLE) is to improve the operations of the criminal justice and juvenile justice system and to promote public safety by providing progressive leadership and coordination within the criminal justice community. To this end, the agency provides a forum for all elements of the criminal justice system to come together in common cause and to develop policy infrastructure and multi-agency programs which serve the needs of a wide range of criminal justice organizations, support proven, critical, or innovative operational initiatives through the grant programs administered by the agency, promote the highest professional and ethical standards in law enforcement through high quality training programs, and to provide quality services to the criminal justice community and victims of crime within the framework of state and federal law and policy.

LCLE PHILOSOPHY:

Public safety is a key element in the quality of life for all Louisiana citizens. The LCLE seeks to create an environment in which all aspects of the criminal justice community work together to promote the security of all people in the state. We seek innovation where old solutions are not working, and seek proven programs in those areas where success has been attained. In decision-making processes, we seek to bring together representatives from all aspects of the criminal justice community in a neutral information rich environment to address public safety concerns, so that decisions reflect the needs of the whole, and build on the strengths of all agencies involved to better service the citizens of Louisiana.

LCLE GOALS:

- I. The LCLE will ensure a continued focus on the improvement of the state's criminal justice community through the equitable administration of state and federal grant programs, high quality training and education programs, methodologically sound policy relevant research, effective multi-agency programs, providing timely assistance to victims of crime, and promoting the application of advanced technology to the criminal justice process.
- II. The LCLE will provide coordination and leadership for the criminal justice community through broad system-wide programs, which are based on participation by all aspects of the criminal justice community and by maintaining a forum for the open discussion of justice issues by all concerned.

LCLE AUTHORIZATION:

Louisiana Revised Statute (R.S.) 15:1201–1256; R.S. 46:1801, et seq.

A. FEDERAL PROGRAMS

MISSION:

Federal Programs will advance the overall agency mission through the effective administration of federal formula and discretionary grant programs as may be authorized by Congress to support the development, coordination, and when appropriate, implementation of broad system-wide programs, and by assisting in the improvement of the state’s criminal justice community through the funding of innovative, essential and needed initiatives at the state and local level.

GOALS:

- I. The LCLE will continue to promote public safety by providing federal funding assistance to all components of the criminal justice community through federal formula and discretionary funding. The LCLE will provide an equitable method for the distribution of funds available under the federal block and discretionary grant programs as may be authorized by Congress, including an appropriate set of checks and balances for each program, within the guidelines established by the applicable federal agency.
- II. The LCLE will promote public safety by continuing to oversee the development and implementation of a statewide integrated criminal justice information system, which will provide criminal justice decision makers at all levels access to the information which they need to make a timely and informed decision. The LCLE will oversee and coordinate the implementation of other broad system-wide programs in the best interest of the criminal justice community and state of Louisiana.

AUTHORIZATION:

1. Louisiana Commission on Law Enforcement (LCLE), R.S. 15:1201, et seq.
2. Violence Against Women Act (VAWA) of 1994, as amended, 34 U.S.C. § 12291(b)(13) (prohibiting discrimination in programs either funded under the statute or administered by the Office on Violence Against Women, both in employment and in the delivery of services or benefits, based on actual or perceived race, color, national origin, sex, religion, disability, sexual orientation, and gender identity) (referring to the Safe Streets Act for enforcement). (Federal Block Grant).

3. Edward Byrne Memorial Justice Assistance Grant (JAG) is a Formula Grant Program. The JAG Program is authorized by Title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (Public Law No. 90–351) (generally codified at 34 U.S.C. 10151–10726), including subpart 1 of part E (codified at 34 U.S.C. 10151 – 10158); see also 28 U.S.C. 530C(a).
4. Victims of Crime Act (VOCA) of 1984, as amended, 34 U.S.C. § 20110(e) and the regulation implementing the Crime Victim Assistance Program, 28 C.F.R. § 94.114 (prohibiting discrimination in programs funded under the statute, both in employment and in the delivery of services or benefits, based on race, color, national origin, sex, religion, and disability). (Federal Block Grant).
5. Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act (JJDPA) of 1974, as amended, Title II Part B Formula Grants Program; Departments of Commerce, Justice, and State, the Judiciary, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, November 2002 (34 U.S.C. § 11182(b)). (Federal Block Grant).
6. Juvenile Accountability Block Grant Program; Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 2002. (Federal Block Grant).

OBJECTIVE I.1:

The LCLE will award and administer two federal grant funds under the Violence Against Women Act (VAWA) Reauthorization Act of 2022, bipartisan legislation passed by Congress as part of the Omnibus appropriations package.

- (a) STOP (Services*Training*Officers*Prosecutors) Violence Against Women Formula Grant Program enhances the capacity of local communities to develop and strengthen effective law enforcement, prosecution, and court strategies to combat violent crimes against women and to develop and strengthen victim services in cases involving violent crimes against women. In surpassing federal minimum pass-through requirements, LCLE allocates 90% of funds to local criminal justice and nongovernmental, nonprofit agencies for each Federal Fiscal Year that the program is administered.
- (b) Sexual Assault Services Formula Grant Program (SASP) is the first federal funding stream solely dedicated to the provision of direct intervention and related assistance for victims of sexual assault. The funding is intended to assist in supporting rape crisis centers and other nonprofit, nongovernmental organizations or tribal programs that provide services, direct intervention, and related assistance to victims of sexual assault. Funds provided through SASP are designed to supplement other funding sources directed at addressing sexual assault on the state level by complying as the federal pass-through to the state sexual assault coalition for each Federal Fiscal Year that the program is administered.

STRATEGY I.1.1:

To apply for federal funds that are available each Federal Fiscal Year.

STRATEGY I.1.2:

- (a) To make STOP Violence Against Women Grant Program funds available through subgrants to eligible criminal justice and nonprofit agencies in accordance with Commission procedures.
- (b) To make SASP Formula Grant Program funds available through subgrants to eligible nonprofit agencies in accordance with Commission procedures.

STRATEGY I.1.3:

- (a) Develop the state plan for the STOP Violence Against Women Grant Program in accordance with applicable federal requirements developing and strengthening effective law enforcement and prosecution strategies to combat crime against women (domestic violence, sexual assault, dating violence, and stalking). Work with the Victim Services Advisory Board and the Priorities Committee of the

Louisiana Commission on Law Enforcement to establish priorities for funding under the program based on the plan and the best attainable match between identified program needs and fundable areas under the applicable federal guidelines.

- (b) Develop the state plan for the SASP Formula Grant Program in accordance with applicable federal requirements developing and strengthening direct intervention and related assistance for victims (women, men, and children) of sexual assault. Work with the Victim Services Advisory Board and the Priorities Committee of the Louisiana Commission on Law Enforcement to establish priorities for funding under the program based on the plan and the best attainable match between identified program needs and fundable areas under the applicable federal guidelines.

PERFORMANCE INDICATORS

Input: Dollars allocated by the United States Department of Justice, Office on Violence Against Women, to Louisiana to develop and strengthen victim services in cases of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking. (LaPAS PI Code – 247)

- (a) STOP dollars allocated by the United States Department of Justice, Office on Violence Against Women Office, to Louisiana for law enforcement, prosecution and courts to combat violent crimes against women and to develop and strengthen victim services in cases involving violent crimes against women.
- (b) SASP dollars allocated by the United States Department of Justice, Office on Violence Against Women to Louisiana for supporting rape crisis centers and other nonprofit, nongovernmental organizations or tribal programs that provide services, direct intervention, and related assistance to victims of sexual assault.

Application for federal funds conducted in a timely and accurate manner resulting in receipt of federal funds.

Output: Number of subgrants awarded (LaPAS PI Code – 248);

Dollar amount of subgrants awarded (LaPAS PI Code – 249); and

Completion of Annual Progress Reports.

- Outcome:** Compliance with federal pass-through requirements;
- Compliance with federal match requirements for STOP Formula Grant Program;
- Number of women served (LaPAS PI Code – 12512); and
- Number of professionals trained to provide services to women who are victims.
- Efficiency:** Direct cost of administration as a percentage of total funding administered.

HOW INDICATORS ARE USED IN MANAGEMENT DECISION MAKING:

The indicators will be used by agency management to ensure its efficient and effective administration of federal grant funds received, and to ensure compliance with the match, pass-through, and reporting requirements pursuant to the applicable federal guidelines. The indicators will also be reported to the United States Department of Justice in a different format, and are also provided to Congress by the appropriate federal agency for use in decision making relative to the future of the grant program itself.

PRIMARY PERSONS WHO WILL BENEFIT:

Law enforcement agencies, law enforcement officers, prosecutors, judges, courts, sexual assault foundation, coalition against domestic violence, women who are victims and their children under the STOP Formula Grant Program; and, the sexual assault coalition, its rape crisis centers, women, men, and children of all ages who are victims of sexual assault under the SASP Formula Grant Program, and ultimately the entire citizenry of Louisiana will benefit.

OBJECTIVE I.2: The LCLE will award and administer federal formula grant funds under the Edward Byrne Memorial Justice Assistance Grant (JAG) Program for anti-drug, violent crime, and criminal justice system improvement projects, complying with the federal requirement that a minimum of 63.5% be passed through to local criminal justice agencies for each Federal Fiscal Year that the program is administered.

STRATEGY I.2.1: To apply for federal funds that are available each Federal Fiscal Year.

STRATEGY I.2.2: To make funds available through subgrants to eligible criminal justice agencies in accordance with Commission procedures.

STRATEGY I.2.3: Develop the State Plan for the Edward Byrne Memorial Justice Assistance Grant (JAG) Program in accordance with applicable federal requirements and utilizing the best available data. Work with the Drug Control and Violent Crime Policy Board and the Priorities Committee of the Louisiana Commission on Law Enforcement to establish priorities for funding under the program based on the plan and the best attainable match between identified program needs and fundable areas under the applicable federal guidelines.

PERFORMANCE INDICATORS:

Input: Dollars allocated by the United States Department of Justice, Bureau of Justice Assistance, to Louisiana for anti-drug, violent crime, and criminal justice system improvement projects. (LaPAS PI Code – 243)

Application for funds conducted in a timely and accurate manner resulting in a receipt of federal funds.

Output: Number of subgrants awarded; (LaPAS PI Code – 244);

Dollar amount of subgrants awarded; (LaPAS PI Code – 245);

Completion of State Annual Performance Report; and

Number of subgrants evaluated for compliance.

Outcome: Compliance with federal pass-through requirements; and

Compliance with federal match requirements.

Efficiency: Direct cost of administration as a percentage of total funding administered.

HOW INDICATORS ARE USED IN MANAGEMENT DECISION MAKING:

The indicators will be used by agency management to ensure its efficient and effective administration of federal grant funds received, and to ensure compliance with the match, pass-through, reporting, and evaluation requirements pursuant to the applicable federal guidelines. The indicators will also be reported to the United States Department of Justice, Bureau of Justice Assistance, Edward Byrne Memorial Justice Assistance Grant (JAG) Program in a different format, and are also provided to Congress by the applicable federal agency for use in decision making relative to the future of the grant program itself.

PRIMARY PERSONS WHO WILL BENEFIT:

Law enforcement agencies, law enforcement officers, courts, crime labs, prosecutors, indigent defenders boards, adult/juvenile victims, substance abusers, and ultimately, the entire citizenry of Louisiana will benefit.

OBJECTIVE I.3: The LCLE will award and administer federal grant funds under the Victim Assistance Formula Grant Program (Victim Assistance Program), complying with the federal pass-through requirement of 10% to each priority category of sexual assault, spousal abuse, child abuse, and underserved victims of violent crime populations for each Federal Fiscal Year that the program is administered.

STRATEGY I.3.1: To apply for federal funds that are available each Federal Fiscal Year.

STRATEGY I.3.2: To make funds available through subgrants to local eligible qualifying community-based organizations and criminal justice and other public agencies that provide services directly to victims in accordance with Commission procedure.

STRATEGY I.3.3: Develop the State Plan and application for the Victim Assistance Program in accordance with applicable federal requirements. Work with the Victim Services Advisory Board and Priorities Committee of the Louisiana Commission on Law Enforcement to establish priorities for funding under the program based on the plan and the best attainable match between identified programs, needs, and fundable areas under the applicable federal guidelines.

PERFORMANCE INDICATORS:

Input: Dollars allocated by the United States Department of Justice, Office for Victims of Crime, to Louisiana for projects that provide direct services to victims of crime. (LaPAS PI Code – 251)

Application for funds conducted in a timely and accurate manner resulting in a receipt of federal funds.

Output: Number of subgrants awarded Dollars allocated by the United States Department of Justice, Office for Victims of Crime, to Louisiana for anti-drug, violent crime, and criminal justice system improvement projects (LaPAS PI Code – 252);

Dollar amount of subgrants awarded (LaPAS PI Code – 253); and

Completion of State Annual Performance Report.

Outcome: Compliance with federal pass-through requirements;

Compliance with federal match requirements;

Number of victims served (LaPAS PI Code – 12513); and
Compliance with the 1% federal training allowance.

Efficiency: Direct cost of administration as a percentage of total funding administered.

HOW INDICATORS ARE USED IN MANAGEMENT DECISION MAKING:

The indicators will be used by agency management to ensure its efficient and effective administration of federal grant funds received, and to ensure compliance with the match, pass-through, and reporting requirements pursuant to the applicable federal guidelines. The indicators will also be reported to the United States Department of Justice, Office for Victims for Crime in a different format, and are also provided to Congress by the applicable federal agency for use in decision making relative to the future of the grant program itself.

PRIMARY PERSONS WHO WILL BENEFIT:

The criminal justice community, victims of crime, and ultimately, the entire citizenry of Louisiana will benefit.

OBJECTIVE I.4: The LCLE will carry out the objectives of the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act (JJDP) of 1974, as amended, to support state and local delinquency prevention and intervention efforts and juvenile justice system improvement through the award and administration of the Title II Formula Block Grant Program (JJDP) by complying with federal requirements related to pass-through of funds (66.67%) to local agencies for each Federal Fiscal Year that the program is administered.

STRATEGY I.4.1: To apply for federal funds that are available each Federal Fiscal Year, and make funds available through subgrants to eligible criminal justice, juvenile justice, nongovernmental agencies, and Native American tribes with law enforcement that is recognized by the Department of the Interior in accordance with Commission procedures.

STRATEGY I.4.2: Develop the state plan for the Title II Formula Block Grant Program (JJDP) in accordance with applicable federal requirements and utilizing the best available data from the annual performance report, monitoring report, juvenile crime analysis and disproportionate minority contact data.

STRATEGY I.4.3: Establish priorities for funding based on identified program needs through the State Plan and in conjunction with the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Advisory Board, the Priorities Committee, and the Louisiana Commission on Law Enforcement, complying with fundable program areas under applicable federal guidelines.

PERFORMANCE INDICATORS:

Input: Dollars allocated by the United States Department of Justice, Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, to Louisiana for projects that support state and local delinquency prevention and intervention efforts and juvenile justice system improvement. (LaPAS PI Code – 255)

Application for funds conducted in a timely and accurate manner resulting in receipt of federal Funds.

Output: Number of subgrants awarded (LaPAS PI Code – 256);

Dollar amount of subgrants awarded (LaPAS PI Code – 257); and

Completion of State Annual PMT Performance Data Report.

Outcome: Compliance with federal pass-through requirements;
Compliance with federal match requirements; and
Number of juveniles served by grant funds (LaPAS PI Code – 12514).

Efficiency: Direct cost of administration as a percentage of total funding administered.

HOW INDICATORS ARE USED IN MANAGEMENT DECISION MAKING:

The indicators will be used by agency management to ensure its efficient and effective administration of federal grant funds received, and to ensure compliance with the match and pass-through requirements pursuant to the applicable federal guidelines. The indicators will also be reported to the United States Department of Justice, Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention in a different format, and are provided to Congress by the applicable federal agency for use in decision-making relative to the future of the grant program itself.

PRIMARY PERSONS WHO WILL BENEFIT:

Juveniles, at-risk youth and their families, service providers, and component agencies of the juvenile justice system and the citizenry of Louisiana will benefit.

OBJECTIVE I.5: The LCLE will carry out the objectives of the Juvenile Accountability Block Grant Program (JABG) promoting greater accountability from the juvenile offender and the juvenile justice system through the award and administration of the JABG Federal Grant Program each Federal Fiscal Year.

STRATEGY I.5.1: To apply for federal funds that are available each Federal Fiscal Year, and make funds available through subgrants to units of local government as designated by the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, in accordance with Commission procedures.

STRATEGY I.5.2: The LCLE will coordinate with the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Advisory Board, Priorities Committee of the Louisiana Commission on Law Enforcement and designated units of local government the funding of JABG programs for the prevention and control of delinquency and the improvement of the juvenile justice system, following all applicable federal guidelines and in accordance with Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention.

PERFORMANCE INDICATORS:

Input: Dollars allocated by the United States Department of Justice, Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, to Louisiana, for projects that are intended to ultimately hold the juvenile offender and the juvenile justice system accountable. (LaPAS PI Code – 269)

Application for funds conducted in a timely and accurate manner resulting in a receipt of federal funds.

Output: Number of subgrants awarded (LaPAS PI Code – 270);

Dollar amount of subgrants awarded (LaPAS PI Code – 271); and

Completion of State Annual Performance Report.

Outcome: Compliance with federal pass-through requirements;

Compliance with federal match requirements; and

Number of juveniles served by grant funds (LaPAS PI Code – 12517).

Efficiency: Direct cost of administration as a percentage of total funding administered.

HOW INDICATORS ARE USED IN MANAGEMENT DECISION MAKING:

The indicators will be used by agency management to ensure its efficient and effective administration of federal grant funds received, and to ensure compliance with the match and pass-through requirements pursuant to the applicable federal guidelines. The indicators will also be reported to the United States Department of Justice, Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention in a different format, and are also provided to Congress by the applicable federal agency for use in decision making relative to the future of the grant program itself.

PRIMARY PERSONS WHO WILL BENEFIT:

Juveniles, service providers, components of the juvenile justice system and the citizenry of Louisiana will benefit.

OBJECTIVE I.6: The LCLE will seek to ensure that criminal justice agencies in Louisiana participate as fully as possible in the federal discretionary grant programs offered by the United States Department of Justice in order to obtain support for critical, pilot, or innovative programs.

Increase awareness of federal discretionary grant programs by state and local criminal justice agencies in Louisiana by maintaining an INTERNET based clearinghouse for discretionary grant information through June 30, 2028.

STRATEGY I.6.1: The LCLE will work with state and local criminal justice agencies to determine the needs and priorities of the criminal justice community in the state. Work with the various agencies within the United States Department of Justice as well as Louisiana's Congressional delegation to identify discretionary grant programs which meet the identified needs.

STRATEGY I.6.2: Maintain a Discretionary Grant Information Clearinghouse on the agency web site. Work with the associations representing the major components of the criminal justice system as well as state level criminal justice agencies to ensure that the site has the information and functionality desired by the criminal justice community.

PERFORMANCE INDICATORS:

Input: Baseline resource allocation for maintaining online clearinghouse.

Output: Number of discretionary grant programs covered in the online clearinghouse.

Outcome: Number of "hits" on the clearinghouse online site.

Efficiency: Cost per "hit" on the clearinghouse online site.

HOW INDICATORS ARE USED IN MANAGEMENT DECISION MAKING:

This set of indicators will be used by management to monitor the progress of the ICJIS implementation process relative to program priorities and resources. These are critical decisions, since the ability of the state to develop a high quality ICJIS is heavily dependent on the success of the implementation effort.

PRIMARY PERSONS WHO WILL BENEFIT:

The primary target group for the ICJIS Strategic Plan is the state-level departments and associations, which are the Louisiana Sheriffs' Association and the Louisiana District

Attorney's Association. These Associations currently house or will house major ICJIS components of the Plan at the Louisiana Supreme Court, Louisiana State Police, the Department of Corrections, and the Louisiana Commission on Law Enforcement.

The ultimate clients for the ICJIS are all of the component agencies of the criminal justice system in the state. The secondary client is the U.S. Department of Justice, inasmuch as the plan charts the state's course in our efforts to comply with the mandates of the Byrne JAG Program, and to participate in the National Crime Information Center (NCIC 2000). Crime victims also benefit from the availability and use of LA VINE.

OBJECTIVE I.7: Apply for two discretionary grants per federal fiscal year in priority areas as determined by the members of the Louisiana Commission on Law Enforcement.

STRATEGY I.7.1: Work with the priorities committee of the Commission to determine priority areas within which to seek federal discretionary assistance.

STRATEGY I.7.2: Work with the applicable federal agencies which issue discretionary grant funds to inform them of the needs in the Louisiana criminal justice community and to demonstrate the ability of criminal justice agencies in Louisiana to deliver the results sought by the federal initiatives.

PERFORMANCE INDICATORS:

Input: Baseline number of discretionary applications prepared.

Output: Number of discretionary applications submitted.

Outcome: Number of discretionary grants awarded (LaPAS PI Code – 23364); and

Amount of funding obtained through discretionary grants (LaPAS PI Code – 12521).

Efficiency: Cost of preparation as percentage of funds awarded.

HOW INDICATORS ARE USED IN MANAGEMENT DECISION MAKING:

Indicators will be used by management to examine the effectiveness of the program and to make decisions based on cost-effectiveness and criticality relative to the resources allocated to the program.

PRIMARY PERSONS WHO WILL BENEFIT:

Agencies which comprise the criminal justice system at the state and local level, as well as private providers of criminal justice and juvenile justice services will benefit.

OBJECTIVE II.1: Coordinate the implementation of Phase II of the ICJIS Strategic Plan.

STRATEGY II.1.1: Work with the ICJIS Policy Board and representatives of all aspects of the criminal justice community to ensure the functionality of the system as it is being implemented.

PERFORMANCE INDICATORS:

Input: Baseline resource allocation for implementation of Phase II of the Strategic Plan.

Output: Implementation of the Plan on schedule.

Outcome: Acceptance of the implementation of the Plan by the criminal justice community.

HOW INDICATORS ARE USED IN MANAGEMENT DECISION MAKING:

This set of indicators will be used by management to monitor the progress of the ICJIS implementation process relative to program priorities and resources. These are critical decisions, since the ability of the state to develop a high quality ICJIS is heavily dependent on the success of the implementation effort.

PRIMARY PERSONS WHO WILL BENEFIT:

The primary target group for the ICJIS Strategic Plan are the state-level departments and associations (Louisiana Sheriffs' Association and Louisiana District Attorney's Association) which house or will house the major ICJIS components (Louisiana Supreme Court, State Police, Department of Corrections, and the Louisiana Commission on Law Enforcement). The ultimate clients for the ICJIS are all of the component agencies of the criminal justice system in the state. The secondary client is the U.S. Department of Justice, inasmuch as the plan charts the state's course in our efforts to comply with the mandates of the Byrne JAG, and to participate in the National Crime Information Center (NCIC 2000). Crime victims also benefit from the availability and use of LA VINE.

OBJECTIVE II.2: Implement the fully operational ICJIS, insuring full connectivity of all components by June 30, 2028.

STRATEGY II.2.1: The LCLE will work with the ICJIS Policy Board, all major stakeholders of the ICJIS, and local law enforcement agencies to implement the ICJIS Strategic Plan. Assist the ICJIS Policy Board in monitoring the implementation of the system within component agencies.

PERFORMANCE INDICATORS:

Input: Baseline resource allocation for the implementation of major ICJIS components.

Output: Number of ICJIS components operational.

Outcome: Percentage of eligible criminal justice agencies with access to one or more ICJIS components; and

Percentage of eligible criminal justice agencies participating in ICJIS.

Efficiency: Cost per participating agency.

HOW INDICATORS ARE USED IN MANAGEMENT DECISION MAKING:

Indicators will be used by management to monitor the implementation of the ICJIS plan and to support decisions relative to program priorities and resources, as well as to trigger needed plan modifications.

PRIMARY PERSONS WHO WILL BENEFIT:

The major groups affected by this objective are the component agencies of the state's criminal justice system. These agencies are affected by the requirements of implementation which must be borne by each agency, and by the access to timely, accurate, and complete information which the system will produce.

OBJECTIVE II.3: Increase the percentage of the state’s population covered by Louisiana Incident Based Reporting (LIBRS) to 95% by June 30, 2028.

STRATEGY II.3.1: Conduct regional training sessions for local law enforcement agencies.

STRATEGY II.3.2: Complete development and fully implement a data quality assurance program to support accurate and timely reporting of crime data by local law enforcement agencies.

STRATEGY II.3.3: Develop and maintain a system of field support for eligible local law enforcement agencies which includes a site visit to each eligible agency on an annual basis. The field support will be designed to encourage transitioning agencies to report, and to assist reporting agencies in their reporting efforts. The field support will also provide technical assistance and training to enable local agencies to utilize the data collected for crime reporting in their own operations.

STRATEGY II.3.4: Work with the Louisiana Sheriffs' Association and the Louisiana Association of Chiefs of Police to encourage full, timely, and accurate transitioning from Uniform Crime Reporting to LIBRS reporting among their member departments.

PERFORMANCE INDICATORS:

Input: Baseline resource allocation; and
Number of law enforcement agencies eligible to contribute data to the system.

Output: Number of training sessions conducted; and
Number of site visits conducted.

Outcome: Number of eligible law enforcement agencies reporting;
Percentage of eligible law enforcement agencies reporting; and
Percentage of state population covered by reporting agencies.

Efficiency: Cost per population covered.

HOW INDICATORS ARE USED IN MANAGEMENT DECISION MAKING:

Indicators will be used by management to monitor the overall output and impact those outputs are having on crime reporting levels in Louisiana. Raw data compiled for the indicators will be used to target problem areas for additional resources, and to establish priorities for the program.

PRIMARY PERSONS WHO WILL BENEFIT:

Eligible state and local law enforcement agencies should report to the system. The clientele for the information produced by the system are all component agencies in the criminal justice system, the Legislature, the Governor, and the public. The secondary beneficiary is the Federal Bureau of Investigation which receives and compiles this information at the national level.

OBJECTIVE II.4: Increase the number of eligible local law enforcement agencies, which have completed Louisiana Incident Based Crime Reporting (LIBRS) certification to 250 by June 30, 2028.

STRATEGY II.4.1: Complete development and distribute the LEMIS–based software to the maximum number of agencies, and provide training and support in its utilization.

STRATEGY II.4.2: Work with the major metropolitan law enforcement agencies in the adaptation of their existing record management systems to become LIBRS compliant. Provide technical support relative to LIBRS standards and grant funding, when possible, to assist in defraying the costs involved.

STRATEGY II.4.3: Provide high quality reports or other functionality from the LIBRS data base to contributing agencies which meet needs of those local agencies which they cannot satisfy from their internal information systems.

STRATEGY II.4.4: Work with the Louisiana Sheriffs' Association and the Louisiana Association of Chiefs of Police to encourage local law enforcement agencies to adopt the LIBRS standard.

PERFORMANCE INDICATORS:

- Input:** Baseline resource allocation; and
Number of law enforcement agencies eligible to contribute data to the system.
- Output:** Number of agencies using La–LEMIS and LEMIS–based software as well as the number of agencies using other RMS vendors; and
Number of agencies receiving funding to modify legacy systems to comport with LIBRS standard.
- Outcome:** Number of agencies completing LIBRS certification; and
Percentage of state population covered by LIBRS reporting.
- Efficiency:** Cost per population covered.

HOW INDICATORS ARE USED IN MANAGEMENT DECISION MAKING:

Management will utilize the indicators and supporting data to assess program development and to set priorities for the certification process as well as to support resource allocation. The certification process for the program is a critical function and requires a substantial number of resources in order to gain maximum impact on reporting levels. This is crucial to the agency's ability to meet the stated objectives.

PRIMARY PERSONS WHO WILL BENEFIT:

Eligible local law enforcement agencies must participate in LIBRS. The target group for the Louisiana Law Enforcement Management Information System (LaLEMIS) are those local law enforcement agencies in need of a computerized record management information system and a means through which to participate in all of the state level criminal justice information systems.

The clientele for the information produced by the system are the component agencies of the criminal justice system, state and local level policy makers, and the public. The secondary client is the Federal Bureau of Investigation which is the parent agency for the National Incident Based Crime Reporting Program which receives and publishes the information produced by LIBRS, along with information from all other participating states.

B. STATE PROGRAMS

MISSION:

State Programs in the LCLE will advance the overall agency mission through the effective administration of state programs as authorized, to assist in the improvement of the state's criminal justice community through the funding of innovative, essential and needed criminal justice initiatives at the state and local levels. State Programs also provide leadership and coordination of multi-agency efforts in those areas directly relating to the overall Agency mission.

GOALS:

The LCLE will continue to promote public safety by providing state funding, research, and policy planning assistance for necessary improvements to all eligible components of the criminal justice community. The LCLE will provide an equitable method for the distribution of funds available, including an appropriate set of checks and balances for each program.

AUTHORIZATION:

1. LCLE, R.S. 15:1201, et seq.
2. Crime Victim Reparations, R.S. 46:1816, et seq.
3. Law Enforcement Assistance Fund, R.S. 46:1816, et seq.
4. Drug Abuse Treatment and Education, C.Cr.P. Act 895.1(E)
5. Tobacco Tax Health Care Fund R.S. 47:841, et seq.
6. Automated Victim Notification System, R.S. 15:1229
7. Peace Officer Standards and Training Law, R.S. 40:2401, et seq.
8. Truancy and Assessment and Service Centers, CHC 791.1, et seq.

OBJECTIVE III.1: The LCLE will allocate, award, and administer the annual state DARE (Drug Abuse Resistance Education) appropriation providing for and enhancing the promotion and improvement of the statewide violence and drug prevention program.

STRATEGY III.1.1: Make funds available through subgrants to eligible agencies demonstrating the capacity to present the DARE program in accordance with the national model.

STRATEGY III.1.2: The LCLE will oversee the statewide certification of DARE officers, and monitor the progress of curriculum delivery toward maintaining the integrity of the program, carrying out the objectives of the national model, by working and partnering with the State DARE Training Center.

PERFORMANCE INDICATORS:

Input: Funds allocated to the DARE program by annual state appropriation; and
Certified officers available to present DARE.

Output: Number of students receiving the DARE presentation (LaPAS PI Codes – 12522, 12523, 12524);

Number of parishes and school districts receiving the DARE presentation (LaPAS PI Codes – 11876, 12518);

Number of new officers certified annually (LaPAS PI Code – 12515);

Number of agencies receiving state DARE funds (LaPAS PI Code – 12518);
and

Dollar amount of subgrants awarded (LaPAS PI Code – 285).

Outcome: Percentage change in number of students receiving the DARE presentation;
and

Difference in pre/post test scores among DARE core students.

Efficiency: Cost per student receiving the DARE presentation; and

Administrative costs as a percentage of the total annual appropriation.

HOW INDICATORS ARE USED IN MANAGEMENT DECISION MAKING:

The indicators will be used by agency management to ensure its efficient and effective administration of state appropriated funds to ensure the integrity of the DARE program. The data is also used to prioritize funding categories of the DARE Program. They will be used by agency management to determine training demands in assessing the needs of the State DARE Training Center. Overall, the data is used to indicate the demand and need of the DARE program in the State.

PRIMARY PERSONS WHO WILL BENEFIT:

Louisiana's school districts and children who receive the DARE program, and ultimately the citizens of Louisiana will benefit.

- OBJECTIVE III.2:** To provide for and validate delivery of standardized basic training to Louisiana peace officers as prescribed by Louisiana Law.
- STRATEGY III.2.1:** Manage, monitor, and administer basic POST (Peace Officers Standards and Training) training statewide.
- STRATEGY III.2.2:** Conduct basic POST certification process through the application of minimum standards and the POST Comprehensive Exam.
- STRATEGY III.2.3:** Develop and implement a comprehensive system of academy evaluation, performance review, and technical assistance which ensures that each academy is conducting the required POST minimum curriculum for all POST certified training programs presented by the academy.
- STRATEGY III.2.4:** Develop and implement a program to review all POST certified curricula on a periodic basis to ensure that the training offered meets the needs of law enforcement personnel in the state, and is of the highest professional quality.
- STRATEGY III.2.5:** Periodically, conduct and validate peace officer job task analysis to ensure that basic training curriculum meets contemporary standards and benchmarks.
- STRATEGY III.2.6:** Continually review, validate, and improve the POST certification examination in order to ensure the quality of the basic training process.

PERFORMANCE INDICATORS:

- Input:** Funds available for basic peace officer training;
Number of accredited training centers; and
Number of students initially enrolled in basic peace officer training.
- Output:** Number of basic peace officer training courses conducted annually (LaPAS PI Code – 272); and
Dollar amount of funds reimbursed to agencies based on the number of peace officers successfully certified at certified regional training centers (LaPAS PI Code – 278).

Outcome: Number of peace officers who successfully completed all aspects of POST minimum standards of training and successfully pass the state POST certification test (LaPAS PI Code – 274); and

Number of peace officers who have successfully completed all aspects of POST minimum standards of training and who have successfully completed the state POST certification re–test (this number is actually included in the total outcome of all certifications for reporting purposes, although a different test is given in the re–test).

Efficiency: Number of persons successfully completing all aspects of POST basic peace officer training as a percentage of the total number of students enrolled in classes graduating in a state fiscal year.

HOW INDICATORS ARE USED IN MANAGEMENT DECISION MAKING:

Management will use the indicators and underlying data to make resource allocation decisions and in the assignment of priorities for training.

PRIMARY PERSONS WHO WILL BENEFIT:

Peace officers, law enforcement agencies, and citizens of the state of Louisiana will benefit.

OBJECTIVE III.3: To provide for and validate delivery of standardized correctional training.

STRATEGY III.3.1: Manage, monitor, and administer the basic training program for correctional peace officers in conformity with standards and curricula established by the Louisiana POST Council.

PERFORMANCE INDICATORS:

Input: Funds available for basic correctional peace officer training;
Number of accredited training centers and satellite centers; and
Number of students initially enrolled in basic correctional peace officer training.

Output: Number of basic correctional peace officer training courses conducted annually (LaPAS PI Code – 273); and
Dollar amount of funds reimbursed to agencies based on the number of peace officers successfully certified at certified regional training centers or satellite centers (LaPAS PI Code – 278).

Outcome: Number of correctional peace officers who successfully complete POST basic training and successfully pass the state POST certification test (LaPAS PI Code – 275); and
Number of correctional peace officers who have successfully completed all aspects of POST minimum standards of training and who have successfully completed the state POST certification retest (this number is actually included in the total outcome of all certifications for reporting purposes, although a different test is given in the retest).

Efficiency: Number of persons successfully completing all aspects of POST basic correctional peace officer training as a percentage of the total number of students enrolled in classes graduating in a state fiscal year.

HOW INDICATORS ARE USED IN MANAGEMENT DECISION MAKING:

Management will use the indicators and underlying data to monitor the correctional officers training support program, and to make decisions relative to resource allocation and priorities for the program.

PRIMARY PERSONS WHO WILL BENEFIT:

Local correctional officers, local detention and correctional agencies, and the citizens of the state of Louisiana will benefit.

OBJECTIVE III.4: Manage, monitor, and administer the basic training program for correctional (jailer) training in conformity with standards and curricula established by the Louisiana POST Council.

PERFORMANCE INDICATORS:

Input: Funds available for correctional (jailer) training.

Output: Dollar amount of funds reimbursed to local agencies based on the number of successful certifications of correctional (jailer) officers.

Outcome: Number of newly certified correctional (jailer) officers.

Efficiency: Average reimbursement per correctional officer (jailer).

HOW INDICATORS ARE USED IN MANAGEMENT DECISION MAKING:

Management will use the indicators and underlying data to monitor the correctional officers (jailer) training support program, and to make decisions relative to resource allocation and priorities for the program.

PRIMARY PERSONS WHO WILL BENEFIT:

Local correctional officers, local detention and correctional agencies, and the citizens of the state of Louisiana will benefit.

OBJECTIVE III.5: To provide for and validate delivery of In-service and Specialized Training as authorized by the Louisiana POST Council.

STRATEGY III.5.1: Evaluate, approve, and administer specialized training.

STRATEGY III.5.2: Provide resources and approval of in-service training of Peace Officers.

PERFORMANCE INDICATORS:

Input: Total funds available for mandated In-service and Specialized Training.

Output: Dollar amount reimbursed to local agencies for mandated in-service and Specialized Training.

Outcome: Number of persons trained.

Efficiency: Average cost per officer trained.

HOW INDICATORS ARE USED IN MANAGEMENT DECISION MAKING:

Management will use the indicators and underlying data to monitor the in-service and specialized training process and in making decisions relative to resource allocation and priority setting for the program.

PRIMARY PERSONS WHO WILL BENEFIT:

All peace officers certified by the POST Council, and ultimately the taxpayers and citizens of the State of Louisiana will benefit.

OBJECTIVE III.6: To conduct Instructor Development and Certification.

STRATEGY III.6.1: Incorporate Instructor Development training into all specialized training program requirements established by POST.

PERFORMANCE INDICATORS:

Input: Amount of funds available; and
Number of POST Master Instructors available.

Output: Number of Instructor Development Courses offered; and
Number of Instructor Development Course participants.

Outcome: Number of Instructor Development certifications awarded annually.

Efficiency: Percentage of course participants successfully completing the program.

HOW INDICATORS ARE USED IN MANAGEMENT DECISION MAKING:

Management will use the indicators and underlying data to monitor the instructor development process and in making decisions relative to resource allocation and priority setting for the program.

PRIMARY PERSONS WHO WILL BENEFIT:

All peace officers certified by the POST Council, and ultimately the taxpayers and citizens of the State of Louisiana will benefit.

OBJECTIVE III.7: To administer the Crime Victims Reparations Program (CVR), keeping average case processing time to below 60 days.

STRATEGY III.7.1: Continue to develop and modify the administrative review/approval process for CVR claims.

STRATEGY III.7.2: Conduct one statewide training workshop for Sheriff's CVR claim investigators and three regional training workshops for Sheriffs' CVR Claim Investigators and District Attorney Victim Assistance Coordinators.

STRATEGY III.7.3: To continually update and implement CVR administrative procedures online for victims and their families, and CVR Claims Investigators.

PERFORMANCE INDICATORS:

Input: Number of reparations claims received by LCLE.

Output: Number of reparations claims processed (LaPAS PI Code – 289); and
Number of crime victims compensated by the reparations program (LaPAS PI Code – 290).

Outcome: Total dollar amount of compensation awarded (LaPAS PI Code – 292).

Efficiency: Average LCLE time to process a claim (LaPAS PI Code – 291).

HOW INDICATORS ARE USED IN MANAGEMENT DECISION MAKING:

Indicators are used to:

1. Adjust the workload of the program manager;
2. Adjust the number of claims considered by the Crime Victims Reparations Board each month;
3. Determine the average number of claims the claim reviewer reviews each month;
4. Assess adequate manpower and resource requirements; and,
5. Determine whether sufficient funds are available to pay reparations awards.

PRIMARY PERSONS WHO WILL BENEFIT:

Victims of violent crime and their families who must deal with emotional, physical, and financial aftermath of crime will benefit.

OBJECTIVE III.8: To administer an Automated Victim Notification System.

STRATEGY III.8.1: To provide notification of offender status to crime victims.

PERFORMANCE INDICATORS:

Input: Funds available to administer the system.

Output: Number of parishes participating in the system (LaPAS PI Code – 15798);

Number of statewide systems participating in the system (LaPAS PI Code – 15799); and

Percentage of population covered by the system (LaPAS PI Code – 15800).

Outcome: Number of parishes with access to the system.

Efficiency: Number of persons accessing LA VINE.

HOW INDICATORS ARE USED IN MANAGEMENT DECISION MAKING:

Indicators will be used by management to track utilization levels of the system, in order to determine necessary improvements, and to track the effect each year's improvements have on utilization.

PRIMARY PERSONS WHO WILL BENEFIT:

The victims themselves will receive the most immediate benefit, as well as victims' families, victim advocates, law enforcement personnel, victim services providers, and the general public interested in determining the court/custodial status of an offender.

OBJECTIVE III.9: To develop and implement a State wide Specialized Training Program.

STRATEGY III.9.1: Manage, monitor, and administer homicide investigator and violent crime training for law enforcement officers statewide.

PERFORMANCE INDICATORS:

Input: Funds available for homicide investigator training; and
Number of law enforcement officers enrolled in training.

Output: Number of homicide investigators trained;
Percentage of population covered by their agencies; and
Number of statewide systems participating in the system.

Outcome: Number of law enforcement officers successfully completing homicide investigator training.

Efficiency: Number of law enforcement officers successfully completing homicide investigator training as a percentage of the total number of enrollees.

HOW INDICATORS ARE USED IN MANAGEMENT DECISION MAKING:

Indicators will be used by management to examine the effectiveness of the training program, and to make decisions based on cost-effectiveness and criticality relative to the resources allocated to the program.

PRIMARY PERSONS WHO WILL BENEFIT:

Law enforcement agencies, investigators, law enforcement officers, and the general public will benefit.

OBJECTIVE III.10: To continue to advance State outcome goals and objectives for public safety.

STRATEGY III.10.1: To develop, provide, and implement efficient and effective administrative functions while continuing to advance crime and safety reform goals and objectives.

PERFORMANCE INDICATORS:

Input: Funds available for administrative budget.

Output: Agency oversight of efficiency and effectiveness of administrative budget.

Outcome: Agency oversight cost as a percent of the overall budget (LaPAS PI Code – 23365).

Efficiency: Agency oversight cost less than 3 percent of the overall budget.

HOW INDICATORS ARE USED IN MANAGEMENT DECISION MAKING:

Indicators will be used by management to examine the efficiency and effectiveness of the agency's administrative oversight cost.

PRIMARY PERSONS WHO WILL BENEFIT:

The citizens of the state of Louisiana will benefit.

OBJECTIVE III.11 To develop, implement and operate a statewide Truancy Assessment and Service Centers (TASC) program.

STRATEGY III.11.1: Provide early identification and assessment of children with chronic absenteeism.

PERFORMANCE INDICATORS:

Input: Funds available for the Truancy Assessment Service Centers (TASC) program by annual state appropriation.

Output: Number of TASC program participants (LaPAS PI Code – 25376);
Number of new Informal Family Service Plan Agreements (IFSPAs) completed during reporting period (LaPAS PI Code – 25377);
Percentage of IFSPAs completed within sixty (60) days (LaPAS PI Code – 25378); and
Percent of children in the TASC program school attendance verified within sixty (60) days (LaPAS PI Code – 25379).

Outcome: Number of truant students with less than 10 unexcused absences after referral to TASC (LaPAS PI Code – 25380); and
Number of new referrals that move to the next academic level (LaPAS PI Code – 25381).

Efficiency: Number of children accessing program.

HOW INDICATORS ARE USED IN MANAGEMENT DECISION MAKING:

The indicators will be used by LCLE management to track the utilization and effectiveness of the TASC in participating school districts to determine what, if any, changes or improvements are needed to increase the efficiency of each center.

PRIMARY PERSONS WHO WILL BENEFIT:

Truant students and their families are the primary beneficiaries of the program. Secondary beneficiaries are the individual school the truant attends, as well as, the school district for each school. Both the school and the respective school district should show an increase in the attendance rates of the truant students serviced by the Center.

APPENDIX A

A. FEDERAL PROGRAMS, OBJECTIVES I.1 – I.7

1. **Provide a brief statement identifying the principal clients and users of each program and the specific service or benefit derived by such persons or organizations.**

The federal Programs will serve eligible units of local government, state government, local criminal justice agencies, private nonprofit agencies, and statewide associations. These entities will receive funds which will enable them to gather and process criminal justice data, fight crime, upgrade or enhance their operations, and/or provide direct services to juveniles or victims, depending on the funding source. The benefits to the state include better trained and equipped law enforcement agencies and officers, enhanced prosecution and judiciary activities, and more comprehensive services to victims. The ultimate beneficiary is the entire citizenry of Louisiana.

2. **Identify the potential external factors that are beyond the control of the entity and that could significantly affect the achievement of its goals or objectives.**
 - A. Federal funds are reduced or are no longer appropriated.
 - B. State match becomes unavailable, or is not provided in sufficient quantity to meet minimum requirements required by the federal program.
 - C. The State chooses not to participate in any or all of the programs.
 - D. The Local Law Enforcement Planning Districts, which work in conjunction with the LCLE and its grant programs, do not allocate and monitor funds timely.
 - E. Local Districts do not notify LCLE timely of programs not able to spend funds timely. This prevents reallocation of federal funds within the time frame.
 - F. Subgrant agencies do not expend funds properly or timely.
 - G. Subgrant agencies do not submit required paperwork timely or correctly. This could be because of staff changes, changes in program philosophy or other issues uncovered by audit or monitoring.
 - H. Other external factors that could significantly affect the achievement of its goals and objectives include changes in administration, funding, needs, priorities, etc. within the Local Law Enforcement Planning Districts, as well as, within subgrant agencies.

3. Provide a description of any program evaluation used to develop objectives and strategies.

Because these are federal formula grant programs, the objective for each program calls for successfully applying for and receiving funds from the federal government and, ensuring compliance with all federally-imposed programmatic and match requirements. The evaluation is necessary to determine if available federal funds are successfully brought into the State.

4. Provide an explanation of how duplication of effort shall be avoided when the operations of more than one program are directed at achieving a single goal, objective, or strategy.

Programs do not duplicate their efforts. Each funding source is independent and works to collaborate and coordinate with other funding sources as state and local needs dictate. For example, the Victims of Crime Act supports two programs in the State under the Louisiana Commission on Law Enforcement: the Crime Victims Reparations (CVR) Program, which is a combination of state and federal funds, and the Crime Victim Assistance (CVA) Program, which is a combination of federal funds and local match, either cash or inkind.

The CVR Program reimburses out-of-pocket expenses to victims of crime once they have reported the crime to law enforcement, and have completed the application process. The CVA Program provides funds to agencies throughout the state so that these agencies can provide direct services to victims. To access this program, which consists entirely of services, and not reimbursement for out-of-pocket expenses, the victim is not required to report to law enforcement.

The STOP Violence Against Women Program serves women who are victims of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking. The federal guidelines complement those of the Crime Victim Assistance Program, in that while agencies may receive funding from both sources, their activities under each funding source are monitored to be sure no duplication of services, dual compensation or supplanting occurs.

5. Documentation as to the validity, reliability, and appropriateness of each performance indicator, as well as the method used to verify and validate the performance indicators as relevant measure of each program's performance.

Please refer to the attached Performance Indicator Matrix and Performance Indicator Documentation Sheets.

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR MATRIX

Objective	Inputs	Outputs	Outcomes	Efficiency
I.1 – I.5	Dollars allocated by the U.S. Department of Justice	Number of subgrants awarded	Compliance with federal pass-through requirements	Direct cost of administration as a percentage of total funding administered
	Application for federal funds conducted in a timely and accurate manner resulting in receipt of federal funds	Dollar amount of subgrants awarded	Compliance with federal match requirements	
		Completion of state annual progress and performance measurements reports		
I.1			Number of professionals trained to provide services to women who are victims	
			Number of women served	
I.2		Number of subgrant evaluated for compliance		
I.3			Number of victims served	
			Compliance with the 1% federal training allowance	
I.4 – I.5			Number of juveniles served by grant funds	

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION SHEET

Program: Federal Programs, Objectives I.1 – I.5

Date: 06/2028

1. INDICATOR NAME – DOLLARS ALLOCATED BY THE UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE FOR THE FOLLOWING FEDERAL GRANT PROGRAMS; VIOLENCE AGAINST WOMEN, BYRNE JAG, CRIME VICTIM ASSISTANCE, JUVENILE JUSTICE AND DELINQUENCY PREVENTION, JUVENILE ACCOUNTABILITY BLOCK GRANT PROGRAM, LOCAL LAW ENFORCEMENT BLOCK GRANT PROGRAM
2. Indicator type – Input.
3. Rationale – This Indicator measures the dollars allocated by the U.S. Department of Justice, based on appropriations made by the United States Congress and represents the amount set aside for Louisiana.
4. Data collection procedures – This information is received by phone call/letter notification from the respective agencies within the United States Department of Justice.
5. Frequency and timing of (a) collection, (b) reporting – This information is received after Congress has signed the Appropriations Bill, usually once a year, and is reported on a federal fiscal year basis.
6. Calculation methodology – Formula used by the United States Department of Justice, usually based on population statistics.
7. Definitions of any unclear terms – Not applicable.
8. What aggregations or disaggregations of the indicator are needed? – None – By state and federal fiscal year.
9. Who is responsible for data collection and quality? – LCLE program staff receives the allocation amounts from the respective United States Department of Justice agencies.
10. Limitations of the indicator – The need for and the appropriation amount are set by the federal government.

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION SHEET

Program: Federal Programs, Objectives I.1 – I.5

Date: 06/2028

1. INDICATOR NAME – APPLICATION FOR FEDERAL FUNDS CONDUCTED IN A TIMELY AND ACCURATE MANNER RESULTING IN RECEIPT OF FEDERAL FUNDS
2. Indicator type – Input.
3. Rationale – This Indicator measures the success of the state in applying for funds and implementing them properly, because without this assurance, funds to the state would cease.
4. Data collection procedures – Award document received from the U.S. Department of Justice on a federal fiscal year basis.
5. Frequency and timing of (a) collection, (b) reporting – Information received from the U.S. Department of Justice by federal Award, on a federal fiscal year basis.
6. Calculation methodology – Not applicable.
7. Definition of any unclear terms – Not applicable.
8. What aggregations or disaggregations of the indicator are needed? – By state and federal fiscal year.
9. Who is responsible for data collection and quality? – LCLE Fiscal and federal program staff.
10. Limitations of the indicator – Limited by the appropriation and availability of federal funds.

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION SHEET

Program: Federal Programs, Objectives I.1 – I.5

Date: 06/2028

1. INDICATOR NAME – NUMBER OF SUBGRANTS AWARDED
2. Indicator type – Output.
3. Rationale – This Indicator measures the number of subgrants awarded for a federal fund type.
4. Data collection procedures – LCLE fiscal section oversees the collection and maintenance of this information.
5. Frequency and timing of (a) collection, (b) reporting – Subgrants for each federal fiscal year are awarded over a period of several years, within the Grant start and end date established on the federal grant award. This indicator is usually reported by federal fund type by federal fiscal year.
6. Calculation methodology – A count of federal subgrants awarded per federal fund type, per federal fiscal year.
7. Definitions of any unclear terms – Federal fiscal year is the federal year of the appropriation. Grant start and end dates are provided on the federal grant award document, and represent a span of time during which federal funds can be used.
8. What aggregations or disaggregations of the indicator are needed? – By state and federal fiscal year.
9. Who is responsible for data collection and quality? – LCLE fiscal section and federal program staff.
10. Limitations of the indicator – Limited by the number of agencies interested and willing to apply for federal grant funds.

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION SHEET

Program: Federal Programs, Objectives I.1 – I.5

Date: 06/2028

1. INDICATOR NAME – DOLLAR AMOUNT OF SUBGRANTS AWARDED
2. Indicator type – Output.
3. Rationale – This Indicator measures the dollar amount awarded in subgrants for a federal fund type, for a particular federal fiscal year.
4. Data collection procedures – LCLE fiscal section.
5. Frequency and timing of (a) collection, (b) reporting – Subgrants for each federal fiscal year are awarded over a period of several years, within the Grant start and end dates established on the federal grant award. This indicator is usually reported by federal fund type by federal fiscal year.
6. Calculation methodology – The sum of the dollar amount awarded per federal fund type, per federal fiscal year.
7. Definitions of any unclear terms – Federal fiscal year is the federal year of the appropriation. Federal grant start and end dates are provided on the federal grant award document and represents a span of time during which federal funds can be used.
8. What aggregations or disaggregations of the indicator are needed? – By state and federal fiscal year.
9. Who is responsible for data collection and quality? – LCLE Fiscal and federal program staff.
10. Limitations of the indicator – None.

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION SHEET

Program: Federal Programs, Objectives I.1 – I.5

Date: 06/2028

1. INDICATOR NAME – COMPLETION OF THE STATE ANNUAL PROGRESS AND PERFORMANCE MEASUREMENTS TOOL (PMT) REPORTS
2. Indicator type – Output.
3. Rationale – Completion of the State Annual Progress and Performance Measurements Tool (PMT) Reports in accordance with federal requirements represents the achievement of Objectives I.1 – I.7.
4. Data collection procedures – Data is collected from subgrant award documents, performance reports, and quarterly progress reports.
5. Frequency and timing of – (a) collection will be on a quarterly basis, (b) reporting will be annually.
6. Calculation methodology – Statistics from agencies submitting progress and performance measurements reports are summed for the reporting period.
7. Definitions of any unclear terms – The reporting time period covers 12 months of project activities that incur within the federal fiscal year or the state fiscal year depending on the federal grant program submitting the report.
8. What aggregations or disaggregations of the indicator are needed? – By calendar year ending in the state fiscal year or federal fiscal year for which the indicator report is made.
9. Who is responsible for data collection and quality? – LCLE federal program staff will be responsible for the collection and reporting of the data.
10. Limitations of the indicator – None.

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION SHEET

Program: Federal Programs, Objectives I.1 – I.5

Date: 06/2028

1. INDICATOR NAME – COMPLIANCE WITH FEDERAL PASS-THROUGH REQUIREMENTS
2. Indicator type – Outcome.
3. Rationale – This Indicator measures the administrative capacity of the LCLE over each federal program to determine compliance with pass-through requirements. This determines if the State is eligible to continue to receive funds from the United States Department of Justice.
4. Data collection procedures – Collected from dollars awarded to subgrant agencies for each fund type, by federal fiscal year.
5. Frequency and timing of (a) collection, (b) reporting – Collected on an ongoing basis during the federal start and end dates for the federal fund types administered. This indicator is reported by federal fund type, by federal fiscal year.
6. Calculation methodology – Sum of pass-through funds as a percentage of the total.
7. Definitions of any unclear terms – Pass-through represents an obligation on the part of the States to make a percentage of funds available to units of local governments, combinations of local units, or other specified groups or organizations. This amount is determined by Congress.
8. What aggregations or disaggregations of the indicator are needed? – By state and federal fiscal year.
9. Who is responsible for data collection and quality? – The LCLE fiscal section and federal program staff.
10. Limitations of the indicator – Limited by the number of agencies defined in the pass-through for each federal fund type, and by those agencies willing and able to apply for federal grant funds.

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION SHEET

Program: Federal Programs, Objectives I.1 – I.5

Date: 06/2028

1. INDICATOR NAME – COMPLIANCE WITH FEDERAL MATCH REQUIREMENTS
2. Indicator type – Outcome.
3. Rationale – This Indicator measures the administrative capacity of the LCLE over each federal program to determine compliance with match requirements. This determines if the State is eligible to continue to receive funds from the United States Department of Justice.
4. Data collection procedures – Collected from dollars awarded to subgrant agencies for each fund type, by federal fiscal year.
5. Frequency and timing of (a) collection, (b) reporting – Collected on an ongoing basis from each subgrantee during the federal start and end dates for the federal fund types administered. This indicator is reported by federal fund type, by federal fiscal year.
6. Calculation methodology – Calculation of minimum match requirements. Match percentages for each federal fund type for each federal fiscal year must meet the minimum federal requirements.
7. Definitions of any unclear terms – Match represents an obligation on the part of the States and subgrantee agencies to meet the amounts required as match to supplement federal funds. This amount is determined by Congress.
8. What aggregations or disaggregations of the indicator are needed? – By state and federal fiscal year.
9. Who is responsible for data collection and quality? – The LCLE fiscal section and federal program staff.
10. Limitations of the indicator – Limited by the number of agencies willing to apply for federal grant funds who can meet the federal match requirements and obligations.

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION SHEET

Program: Federal Programs, Objectives I.1 – I.5

Date: 06/2028

1. INDICATOR NAME – DIRECT COST OF ADMINISTRATION AS A PERCENTAGE OF TOTAL FUNDING ADMINISTERED
2. Indicator type – Efficiency.
3. Rationale – The efficiency of a grants administration effort is best expressed in terms of the percentage of funding used for administration as a function of the dollar amount administered. The use of such a figure is preferable to a cost per subgrant, since the latter does not allow for the additional complexity and administrative responsibilities for subgrants for larger dollar amounts which are open across several fiscal years. The use of a percentage in administrative costs for the total federal grant amount administered gives a more realistic indicator because it accounts for the work conducted on all open federal grants.
4. Data collection procedures – This indicator will be collected by the LCLE fiscal section.
5. Frequency and timing of (a) collection, (b) reporting – Ongoing during the state fiscal year; indicator can be reported on a state fiscal year basis for each fund type.
6. Calculation methodology – The amount expended for the administration of the specific federal grant program is divided by the total federal dollar amount awarded that program which is open during the state fiscal year for which the indicator is prepared, multiplied by 100.
7. Definitions of any unclear terms – An open federal grant is one which is open or active during some part of the state fiscal year. This information is maintained by the LCLE fiscal section.
8. What aggregations or disaggregations of the indicator are needed? – By state fiscal year.
9. Who is responsible for data collection and quality? – LCLE fiscal section.
10. Limitations of the indicator – Federal funds available.

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION SHEET

Program: Federal Programs, Objective I.1

Date: 06/2028

1. INDICATOR NAME: NUMBER OF PROFESSIONALS TRAINED TO PROVIDE SERVICES TO WOMEN WHO ARE VICTIMS
2. Indicator type – Outcome.
3. Rationale – Measures number of participants and number of specialized courses offered.
4. Data collection procedures – At the conclusion of each specialized course the subgrantee will report results to LCLE staff.
5. Frequency and timing of (a) collection, (b) reporting – Data is collected on a quarterly basis and reported to the LCLE staff.
6. Calculation methodology – Simple addition.
7. Definitions of any unclear terms – None.
8. What aggregations or disaggregations of the indicator are needed? – By fiscal year.
9. Who is responsible for data collection and quality? – LCLE federal program staff.
10. Limitations of the indicator – The number of participants and specialized courses offered are dependent on the federal funds available for this purpose.

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION SHEET

Program: Federal Programs, Objective I.1

Date: 06/2028

1. INDICATOR NAME – NUMBER OF WOMEN SERVED
2. Indicator type – Outcome.
3. Rationale – Measures number of women served.
4. Data collection procedures – Data collected from count derived from reports submitted by the subgrantee agencies.
5. Frequency and timing of (a) collection, (b) reporting – Data is collected on a quarterly basis and reported to the LCLE staff.
6. Calculation methodology – Simple addition.
7. Definitions of any unclear terms – None.
8. What aggregations or disaggregations of the indicator are needed? – By state fiscal year.
9. Who is responsible for data collection and quality? – LCLE federal program staff.
10. Limitations of the indicator – The number of victims served and is dependent on the federal funds available for this purpose.

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION SHEET

Program: Federal Program, Objective I.2

Date: 06/2028

1. INDICATOR NAME – NUMBER OF SUBGRANTS EVALUATED FOR COMPLIANCE
2. Indicator type – Output.
3. Rationale – Site visits by federal evaluator are a major output of the BYRNE JAG program. Agencies are encouraged to showcase their project through illustrations, field operations, and provide reports of information regarding the impact of project activities. Additionally, through site visits the evaluator can provide technical assistance relative to the agency's specific needs.
4. Data collection procedures – The quarterly BJA Performance Measurement Tool (PMT) and Egrants progress reports are the primary source of data collected. The data is analyzed prior to the site visit to prepare for the evaluation of a project. The site visit allows for a verbal as well as a visual understanding of activities and the impact of the project. The federal evaluator compiles the information collected in an evaluation report which is critical in compliance with the federal reporting requirements.
5. Frequency and timing of (a) collection, (b) reporting – Annually, report due by November 1 each year.
6. Calculation methodology – Sum of the projects evaluated.
7. Definitions of any unclear terms – None.
8. What aggregations or disaggregations of the indicator are needed? – By calendar year.
9. Who is responsible for data collection and quality? – Federal Evaluator.
10. Limitations of the indicator – The number of site visits conducted is dependent upon resources and time available.

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION SHEET

Program: Federal Programs, Objective I.3

Date: 06/2028

1. INDICATOR NAME – NUMBER OF VICTIMS SERVED
2. Indicator type – Output.
3. Rationale – The number of specialized training seminars offered and the number of participants.
4. Data collection procedures – Participants will be required to answer questions regarding the effectiveness and usefulness of the training. At the conclusion of the training, the agency hosting the seminar will report the number of participants to LCLE staff.
5. Frequency and timing of (a) collection, (b) reporting – At the conclusion of each training seminar.
6. Calculation methodology – Simple addition.
7. Definitions of any unclear terms – None.
8. What aggregations or disaggregations of the indicator are needed? – By federal fiscal year.
9. Who is responsible for data collection and quality? – LCLE federal program staff.
10. Limitations of the indicator – The number of participants receiving training is determined by the amount of funds available for this purpose.

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION SHEET

Program: Federal Programs, Objective I.3

Date: 06/2028

1. INDICATOR NAME – COMPLIANCE WITH THE 1% FEDERAL TRAINING ALLOWANCE
2. Indicator type – Outcome.
3. Rationale – This indicator measures the number of projects awarded to agencies that provide training to agencies that provide direct services to victims of crime as a statewide-funded project encompassing one or more of the 64 parishes in Louisiana.
4. Data collection procedures – Oversight and monitoring of persons trained and/or certified will be conducted by project director for the Program.
5. Frequency and timing of (a) collection, (b) reporting – The number of training sessions conducted and number of persons receiving training will be reported to LCLE on a quarterly basis.
6. Calculation methodology – Sum of the number of training sessions conducted within a federal fiscal year grant period.
7. Definitions of unclear terms – None.
8. What aggregations or disaggregations of the indicator are needed? – By federal fiscal year.
9. Who is responsible for data collection and quality? – The recording and collecting of data rests with the CVA staff.
10. Limitations of the indicator – The number of training sessions conducted is dependent upon the resources available.

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION SHEET

Program: Federal Programs, Objective I.4 – I.5

Date: 06/2028

1. INDICATOR NAME – NUMBER OF JUVENILES SERVED BY GRANT FUNDS
2. Indicator type – Outcome.
3. Rationale – Indicator measures number of juveniles being served statewide by thirty-two (32) program purpose areas.
4. Data collection procedures – Data is collected from subgrant award documents.
5. Frequency and timing of (a) collection, (b) reporting – Ongoing.
6. Calculation methodology – Subgrants are categorized by program type; number of juveniles receiving services per program is calculated.
7. Definitions of any unclear terms – None.
8. What aggregations or disaggregations of the indicator are needed? – By federal grant period.
9. Who is responsible for data collection and quality? – LCLE Federal Juvenile Justice program staff.
10. Limitations of the indicator – Accurate and timely data provided by subgrantees.

A. FEDERAL PROGRAMS, OBJECTIVES I.6 – I.7

- 1. Provide a brief statement identifying the principal clients and users of each program and the specific service or benefit derived by such persons or organizations.**

The primary clients for the Discretionary Grant Program are the agencies comprising the Louisiana criminal justice system. Major stakeholders include the Department of Corrections, State Police, Supreme Court, Sheriffs, Chiefs of Police, District Attorneys, Judges, and other criminal justice service providers. The primary benefit received is a potential source of funding for those needed, critical, or innovative programs which would benefit criminal justice operations, but where funding is not available in the state.

- 2. Identify the potential external factors that are beyond the control of the entity and that could significantly affect the achievement of its goals or objectives.**

The ability of the agency to meet the goals and objectives under this program is limited by the funding provided at the federal level for discretionary grant programs. Further, the agency is limited by the areas which are selected by the applicable federal agencies for funding within a particular discretionary grant program within the parameters established by Congress.

- 3. Provide a description of any program evaluation used to develop objectives and strategies.**

The need for the Discretionary Grant Program arose from discussions among members of the Louisiana Commission on Law Enforcement relative to whether or not the criminal justice agencies in the state were benefiting from the federal discretionary grant programs as much as they should. It was determined that very few discretionary grants for criminal justice programs were being awarded to Louisiana criminal justice agencies. Based on the discussions, it was determined that most agencies in the state were not adequately aware of the federal discretionary grant programs available, and if aware, lacked the ability to respond to the solicitation in a timely manner.

- 4. Provide an explanation of how duplication of effort shall be avoided when the operations of more than one program are directed at achieving a single goal, objective, or strategy.**

There is no other state level clearinghouse for this information. Since each discretionary grant application prepared by the LCLE staff must be reviewed and approved by the full Commission, the possibility of duplication is remote.

5. **Documentation as to the validity, reliability, and appropriateness of each performance indicator, as well as the method used to verify and validate the performance indicators as relevant measure of each program's performance.**

See Performance Indicator Matrix and Documentation Sheets.

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR MATRIX

Objective	Inputs	Outputs	Outcomes	Efficiency
I.6	Baseline resource allocation for maintaining online clearinghouse	Number of discretionary grant programs covered in the online clearinghouse	Number of “hits” on the clearinghouse online site	Cost per “hit” on the clearinghouse online site
I.7	Baseline number of discretionary applications prepared	Number of discretionary grant applications submitted	Number of discretionary grants awarded	Cost of preparation as percentage of funds awarded
			Amount of funding obtained through discretionary grants	

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION SHEET

Program: Federal Programs, Objective I.6

Date: 06/2028

1. INDICATOR NAME – BASELINE RESOURCE ALLOCATION FOR MAINTAINING ONLINE CLEARINGHOUSE
2. Indicator type – Input.
3. Rationale – This indicator measures the resource investment in maintaining the discretionary grant web site.
4. Data collection procedures – Data will be maintained by the Fiscal section of LCLE based on time sheets and expenditure request forms completed for the Discretionary Grant program. The origin of the data is the staff of the Policy Planning, Research and Information Systems unit of LCLE working on the program as verified by supervisory personnel.
5. Frequency and timing of (a) collection, (b) reporting – Annually, on a state fiscal year basis.
6. Calculation methodology – Personal resources will be calculated on the basis of the time spent on the project multiplied by the salary rate of the employees involved, added to the expenditure totals on the approved expenditure request forms (verified against actual expenditures) identified as part of the Discretionary Grant Program on the form.
7. Definitions of any unclear terms – None.
8. What aggregations or disaggregations of the indicator are needed? – Annually, by State Fiscal Year.
9. Who is responsible for data collection and quality? – staff assigned to the Discretionary Grant Program will be responsible for maintaining the time sheets and properly completing the expenditure request forms. Verification and quality assurance is the responsibility of the line supervisor. The data will be maintained by the fiscal section of LCLE, which shall also reconcile requested expenditures with actual expenditures reported.
10. Limitations of the indicator – None.

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION SHEET

Program: Federal Programs, Objective I.6

Date: 06/2028

1. INDICATOR NAME – NUMBER OF DISCRETIONARY GRANT PROGRAMS COVERED IN THE ONLINE CLEARINGHOUSE
2. Indicator type – Output.
3. Rationale – The purpose of the online clearinghouse for the Discretionary Grant Program is to improve access to information relative to grant opportunities for the criminal justice community. A major indicator of output for Objective I. 6 then would be the number of grant programs contained in the data base which is available for access.
4. Data collection procedures – Data will be collected directly from the web site by counting the number of Discretionary Grant programs covered. The origin of the information is the staff assigned to the program. Counts will be verified by supervisory personnel.
5. Frequency and timing of (a) collection, (b) reporting – Annually, on a state fiscal year basis.
6. Calculation methodology – Addition of the number of programs on the website.
7. Definitions of any unclear terms – Discretionary Grant Program is an identifiable grant program, if the program is for a single purpose or a fundable purpose area within a larger program.
8. What aggregations or disaggregations of the indicator are needed? – By state fiscal year.
9. Who is responsible for data collection and quality? – Staff assigned to the Discretionary Grant Program shall be responsible for the primary collection of the data. Supervisory staff shall be responsible for verification and quality assurance.
10. Limitations of the indicator – A major variable beyond the control of LCLE in this program area is the number of discretionary grant programs authorized by Congress in a given fiscal year.

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION SHEET

Program: Federal Programs, Objective I.6

Date: 06/2028

1. INDICATOR NAME – NUMBER OF “HITS” ON THE CLEARINGHOUSE ONLINE SITE
2. Indicator type – Outcome.
3. Rationale – Since Objective I.6 seeks to increase the awareness of discretionary grant opportunities by providing a comprehensive one stop information resource for use by criminal justice agencies in Louisiana, a primary indicator of the outcome would be the extent to which the site is utilized. The number of times the site is accessed is an indicator of the level of utilization and provides a primary measure of the degree to which the site is successful in publicizing the available discretionary grant programs.
4. Data collection procedures – Data collection will be via an automated web counter which will be installed on the website.
5. Frequency and timing of (a) collection, (b) reporting – Annually, on a state fiscal year basis.
6. Calculation methodology – None.
7. Definitions of any unclear terms – A “hit” represents someone accessing the clearinghouse web page. The number of “hits”, therefore, represents the number of visitors to the web page during a specific time period.
8. What aggregations or disaggregations of the indicator are needed? – By state fiscal year.
9. Who is responsible for data collection and quality? – The staff assigned to the Discretionary Grant program will be responsible for the selection and monitoring of the automated web counter.
10. Limitations of the indicator – A count of the number of times a web site is accessed does not distinguish among the types of visitors. In other words, the count of hits on the site is an indication of general use by the public as well as the criminal justice community.

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION SHEET

Program: Federal Programs, Objective I.6

Date: 06/2028

1. INDICATOR NAME – COST PER “HIT” ON THE CLEARINGHOUSE ONLINE SITE
2. Indicator type – Efficiency.
3. Rationale – The idea behind the use of a web-based clearinghouse for discretionary grant information is that it is an inexpensive means to provide a large amount of information to a wide audience. The cost per “hit” indicator provides a gauge of the cost per utilization as a measure of efficiency.
4. Data collection procedures – Data collection shall be accomplished by the staff assigned to the Discretionary Grant Program. The number of “hits” shall be determined by an automated web counter installed on the site. The total costs associated with the site will be determined on a fiscal year basis by the Fiscal section of LCLE, the basis of time sheets and reconciled expenditure request forms as described for the input indicator for Objective I.6. These records will be maintained by the Fiscal section.
5. Frequency and timing of (a) collection, (b) reporting – Annually, on a state fiscal year basis.
6. Calculation methodology – The total cost for the development and maintenance of the web-based clearinghouse will be divided by the number of “hits” recorded by the automated web site counter.
7. Definitions of any unclear terms – None.
8. What aggregations or disaggregations of the indicator are needed? – By state fiscal year.
9. Who is responsible for data collection and quality? – The staff assigned to the Discretionary Grant Program shall be responsible for the collection and calculation of the data. The fiscal section of LCLE shall be responsible for the maintenance of the financial records relating to the program.
10. Limitations of the indicator – This method of calculating efficiency relates only to the cost per “hit” without differentiating between criminal justice and general users.

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION SHEET

Program: Federal Programs, Objective I.7

Date: 06/2028

1. INDICATOR NAME – BASELINE NUMBER OF DISCRETIONARY APPLICATIONS PREPARED
2. Indicator type – Input.
3. Rationale – In seeking to fulfill Objective I.7, the primary input is the number of discretionary grant applications prepared during a fiscal year. Not all applications prepared receive approval through the internal review process for submission.
4. Data collection procedures – Source documents are the applications prepared. These documents are maintained by the Policy Planning Section of the LCLE.
5. Frequency and timing of (a) collection, (b) reporting – Annually, on a state fiscal year basis.
6. Calculation methodology – Not applicable.
7. Definitions of any unclear terms – Not applicable.
8. What aggregations or disaggregations of the indicator are needed? – Annually, on a state fiscal year basis.
9. Who is responsible for data collection and quality? – The secretary for the Division of Policy Planning, Research and Information Systems shall be responsible for maintaining the files on each discretionary grant application prepared.
10. Limitations of the indicator – The number of discretionary grant programs available and the permissible funding areas are determined by Congress and the applicable federal agencies. The number of such programs which offer opportunities for Louisiana to fund priority, critical, innovative, or needed programs cannot be known in advance. Therefore, the number of applications prepared is largely a function of the match between state needs and available programs, which is beyond the control of LCLE.

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION SHEET

Program: Federal Programs, Objective I.7

Date: 06/2028

1. INDICATOR NAME – NUMBER OF DISCRETIONARY GRANT APPLICATIONS SUBMITTED
2. Indicator type – Output.
3. Rationale – The number of discretionary grant applications submitted measures the result for Objective I.7.2.
4. Data collection procedures – Source documents are the applications on file in the Policy Planning, Research and Information Systems Division of LCLE, and the associated acknowledgment of receipt letter from the applicable federal agency.
5. Frequency and timing of (a) collection, (b) reporting – Data will be collected on an on-going basis as applications are filed with the appropriate federal agency, and receipt letters are received. Reports will be made on an annual basis at the end of the state fiscal year.
6. Calculation methodology – Simple count.
7. Definitions of any unclear terms – None.
8. What aggregations or disaggregations of the indicator are needed? – By state fiscal year in which application was made.
9. Who is responsible for data collection and quality? – staff of the Policy Planning section shall be responsible for data collection, quality assurance, file maintenance and reporting the indicator.
10. Limitations of the indicator – None.

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION SHEET

Program: Federal Programs, Objective I.7

Date: 06/2028

1. INDICATOR NAME – NUMBER OF DISCRETIONARY GRANTS AWARDED
2. Indicator type – Outcome.
3. Rationale – The award of a discretionary grant is the successful outcome of submitting a discretionary grant application. The number of such awards in a given fiscal year is an indication of the agency's success in accessing the federal resources available.
4. Data collection procedures – Data for this indicator will be collected by counting the number of discretionary grant award letters received by LCLE in a fiscal year. The origin of the documents will be the applicable federal agency for the specific discretionary grant program. The files containing the source documents will be maintained by the Grants Administration section of LCLE.
5. Frequency and timing of (a) collection, (b) reporting – Annually, on a state fiscal year basis.
6. Calculation methodology – None.
7. Definitions of any unclear terms – None.
8. What aggregations or disaggregations of the indicator are needed? – By state fiscal year in which the grant award notice is dated.
9. Who is responsible for data collection and quality? – The staff assigned to the Discretionary Grant Program shall be responsible for the collection and reporting of the data. The source documents shall be maintained by the Fiscal section of LCLE.
10. Limitations of the indicator – The number of grant awards is significantly conditioned by the match between the needs of the state and the available discretionary grant programs. Since the availability of discretionary programs is controlled by Congress and the applicable federal agencies, much of the variation in this indicator is beyond the control of LCLE.

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION SHEET

Program: Federal Programs, Objective I.7

Date: 06/2028

1. INDICATOR NAME – AMOUNT OF FUNDING OBTAINED THROUGH DISCRETIONARY GRANTS
2. Indicator type – Outcome.
3. Rationale – While the number of grants awarded is an important indicator of the outcome of LCLE's efforts to obtain federal support for needed state initiatives, the dollar value of the grants received is an equally important indicator.
4. Data collection procedures – Data will be collected from grant award documents issued by the applicable federal agencies to LCLE. These source documents will be maintained by the Grants Administration section of LCLE. Data will be collected by the staff assigned to the Discretionary Grant Program and verified by the Fiscal Section of the agency.
5. Frequency and timing of (a) collection, (b) reporting – Annually, on a state fiscal year basis.
6. Calculation methodology – Addition of total grant award amounts for all discretionary grants received by LCLE during a given state fiscal year.
7. Definitions of any unclear terms – None.
8. What aggregations or disaggregations of the indicator are needed? – By state fiscal year.
9. Who is responsible for data collection and quality? – Staff assigned to the Discretionary Grant Program shall be responsible for data collection and calculation. The Fiscal section of LCLE shall be responsible for verification. The Fiscal Section of LCLE shall be responsible for the maintenance of the source documents.
10. Limitations of the indicator – The availability of federal discretionary grant programs is determined by Congress and the applicable federal agencies, and are beyond the control of LCLE.

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION SHEET

Program: Federal Programs, Objective I.7

Date: 06/2028

1. INDICATOR NAME – COST OF PREPARATION AS PERCENTAGE OF FUNDS AWARDED
2. Indicator type – Efficiency.
3. Rationale – The cost of preparation of discretionary grant applications as a percentage amount of the discretionary grants awarded within a fiscal year is a measurement of the return on investment for the program.
4. Data collection procedures – Costs associated with the preparation (personnel and production costs) shall be noted by the staff assigned to the Discretionary Grant Program and reported to the Fiscal section of LCLE. The Fiscal section shall maintain the original source documents.
5. Frequency and timing of (a) collection, (b) reporting – Annually, on a state fiscal year basis.
6. Calculation methodology – The total determinable costs for the preparation of all discretionary grant applications developed within a state fiscal year shall be divided by the amount of federal discretionary funds awarded during the same state fiscal year.
7. Definitions of any unclear terms – None.
8. What aggregations or disaggregations of the indicator are needed? – By state fiscal year.
9. Who is responsible for data collection and quality? – Staff assigned to the Discretionary Grant Program shall be responsible for tracking costs as they occur in the application development process, as well as for the collection of award figures from source documents and all calculations. Supervisory staff shall be responsible for verification of costs submitted. The Fiscal section of LCLE shall be responsible for maintaining the records on costs and for maintaining records on the award amounts.
10. Limitations of the indicator – As noted in the preceding indicators for Objective I.1.1., the availability of discretionary grant programs and their attendant requirements rest with Congress and the applicable federal agencies. A further limitation on this indicator is that grants applied for in one state fiscal year may not be awarded in the same year.

A. FEDERAL PROGRAMS, OBJECTIVES II.1 – II.4

- 1. Provide a brief statement identifying the principal clients and users of each program and the specific service or benefit derived by such persons or organizations.**

The primary clients for the ICJIS Program are the agencies comprising the Louisiana criminal justice system. Major stakeholders include the state level agencies which operate the major system components: Louisiana Commission on Law Enforcement, Supreme Court, State Police, and Corrections, as well as the local criminal justice agencies which are the originator of most records and the major system end users. The primary benefit received is information for policy development, as well as tactical and strategic operations.

- 2. Identify the potential external factors that are beyond the control of the entity and that could significantly affect the achievement of its goals or objectives.**

There are two major external factors which bear upon the agency's ability to meet the goals and objectives established for the ICJIS program. First, is adequate funding for the ICJIS program and its components. Since most of the component systems of ICJIS are housed in other agencies, the Louisiana Commission on Law Enforcement has no control over budget requests or expenditures. The second major external factor is that the Louisiana Commission on Law Enforcement serves as the planner and coordinator for the ICJIS. With the exception of the state Uniform Crime Reporting System, and the Louisiana Incident Based Crime Reporting Program, all other major ICJIS components are controlled by other agencies.

- 3. Provide a description of any program evaluation used to develop objectives and strategies.**

The objectives and strategies for the ICJIS program grew out of two primary sources. First was a study done in 1993 by the Louisiana Commission on Law Enforcement, the Louisiana Department of Public Safety and Corrections, and the Louisiana Supreme Court on the state of criminal justice information. The end result of this study was *The Blueprint for the Future of Criminal History Record Information in Louisiana*. This document was followed by the development of the *Phase I Strategic Plan* in 1995, which assessed the progress which had been made since the publication of the *Blueprint*, and established a general design for the ICJIS. *Phase II of the Strategic Plan* has now been finalized and will be used as the guideline for the actual implementation of the ICJIS.

The second source was the mandate created by Congress that states participating in the Byrne JAG Program must bring their state level criminal justice information systems up to certain minimum standards. This effort was generated by two federal

level efforts: (1) the modernization of the national criminal justice information system through the NCIC 2000 project, and (2) the increased demands placed on the state and national criminal justice information systems by the passage of the Brady Handgun Control Act. These federal mandates coupled with the work which had already been accomplished in the state to ensure timely, complete, and accurate criminal justice information provide the framework for the ICJIS Program.

4. Provide an explanation of how duplication of effort shall be avoided when the operations of more than one program are directed at achieving a single goal, objective, or strategy.

The Louisiana Commission on Law Enforcement is the coordinating agency for ICJIS. Duplication will be avoided in two ways. First, by involving representatives from each major stakeholder group in all decisions, thus rendering the possibility of duplication remote. Second, the general design of the ICJIS calls for the use of client specific systems housed within appropriate host agencies (*e.g.*, Automated Fingerprint Identification System at State Police, Case Management Information System at the Louisiana Supreme Court) with the main ICJIS serving as a pointer and retrieval system, duplication (*i.e.*, summary information) within the system is kept to a minimum.

5. Documentation as to the validity, reliability, and appropriateness of each performance indicator, as well as the method used to verify and validate the performance indicators as relevant measure of each program's performance.

See attached Performance Indicator Matrix and Performance Indicator Documentation Sheets.

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR MATRIX

Objective	Input	Output	Outcome	Efficiency
II.1	Baseline resource allocation for implementation of Phase II of the Strategic Plan	Implementation of the plan on schedule	Acceptance of the plan by the criminal justice community	N/A
II.2	Baseline resource allocation for the implementation of major ICJIS components	Number of ICJIS components operational	Percentage of eligible criminal justice agencies with access to one or more ICJIS components	Cost per participating agency
			Percentage of eligible criminal justice agencies participating in ICJIS	
II.3	Baseline resource allocation	Number of training sessions conducted	Number of eligible law enforcement agencies reporting	Cost per Population covered
	Number of law enforcement agencies eligible to contribute data to the system		Percentage of eligible law enforcement agencies reporting	
		Number of site visits conducted	Percentage of state population covered by reporting agencies	
II.4	Baseline resource allocation	Number of agencies using LA-LEMIS and LEMIS based software	Number of agencies completing LIBRS certification	Cost per Population covered
	Number of law enforcement agencies eligible to contribute data to the system.	Number of agencies receiving funding to modify legacy systems to comport with LIBRS standard	Percentage of state population covered by LIBRS reporting	

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION SHEET

Program: Federal Programs, Objective II.1

Date: 06/2028

1. INDICATOR NAME – BASELINE RESOURCE ALLOCATION FOR IMPLEMENTATION OF PHASE II OF THE STRATEGIC PLAN
2. Indicator type – Input.
3. Rationale – The funding for the personnel and contractors necessary to implement the ICJIS Strategic Plan is the primary measurable input for the planning process.
4. Data collection procedures – Data will be collected from source documents maintained by the Grants Administration section of LCLE. The origin of the source documents is the United States Department of Justice in the form of approved grant budgets.
5. Frequency and timing of (a) collection, (b) reporting – Annually, on a state fiscal year basis.
6. Calculation methodology – None.
7. Definitions of any unclear terms – None.
8. What aggregations or disaggregations of the indicator are needed? – By state fiscal year.
9. Who is responsible for data collection and quality? – The staff assigned to the ICJIS project shall be responsible for collecting the necessary data from source documents (grant budgets). The Fiscal section of LCLE shall be responsible for verifying the expenditure of the funds budget within the applicable fiscal year.
10. Limitations of the indicator – The baseline resources depend upon continuation of various grant programs by Congress. The approval of the State’s plan and application by The United States Department of Justice, and such appropriations as may be made for this purpose by the Legislature.

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION SHEET

Program: Federal Programs, Objective II.1

Date: 06/2028

1. INDICATOR NAME – IMPLEMENTATION OF THE PLAN ON SCHEDULE
2. Indicator type – Output.
3. Rationale – The purpose of the ICJIS planning process is to implement a Strategic Plan to guide the future development of the system. The major output of the process, therefore, is the implementation of the plan on schedule.
4. Data collection procedures – Source documents are the Grant progress reports filed by LCLE with the U.S. Department of Justice. These reports are maintained by the Grants Administration section of LCLE.
5. Frequency and timing of (a) collection, (b) reporting – Annually, on a fiscal year basis.
6. Calculation methodology – None.
7. Definitions of any unclear terms – Implementation of the ICJIS strategic plan is accomplished when the plan is presented to the Chairman of LCLE.
8. What aggregations or disaggregations of the indicator are needed? – None.
9. Who is responsible for data collection and quality? – Staff assigned to the ICJIS program are responsible for collecting and reporting the data from grant files maintained by the Fiscal Section of LCLE.
10. Limitations of the indicator – None.

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION SHEET

Program: Federal Programs, Objective II.1

Date: 06/2028

1. INDICATOR NAME – ACCEPTANCE OF THE PLAN BY THE CRIMINAL JUSTICE COMMUNITY
2. Indicator type – Outcome.
3. Rationale – Since the purpose of the Strategic Plan is to provide a blueprint for all elements of the state’s criminal justice system to work together for the creation of an integrated information system which provides criminal justice decision makers with timely, accurate and complete information, then the outcome of the planning process is the acceptance of the Strategic Plan to the major stakeholders in the system.
4. Data collection procedures – Data will be contained in grant progress reports completed by ICJIS program staff, submitted to the U.S. Department of Justice, and maintained by the Grants Administration section of LCLE.
5. Frequency and timing of (a) collection, (b) reporting – Annually, by State Fiscal Year.
6. Calculation methodology – None.
7. Definitions of any unclear terms – “Major stakeholders” are representatives of the State Police, Department of Corrections, the Supreme Court of Louisiana, LCLE, and local criminal justice agencies.
8. What aggregations or disaggregations of the indicator are needed? – None.
9. Who is responsible for data collection and quality? – LCLE staff shall be responsible for collecting and reporting the data based on source documents maintained by the Fiscal Section of LCLE.
10. Limitations of the indicator – None.

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION SHEET

Program: Federal Programs, Objective II.2

Date: 06/2028

1. INDICATOR NAME – BASELINE RESOURCE ALLOCATION FOR THE IMPLEMENTATION OF MAJOR ICJIS COMPONENTS.
2. Indicator type – Input.
3. Rationale – The primary input into the implementation of the various ICJIS components is funding. The funding levels available will determine the speed at which the implementation will progress.
4. Data collection procedures – Data will be collected by LCLE staff from grant documents maintained by the Grants Administration section of LCLE. The source documents have their origin with the sub-grantee agencies which are implementing various components of the ICJIS.
5. Frequency and timing of (a) collection, (b) reporting – Annually, at the end of each state fiscal year.
6. Calculation methodology – Summing the dollar amount spent in a state fiscal year from any LCLE source to implement ICJIS.
7. Definitions of any unclear terms – The component systems of ICJIS are: Louisiana Incident Based Crime Reporting System, Louisiana Law Enforcement Management Information System, Louisiana Computerized Criminal History System, Automated Fingerprint Identification System, Louisiana Prosecuting Attorney's Management Information System, Case Management Information System, Corrections and Justice Unified Network, Juvenile Information Records Management System, Louisiana Victim Information and Notification Everyday system, and various intermediate systems and communications networks which connect two or more of the major components listed.
8. What aggregations or disaggregations of the indicator are needed? – By state fiscal year.
9. Who is responsible for data collection and quality? – ICJIS staff will collect the data from source documents maintained by the Fiscal section of LCLE which is responsible for source document quality control and verification.
10. Limitations of the indicator – This indicator will only reflect resources provided from LCLE sources. It will not include resources provided by the major component system host agencies outside of LCLE sources. Resources available are dependent upon authorizations and appropriations by Congress, approval of state plans and applications by The United States Department of Justice, and such appropriations as the Legislature may make for this purpose.

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION SHEET

Program: Federal Programs, Objective II.2

Date: 06/2028

1. INDICATOR NAME – NUMBER OF ICJIS COMPONENTS OPERATIONAL
2. Indicator type – Output.
3. Rationale – The baseline resources going toward ICJIS provide the input to implement the major component systems. The output is then the component systems which are implemented as a result.
4. Data collection procedures – Data will be collected by the LCLE staff based on survey information relative to the status of each major component system at the end of each state fiscal year. The origin of the information relative to any specific component is the host agency for that system.
5. Frequency and timing of (a) collection, (b) reporting – Annually, at the end of the state fiscal year.
6. Calculation methodology – Developed means that a major component system is ready for implementation regardless of the number of end users attached to the system. In a system as large as ICJIS, the end user agencies will not come on-line all at once, but will be phased in over a period of time, as the necessary end user level infrastructure is developed and implemented.

Note: Systems such as ICJIS are never "finally developed", but are continuously in a process of refinement and maintenance. Systems developed in a “present context” means ready to connect end users to the version articulated in the Strategic Plan.
7. Definitions of any unclear terms – None.
8. What aggregations or disaggregations of the indicator are needed? – By state fiscal year.
9. Who is responsible for data collection and quality? – LCLE staff is responsible for data collection, maintenance of the data files, and site monitoring sufficient to verify information provided by major component host agencies.
10. Limitations of the indicator – The decision and ability to make various components of ICJIS operational rests with the host agency and, with the exception of those components housed at LCLE, are beyond LCLE control.

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION SHEET

Program: Federal Programs, Objective II.2

Date: 06/2028

1. INDICATOR NAME – PERCENTAGE OF ELIGIBLE CRIMINAL JUSTICE AGENCIES WITH ACCESS TO ONE OR MORE ICJIS COMPONENTS
2. Indicator type – Outcome.
3. Rationale – The ultimate outcome sought through the ICJIS is to have all major criminal justice data bases accessible to all criminal justice agencies in the state which have a need for the information and the clearance to receive it. The percentage of eligible criminal justice agencies with access to one or more ICJIS component provides an indicator for this overall outcome.
4. Data collection procedures – Data will be collected by the LCLE staff via a survey of major component host agencies. The information originates with the host agencies implementing the major component systems. The raw data files are maintained by the ICJIS staff. The determination of eligible agencies will be made by the ICJIS user group and then subject to the approval of the major component host agencies and representatives of the end–user groups (i.e., local criminal justice agencies).
5. Frequency and timing of (a) collection, (b) reporting – Annually, at the end of the state fiscal year.
6. Calculation methodology – The number of eligible criminal justice agencies with access to one or more major component systems of the ICJIS will be divided by the total number of eligible criminal justice agencies.
7. Definitions of any unclear terms – The definition of eligible criminal justice agency is an agency with a need for information contained on one or more ICJIS component systems, which has the appropriate security approval(s), and which meet other such criteria (such as agency size or jurisdiction) as may be necessary to make the system cost–effective.
8. What aggregations or disaggregations of the indicator are needed? – By state fiscal year.
9. Who is responsible for data collection and quality? – The LCLE staff is responsible for data collection, maintenance of the data files, and calculations. Data quality and validity will be determined by ICJIS staff based on a sample of the information received from the host agencies.
10. Limitations of the indicator – A limitation of this indicator is the speed at which the host agencies are able to develop the major component systems of ICJIS is outside of the control of LCLE. The LCLE’s role in this endeavor is to provide planning and coordination for the system development effort and such resources as may become available through federal grant sources.

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION SHEET

Program: Federal Programs, Objective II.2

Date: 06/2028

1. INDICATOR NAME – PERCENTAGE OF ELIGIBLE CRIMINAL JUSTICE AGENCIES PARTICIPATING IN ICJIS
2. Indicator type – Outcome.
3. Rationale – Just as providing access to the information to be contained in the ICJIS is a major outcome sought through the project, the number of participating end-user agencies are a major outcome indicator. The information contained in all but two of the major state level systems which comprise ICJIS originates with local criminal justice agencies. If local criminal justice agencies do not participate in the system by submitting timely, accurate, and complete data, the system will not function. ICJIS must provide sufficiently dependable critical information in a timely fashion so as to justify the effort required of the local law enforcement community to provide their portion of the information. For these reasons, participation by eligible local law enforcement agencies in ICJIS is a major outcome indicator.
4. Data collection procedures – Data will be collected by the ICJIS via an annual survey of major state system host agencies relative to contributing local criminal justice agencies. The information will originate with the host agencies for the major systems and will be validated through analysis (reasonableness of the number of records being submitted by various local criminal justice agencies) and sample monitoring.
5. Frequency and timing of (a) collection, (b) reporting – Annually, at the end of the state fiscal year.
6. Calculation methodology – The number of criminal justice agencies participating in one or more ICJIS component systems at the end of the state fiscal year will be divided by the number of criminal justice agencies eligible to participate.
7. Definitions of any unclear terms – Eligible to participate means that a criminal justice agency is the originator of a record required by ICJIS and is not reporting to ICJIS through another criminal justice agency.
8. What aggregations or disaggregations of the indicator are needed? – By state fiscal year.
9. Who is responsible for data collection and quality? – The LCLE staff will have the primary responsibility for collecting the data, maintaining the files, and conducting quality assurance analysis on the data received.
10. Limitations of the indicator – The limitation of this indicator is that the decision to participate or not participate is entirely in the control of the specific criminal justice agency. The role of LCLE in this endeavor is to coordinate the implementation between the major state systems and the inducer agencies, and attempt to persuade criminal justice agencies to participate.

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION SHEET

Program: Federal Programs, Objective II.2

Date: 06/2028

1. INDICATOR NAME – COST PER PARTICIPATING AGENCY
2. Indicator type – Efficiency.
3. Rationale – The utility of the ICJIS for the criminal justice agencies at all levels should encourage individual agency participation. As the ICJIS becomes implemented, requiring fewer resources for operation and maintenance than were necessary for development, and providing more complete, accurate and timely information to criminal justice agencies which improves local level criminal justice operations, the cost per participating agency should decrease. That is, as the system becomes more mature, it should become more efficient (providing more information, to more agencies, at a lower cost).
4. Data collection procedures – The LCLE staff will bear the primary responsibility for data collection, file maintenance and validation. The base data will be collected via survey of the agencies operating the major ICJIS components. The cost data will be collected through the subgrant files for ICJIS related projects maintained by the Grants Administration section of LCLE. In both cases the data originates with the agencies operating the major component systems, and the sub-grantees receiving support for ICJIS related projects through LCLE.
5. Frequency and timing of (a) collection, (b) reporting – Annually, at the end of the state fiscal year.
6. Calculation methodology – The dollar amount of the subgrants awarded through LCLE for ICJIS related projects during the fiscal year will be divided by the number of eligible criminal justice agencies participating in the system at the end of the state fiscal year.
7. Definitions of any unclear terms – An ICJIS related project is a project which has as its primary goal the development, implementation or operation of an ICJIS component system, or creating the infrastructure necessary for eligible criminal justice agencies to participate in the program.
8. What aggregations or disaggregations of the indicator are needed? – By state fiscal year.
9. Who is responsible for data collection and quality? – The LCLE staff will be responsible for the collection of data from the major system component agencies relative to participation of eligible criminal justice agencies in ICJIS. The ICJIS staff will also collect data contained in sub-grant files relative to sub-grant awards made during the fiscal year. The subgrant files are maintained and validated by the Fiscal section of LCLE.
10. Limitations of the indicator – The primary limitation of this indicator is that it tracks only the costs which are covered through an LCLE source. It does not include projects funded out of individual criminal justice agency budgets. Also, decisions made by individual criminal justice agencies to participate in ICJIS are not in the control of LCLE.

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION SHEET

Program: Federal Programs, Objective II.3

Date: 06/2028

1. INDICATOR NAME – BASELINE RESOURCE ALLOCATION
2. Indicator type – Input.
3. Rationale – The funding for the development and implementation of the various crime reporting programs is the primary input into the system.
4. Data collection procedures – Data will be collected from the subgrant files maintained by the Grants Administration section of LCLE which have been identified as containing crime reporting components (i.e., Uniform Crime Reporting or Incident Based Crime Reporting). The origin of the data contained in these files (sub–grant budgets) is the subgrantee agency.
5. Frequency and timing of (a) collection, (b) reporting – Agencies report to the LCLE monthly, LCLE also reports to the FBI on a monthly basis.
6. Calculation methodology – None.
7. Definitions of any unclear terms – None.
8. What aggregations or disaggregations of the indicator are needed? – By state fiscal year in which grant was awarded.
9. Who is responsible for collection and quality? – The LCLE staff has the primary responsibility for data collection. The Fiscal section of LCLE has the primary responsibility for the maintenance of the subgrant files and ensuring their accuracy and completeness.
10. Limitations of the indicator – Baseline resources allocated for this purpose are dependent upon allocations and appropriations by Congress, approval of state plans and applications by The United States Department of Justice, and such appropriations as the Legislature may make for this purpose.

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION SHEET

Program: Federal Programs, Objective II.3

Date: 06/2028

1. INDICATOR NAME – NUMBER OF LAW ENFORCEMENT AGENCIES ELIGIBLE TO CONTRIBUTE DATA TO THE SYSTEM
2. Indicator type – Input.
3. Rationale – This indicator represents the number of local law enforcement agencies which would be reporting crime statistics to the system. It is used in calculation of the outcome indicator for Objective II.3, and represents the universe of potential reporting agencies.
4. Data collection procedures – The primary source documents for this indicator is the list of eligible law enforcement agencies maintained by the UCR/LIBRS section of LCLE.
5. Frequency and timing of (a) collection, (b) reporting – Data collection is on-going as agencies change status. Reporting is on an annual basis at the end of the state fiscal year.
6. Calculation methodology – Simple count.
7. Definitions of any unclear terms – An eligible local law enforcement agency is an agency with jurisdiction over reportable offenses which in practice respond to calls for service relative to reportable offenses, and which is not reporting crime statistics under another agency.
8. What aggregations or disaggregations of the indicator are needed? – By state calendar year ending within the state fiscal year for which the report on the indicator is made.
9. Who is responsible for data collection and quality? – The UCR/LIBRS field staff is responsible for creating the list based on responses from individual agencies, as well as for validation of the information, file maintenance, data collection and report preparation.
10. Limitations of the indicator – None.

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION SHEET

Program: Federal Programs, Objective II.3

Date: 06/2028

1. INDICATOR NAME – NUMBER OF TRAINING SESSIONS CONDUCTED
2. Indicator type – Output.
3. Rationale – A major component of a high-quality crime reporting system is an appropriate training program. The provision of adequate training is essential both to the efficiency of the programs (reducing time spent correcting reporting agency errors) and in encouraging reporting. Agencies which are not properly trained find reporting difficult or impossible and often drop out of the program reducing the accuracy of the state's crime statistics. The number of training sessions is highly significant due to limitations of class size (to increase effectiveness of the training) and to provide flexibility to local law enforcement agencies in scheduling training (thereby improving coverage).
4. Data collection procedures – The primary source documents are the UCR/LIBRS training logs. The origin of these documents are the UCR/LIBRS field staff which conducts the training sessions.
5. Frequency and timing of (a) collection, (b) reporting – Annually, at the end of the state fiscal year.
6. Calculation methodology – Sum of the number of training sessions conducted within a state fiscal year.
7. Definitions of any unclear terms – None.
8. What aggregations or disaggregations of the indicator are needed? – By state fiscal year.
9. Who is responsible for data collection and quality? – The primary responsibility for the recording, collecting and reporting of this data rests with the UCR/LIBRS staff.
10. Limitations of the indicator – The number of training sessions conducted is dependent upon the resources available.

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION SHEET

Program: Federal Programs, Objective II.3

Date: 06/2028

1. INDICATOR NAME – NUMBER OF SITE VISITS CONDUCTED
2. Indicator type – Output.
3. Rationale – Site visits by field staff are a major output of the program because it is during the site visits agencies are encouraged to report, provide technical assistance relative to their record management system to make reporting more complete and accurate, and given additional training in the complex rules required by the Federal Bureau of Investigation in reporting crime statistics to the national level. Further, the turnover of staff in the records management sections of many local agencies is a major problem if site visits are not adequate to supplement regular training sessions. Site visits are also crucial to the LIBRS certification effort when local agencies are changing their mode of reporting crime statistics from the summary UCR method, to the incident-based crime reporting system. In short, the number of site visits reflect the amount of direct contact which individual law enforcement agencies have with the UCR/LIBRS program.
4. Data collection procedures – The primary source documents are the site visit logs maintained by the UCR/LIBRS field staff and reviewed monthly by the UCR/LIBRS field staff supervisor. Data would be collected by the UCR/LIBRS field supervisor by counting the number of site visits recorded in the log, and verified by comparison of the site visit logs with the field reports required on each visit.
5. Frequency and timing of (a) collection, (b) reporting – Annually, at the end of the state fiscal year.
6. Calculation methodology – Sum of the recorded site visits.
7. Definitions of any unclear terms – None.
8. What aggregations or disaggregations of the indicator are needed? – By state fiscal year.
9. Who is responsible for data collection and quality? – Responsibility for the origination of the source documents resides with the UCR/LIBRS field staff. Responsibility for data collection, calculation and verification (by comparison to site visit reports) rests with the UCR/LIBRS field supervisor.
10. Limitations of the indicator – The number of site visits conducted is dependent upon resources available.

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION SHEET

Program: Federal Programs, Objective II.3

Date: 06/2028

1. INDICATOR NAME – NUMBER OF ELIGIBLE LAW ENFORCEMENT AGENCIES REPORTING
2. Indicator type – Outcome.
3. Rationale – The desired result from the activities measured by the output indicators for Objective II.3 is to increase the level of crime reporting, either through participation in summary UCR or the incident-based system. For this reason, the number of eligible law enforcement agencies reporting crime data is an important indicator of the effect of the efforts measured by the output indicators.
4. Data collection procedures – The primary source documents for this indicator are the reports submitted by eligible local law enforcement agencies and the agency reporting log. The actual crime reports originate with the local law enforcement agency making the report. The agency reporting log originates in the UCR/LIBRS section of LCLE and represents a tabulation of reporting by agency by month by form type.
5. Frequency and timing of (a) collection, (b) reporting – Annually, at the end of the state fiscal year (for counting—the report period is the calendar year since this is how crime data is recorded). More frequent counts would be misleading since an agency may submit a report with errors which might (depending upon the number and complexity of errors, as well as the structure of the local agency's records management system) take months to reconcile; and because some agencies submit all of their data at the end of the reporting cycle, rather than monthly.
6. Calculation methodology – Count of the number of agencies reporting four months or more for the previous calendar year. Counts are made for the previous year to the current calendar year ending within the state fiscal year in which the indicator is reported. FBI deadlines for completion of the year's submissions typically fall between March and April of the following calendar year.
7. Definitions of any unclear terms – None.
8. What aggregations or disaggregations of the indicator are needed? – Counts are made for the previous year to the current calendar year ending within the state fiscal year in which the indicator is reported.
9. Who is responsible for data collection and quality? – The UCR/LIBRS field staff is responsible for recording and maintenance of agency reporting logs. The UCR/LIBRS supervisor is responsible for the validation of the logs against the crime reports actually filed by the reporting agencies.
10. Limitations of the indicator – The decision whether or not to report crime statistics to the state rests with the individual law enforcement agencies.

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION SHEET

Program: Federal Programs, Objective II.3

Date: 06/2028

1. INDICATOR NAME – PERCENTAGE OF ELIGIBLE LAW ENFORCEMENT AGENCIES REPORTING
2. Indicator type – Outcome.
3. Rationale – While the number of eligible law enforcement agencies reporting provides an outcome measure relative to increasing or decreasing reporting in absolute terms it lacks context. Using a percentage of eligible agencies reporting measure provides a context for assessing how well the program is achieving its goal of complete, accurate, and timely crime reports for the state.
4. Data collection procedures – Source documents are the actual crime reports received from the eligible local law enforcement agencies. The agency reporting logs created by the UCR/LIBRS staff based on the crime report submissions serve as the basis for determining the percentage of eligible agencies reporting. The list of eligible agencies created by the UCR/LIBRS section based on objective criteria serves as the basis for the denominator of the calculation.
5. Frequency and timing of (a) collection, (b) reporting – Annually, at the end of the state fiscal year for the calendar year ending within the state fiscal year of the indicator report.
6. Calculation methodology – The number of eligible law enforcement agencies reporting is divided by the number of eligible law enforcement agencies and the result multiplied by 100 to determine the percentage.
7. Definitions of any unclear terms – An eligible law enforcement agency is an agency which has jurisdiction over reportable offenses (determined under Federal Bureau of Investigation rules) and in practice at least responds to initial calls for service relating to reportable offenses, and where the crimes reported to them are not already reported by another agency.
8. What aggregations or disaggregations of the indicator are needed? – By the calendar year ending in the state fiscal year for which the indicator report is prepared.
9. Who is responsible for data collection and quality? – The responsibility for collecting the data and performing the calculation rests with the UCR/LIBRS field supervisor who also verifies the accuracy of summary information on the agency report logs by comparison with the actual crime reports received from the local law enforcement agencies.
10. Limitations of the indicator – The decision to report crime statistics or not rests with the eligible law enforcement agency.

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION SHEET

Program: Federal Programs, Objective II.3

Date: 06/2028

1. INDICATOR NAME – PERCENTAGE OF STATE POPULATION COVERED BY REPORTING AGENCIES
2. Indicator type – Outcome.
3. Rationale – This indicator is included to provide additional context for evaluating how well the program is accomplishing its goal of accurate, timely and complete crime reporting. Where the absolute number of agencies reporting can indicate movement up or down, it provides no context relative to the total number of agencies which should be reporting. The percentage of eligible agencies reporting overcomes this limitation; however, it does not help answer the question "how much of the crime is actually being reported?" Since there is no methodology for determining unreported crime directly, secondary measures must be used. One which is used by the Federal Bureau of Investigation is to examine the percentage of the state's population residing in jurisdictions where the primary law enforcement agency is reporting. Thus, the inclusion of this indicator provides a gauge as to the likely percentage of crime reported to law enforcement that is included in the crime statistics produced.
4. Data collection procedures – The primary source for the population figures is the Bureau of the Census. The primary source for the identification of eligible agencies reporting is the agency reporting logs maintained by the UCR/LIBRS staff.
5. Frequency and timing of (a) collection, (b) reporting – Annually, at the end of the state fiscal year for the calendar year ending that period.
6. Calculation methodology – The population served by the agencies reporting four months or more for the previous calendar year is determined based on the figures from the FBI, Uniform Crime Reporting Program and summed. This figure is then divided by the total population of the state based on the figures from the FBI, Uniform Crime Reporting Program and the result multiplied by 100 to arrive at the percentage.
7. Definitions of any unclear terms – None.
8. What aggregations or disaggregations of the indicator are needed? – From the previous year to the current calendar year ending within the state fiscal year in which the indicator is reported.
9. Who is responsible for data collection and quality? – The UCR/LIBRS staff is responsible for collection of the data based on Bureau of Investigation, Uniform Crime Reporting Program reports and the agency reporting logs. The staff is also responsible for the calculations. The results are verified by the Statistical Analysis Center of LCLE.
10. Limitations of the indicator – The decision to report or not to report crime statistics rests with the eligible law enforcement agency and not with LCLE.

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION SHEET

Program: Federal Programs, Objective II.3

Date: 06/2028

1. INDICATOR NAME – COST PER POPULATION COVERED
2. Indicator type – Efficiency.
3. Rationale – There are several ways to approach cost efficiency in the context of the crime reporting program. The decision to use cost per population covered rather than cost per agency is based on the notion that the former provides a greater context for comparing the data across years. Using absolute numbers of agencies reporting makes the tacit assumption that all agencies are responsible for about the same amount of crime reporting; a significant assumption since the goal is to have as complete, accurate, and timely a picture of crime in the state as possible. Looking at cost per population served is one way to compare (albeit through an indicator rather than directly) the percentage of crime actually included in the statistics.
4. Data collection procedures – The primary source for cost data is the subgrant budgets included in the files of the Grants Administration section of LCLE for UCR/LIBRS related projects. The origins of these data are the subgrantees submitting the budget information to Grants Administration. The primary source for the population figures is the Bureau of the Census.
5. Frequency and timing of (a) collection, (b) reporting – Annually, for the calendar year ending in the state fiscal year for which the indicator report is made.
6. Calculation methodology – The UCR/LIBRS program costs derived from the subgrant files for awards made during the calendar year for the reporting cycle in question is divided by the population residing in jurisdictions where the primary eligible law enforcement agency has reported full crime statistics for four months or more for the reporting cycle and the result multiplied by 100 to determine the percentage.
7. Definitions of any unclear terms – None.
8. What aggregations or disaggregations of the indicator are needed? – From the previous year to the current calendar year ending within the state fiscal year in which the indicator is reported.
9. Who is responsible for data collection and quality? – Primary responsibility for collection, maintenance, and verification of the data used in the calculation rests with the UCR/LIBRS staff. Responsibility for the calculations and verification of the methodology resides with the Statistical Analysis Center of LCLE.

10. Limitations of the indicator – The decision whether or not to report crime statistics rest entirely on the individual law enforcement agency and is beyond the control of LCLE. The use of cost figures based on crime reporting related subgrants awarded accounts only for those costs covered through LCLE sources. Because at this time (transition period) agencies can report crime statistics either through UCR or LIBRS these budgets cannot be separated for these purposes. This has the effect of overestimating costs since much LIBRS work involves working with agencies already reporting under UCR, in the conversion process from UCR to LIBRS and not just in working with agencies reporting through LIBRS.

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION SHEET

Program: Federal Programs, Objective II.4

Date: 06/2028

1. INDICATOR NAME – BASELINE RESOURCE ALLOCATION
2. Indicator type – Input.
3. Rationale – The primary measurable input for the LIBRS conversion effort is the funding available to both the state program and local programs. Unlike summary UCR, LIBRS requires a significant data processing infrastructure at both the state program and reporting agency level. It also requires considerable modification of legacy record management systems or the acquisition of new software.
4. Data collection procedures – The data necessary for this indicator is contained in the subgrant files maintained by the Grants Administration section of LCLE. The origin of the source documents are the individual subgrantees.
5. Frequency and timing of (a) collection, (b) reporting – Annually, by State Fiscal Year.
6. Calculation methodology – The budget for LIBRS and La–LEMIS related projects awarded during the fiscal year for which the indicator report is prepared are summed.
7. Definitions of any unclear terms – None.
8. What aggregations or disaggregations of the indicator are needed? – Aggregated by State Fiscal Year.
9. Who is responsible for data collection and quality? – The primary responsibility for data collection and calculation resides with the UCR/LIBRS staff. The responsibility for ensuring the accuracy and validity of information contained in the subgrant files rests with the Grants Administration section of LCLE.
10. Limitations of the indicator – This indicator will only reflect LIBRS and La–LEMIS efforts funded from LCLE sources. Baseline resources are determined by the authorizations and appropriations made by Congress, approval of the state’s plans and applications by The United States Department of Justice and such appropriations as the Legislature may make for this purpose.

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION SHEET

Program: Federal Programs, Objective II.4

Date: 06/2028

1. INDICATOR NAME – NUMBER OF LAW ENFORCEMENT AGENCIES ELIGIBLE TO CONTRIBUTE DATA TO THE SYSTEM
2. Indicator type – Input.
3. Rationale – This indicator represents the number of local law enforcement agencies which would be reporting crime statistics to the system. It is used in calculation of the outcome indicator for Objective II.4, and represents the universe of potential reporting agencies.
4. Data collection procedures – The primary source documents for this indicator is the list of eligible law enforcement agencies maintained by the UCR/LIBRS section of LCLE.
5. Frequency and timing of (a) collection, (b) reporting – Data collection is on-going as agencies change status. Reporting is on an annual basis at the end of the state fiscal year.
6. Calculation methodology – Simple count.
7. Definitions of any unclear terms – Eligible local law enforcement agency is an agency with jurisdiction over reportable offenses which in practice respond to calls for service relative to reportable offenses, and which is not reporting crime statistics under another agency.
8. What aggregations or disaggregations of the indicator are needed? – By state calendar year ending within the state fiscal year for which the report on the indicator is made.
9. Who is responsible for data collection and quality? – The UCR/LIBRS field staff is responsible for creating the list based on responses from individual agencies, as well as for validation of the information, file maintenance, data collection and report preparation.
10. Limitations of the indicator – None.

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION SHEET

Program: Federal Programs, Objective II.4

Date: 06/2028

1. INDICATOR NAME – NUMBER OF AGENCIES USING LA-LEMIS AND LEMIS-BASED SOFTWARE
2. Indicator type – Output.
3. Rationale – One of the major strategies to assist local law enforcement agencies in meeting the infrastructure requirements of LIBRS was to develop a LIBRS compliant records management system in the public domain, where agencies could obtain quality software at nominal expense. That software was La-LEMIS. La-LEMIS is a major part of the strategy for the implementation of LIBRS and, for that reason the number of agencies utilizing La-LEMIS is a major outcome indicator. Other software has been developed using LEMIS as a base. This software, Automated Records Management and Mapping System (ARMMS) has been developed by a local law enforcement agency and will be distributed to other agencies. ARMMS will also be used to assist in the implementation of LIBRS. ARMMS, unlike, LEMIS, is not supported by the LCLE.
4. Data collection procedures – Source documents for determining the number of agencies utilizing La-LEMIS are the La-LEMIS training and technical assistance logs maintained by the La-LEMIS program staff. For LEMIS-based products, such as ARMMS, input from ARMMS staff, Louisiana Sheriffs' Association and product vendors will be used to determine the number of users.
5. Frequency and timing of (a) collection, (b) reporting – Annually, at the end of the state fiscal year.
6. Calculation methodology – Number of agencies which report that are using La-LEMIS and LEMIS-based software and have attended the La-LEMIS training program are summed.
7. Definitions of any unclear terms – None.
8. What aggregations or disaggregations of the indicator are needed? – By state fiscal year.
9. Who is responsible for data collection and quality? – The primary responsibility for data collection and validation is the La-LEMIS staff.
10. Limitations of the indicator – The use of La-LEMIS software is voluntary on the part of individual law enforcement agencies. Non-LEMIS-based software is not supported by the LCLE staff.

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION SHEET

Program: Federal Programs, Objective II.4

Date: 06/2028

1. INDICATOR NAME – NUMBER OF AGENCIES RECEIVING FUNDING TO MODIFY LEGACY SYSTEMS TO COMPORT WITH LIBRS STANDARD
2. Indicator type – Output.
3. Rationale – One of the major strategies to assist local law enforcement agencies in meeting the infrastructure requirements of LIBRS was to provide grant support for law enforcement agencies with legacy systems which were not LIBRS compliant. This is the second phase of the strategy to assist local law enforcement agencies to become LIBRS reporting capable and, therefore is a major output indicator.
4. Data collection procedures – Source documents for determining the number of agencies receiving financial assistance in converting legacy systems to meet LIBRS standards are the system improvement related subgrant files maintained by the Grants Administration section of LCLE, and the cooperative agreement files maintained by the Fiscal section of LCLE. The origin of the source documents contained in the subgrant files are the subgrantees. The origin of the source documents contained in the cooperative agreement files is a joint effort between UCR/LIBRS staff and the requesting agency.
5. Frequency and timing of (a) collection, (b) reporting – Annually, at the end of the state fiscal year.
6. Calculation methodology – Number of agencies awarded subgrants or cooperative agreements to convert or replace legacy systems (or obtain a system) during the state fiscal year for which the indicator report is prepared are summed.
7. Definitions of any unclear terms – None.
8. What aggregations or disaggregations of the indicator are needed? – By state fiscal year.
9. Who is responsible for data collection and quality? – The primary responsibility for data collection and validation is the UCR/LIBRS staff. For the subgrant files the Grants Administration section of LCLE is responsible for insuring that the information contained in them is current and accurate.
10. Limitations of the indicator – The number of agencies funded is determined by the available resources.

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION SHEET

Program: Federal Programs, Objective II.4

Date: 06/2028

1. INDICATOR NAME – NUMBER OF AGENCIES COMPLETING LIBRS CERTIFICATION
2. Indicator type – Outcome.
3. Rationale – Before an agency can report crime statistics through the LIBRS system, the local law enforcement agency must pass a certification process which ensures that the software and procedures are in place to produce 96% error-free data submissions. Since certification is the first step toward LIBRS reporting, it is a significant outcome indicator for the program.
4. Data collection procedures – Source documents for this indicator are the lists of agencies successfully completing LIBRS certification which are created by the LIBRS staff conducting the certification process. Backup documentation for verification are the error listings which would indicate 96% error free submissions.
5. Frequency and timing of (a) collection, (b) reporting – Annually, at the end of the state fiscal year.
6. Calculation methodology – Number of agencies successfully completing LIBRS certification are summed for the state fiscal year for which the indicator report is produced.
7. Definitions of any unclear terms – Successful completion of LIBRS certification means an agency has met the criteria established in the LIBRS certification procedures.
8. What aggregations or disaggregations of the indicator are needed? – By state fiscal year.
9. Who is responsible for data collection and quality? – The primary responsibility for collecting and validating the data for this indicator rests with the LIBRS staff.
10. Limitations of the indicator – The number of agencies completing LIBRS certification is dependent on the funding available to local agencies to become LIBRS compliant and the decision of local agencies to fully participate in the certification process.

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION SHEET

Program: Federal Programs, Objective II.4

Date: 06/2028

1. INDICATOR NAME – PERCENTAGE OF STATE POPULATION COVERED BY LIBRS REPORTING
2. Indicator type – Outcome.
3. Rationale – This indicator is a direct measure of the desired outcome of the program. It also answers the question: "how much of the crime is actually being reported in the more detailed and flexible LIBRS format?"
4. Data collection procedures – The primary source for the population figures is the Bureau of Investigation, Uniform Crime Reporting Program. The primary source for the identification of certified agencies reporting under LIBRS is the agency reporting logs maintained by the LIBRS staff. Backup validation is available through the LIBRS submission edit reports on each submission made. This documentation is developed and maintained at the LIBRS data center.
5. Frequency and timing of (a) collection, (b) reporting – Annually, at the end of the state fiscal year for the calendar year ending that period.
6. Calculation methodology – The population served by the agencies reporting under LIBRS at the end of each calendar year is determined based on Bureau of Investigation, Uniform Crime Reporting Program reports and summed. This figure is then divided by the total population of the state based on Bureau of Investigation, Uniform Crime Reporting reports and the result multiplied by 100 to arrive at the percentage.
7. Definitions of any unclear terms – None.
8. What aggregations or disaggregations of the indicator are needed? – By calendar year ending in the state fiscal year for which the indicator report is made.
9. Who is responsible for data collection and quality? – The LIBRS staff is responsible for collection of the data based on Bureau of Investigation, Uniform Crime Reporting reports and the agency reporting logs. The staff is also responsible for the calculations. The results are verified by the Statistical Analysis Center of LCLE.
10. Limitations of the indicator – The decision to participate in LIBRS rests with the eligible law enforcement agency and not with LCLE.

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION SHEET

Program: Federal Programs, Objective II.4

Date: 06/2028

1. INDICATOR NAME – COST PER POPULATION COVERED
2. Indicator type – Efficiency.
3. Rationale – There are several ways to approach cost efficiency in the context of the crime reporting program. The decision to use cost per population covered rather than cost per agency is based on the notion that the former provides a greater context for comparing the data across years. Using absolute numbers of agencies reporting makes the tacit assumption that all agencies are responsible for about the same amount of crime reporting; a significant assumption since the goal is to have as complete, accurate, and timely a picture of crime in the state as possible. Looking at cost per population served is one way to compare (albeit through an indicator rather than directly) the percentage of crime actually included in the statistics.
4. Data collection procedures – The primary source for cost data is the subgrant budgets included in the files of the Grants Administration section of LCLE for LIBRS related projects. The origins of these data are the subgrantees submitting the budget information to Grants Administration, and the Cooperative Agreements maintained by the Fiscal section of LCLE. The primary source for the population figures is the Bureau of the Census.
5. Frequency and timing of (a) collection, (b) reporting – Annually, for the calendar year ending in the state fiscal year for which the indicator report is made.
6. Calculation methodology – The LIBRS program costs derived from the sub-grant and cooperative agreement files for awards made during the calendar year for the reporting cycle in question is divided by the population residing in jurisdictions where the primary law enforcement agency is reporting under LIBRS at the end of the calendar year and the result multiplied by 100 to determine the percentage.
7. Definitions of any unclear terms – None.
8. What aggregations or disaggregations of the indicator are needed? – By calendar year ending in the state fiscal year for which the indicator report is made.
9. Who is responsible for data collection and quality? – Primary responsibility for collection, maintenance, and verification of the data used in the calculation rests with the LIBRS staff. Responsibility for the calculations and verification of the methodology resides with the Statistical Analysis Center of LCLE.
10. Limitations of the indicator – The decision whether or not to participate in LIBRS rests entirely on the individual law enforcement agency and is beyond the control of LCLE. The use of cost figures based on crime reporting related subgrants awarded accounts only for those costs covered through LCLE sources.

B. STATE PROGRAMS, OBJECTIVE III.1

- 1. Provide a brief statement identifying the principal clients and users of each program and the specific service or benefit derived by such persons or organizations.**

Grants are made available to police departments and sheriff's offices demonstrating the capacity to present the DARE program. In turn, these agencies utilize these funds to serve the ultimate client, Louisiana's school children.

- 2. Identify the potential external factors that are beyond the control of the entity and that could significantly affect the achievement of its goals or objectives.**

State General Fund appropriations are essential to the meeting of goals and objectives of this program. Funding enables the certification of officers qualified to teach DARE across the state. Funding provides support for classroom materials used by DARE officers during curriculum presentation.

- 3. Provide a description of any program evaluation used to develop objectives and strategies.**

Several national studies/surveys concluding that successful presentation of the DARE program should include all aspects of the curriculum (elementary, junior high, senior high, and parent).

- 4. Provide an explanation of how duplication of effort shall be avoided when the operations of more than one program are directed at achieving a single goal, objective, or strategy.**

All funding requests for the support of a DARE program by local agencies are directed to the state DARE grant program. All grant requests for DARE by the LCLE are considered by the DARE Advisory Board.

- 5. Documentation as to the validity, reliability, and appropriateness of each performance indicator, as well as the method used to verify and validate the performance indicators as relevant measure of each program's performance.**

See attached Performance Indicator Matrix and Performance Indicator Documentation Sheets.

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR MATRIX

Objective	Input	Output	Outcome	Efficiency
III.1	Funds allocated to the DARE program by annual state appropriation	Number of students receiving the DARE presentation	Percentage change in number of students receiving DARE presentation	Cost per student receiving DARE presentation
		Number of parishes receiving the DARE presentation		
	Certified officers available to present DARE	Number of new officers certified annually	Difference in pre/post test scores among DARE core students	Administrative costs as a percentage of the total annual appropriation
		Number of agencies receiving state DARE funds		
		Dollar amount of subgrants awarded		

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION SHEET

Program: State Programs, Objective III.1

Date: 06/2028

1. INDICATOR NAME – FUNDS ALLOCATED TO THE DARE PROGRAM BY ANNUAL STATE APPROPRIATION
2. Indicator type – Input.
3. Rationale – This indicator measures resource allocation and funding needs.
4. Data collection procedures – State General Fund Appropriation.
5. Frequency and timing of (a) collection, (b) reporting – Annually, state fiscal year cycle.
6. Calculation methodology – Not necessary.
7. Definitions of any unclear terms – Not applicable.
8. What aggregations or disaggregations of the indicator are needed? – By state fiscal year
9. Who is responsible for data collection and quality? – LCLE fiscal section.
10. Limitations of the indicator – Limited by amount of appropriation versus statewide funding needs of DARE projects.

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION SHEET

Program: State Programs, Objective III.1

Date: 06/2028

1. INDICATOR NAME – CERTIFIED OFFICERS AVAILABLE TO PRESENT DARE
2. Indicator type – Input.
3. Rationale – Measures number of DARE officers certified and available to present the DARE program.
4. Data collection procedures – Number of officers successfully completing DARE Officer Training through the DARE State Training Center and assigned by departments to conduct classroom presentation of DARE.
5. Frequency and timing of (a) collection, (b) reporting – Data collection is ongoing, primarily conducted during the application process and reported on a state fiscal year basis.
6. Calculation methodology – Total number of officers named on grant applications certified and assigned to present DARE annually.
7. Definitions of any unclear terms – Officers meeting the qualification criteria must successfully complete an 80-hour DARE training in order to be certified to present the DARE curriculum.
8. What aggregations or disaggregations of the indicator are needed? – By state fiscal year.
9. Who is responsible for data collection and quality? – LCLE DARE program staff collect data; certifications are verified through the State DARE Training Center.
10. Limitations of the indicator – Limited by the number of officers local agencies assign to DARE and the number of officers successfully completing DARE certification.

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION SHEET

Program: State Programs, Objective III.1

Date: 06/2028

1. INDICATOR NAME – NUMBER OF STUDENTS RECEIVING THE DARE PRESENTATION
2. Indicator type – Output.
3. Rationale – Measures number of students receiving DARE through an LCLE grant.
4. Data collection procedures – Count derived from reports submitted by the subgrant agency.
5. Frequency and timing of (a) collection, (b) reporting – Data is collected during the application process. Data reported on a state fiscal year basis.
6. Calculation methodology – Total students receiving DARE as reported by the subgrant agency.
7. Definitions of any unclear terms – Not applicable.
8. What aggregations or disaggregations of the indicator are needed? – By state fiscal year.
9. Who is responsible for data collection and quality? – Subgrant agency provides data. Data is maintained by the LCLE DARE program staff.
10. Limitations of the indicator – Limited by the number of schools able to be reached, and the number of officers available to present.

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION SHEET

Program: State Programs, Objective III.1

Date: 06/2028

1. INDICATOR NAME – NUMBER OF PARISHES RECEIVING THE DARE PRESENTATION
2. Indicator type – Output.
3. Rationale – Assists in determining funding distribution. Measures number of officers needed to present the DARE program statewide and the number of students to be targeted.
4. Data collection procedures – Data collected by the LCLE.
5. Frequency and timing of (a) collection, (b) reporting – Ongoing.
6. Calculation methodology – Not applicable.
7. Definitions of any unclear terms – Not applicable.
8. What aggregations or disaggregations of the indicator are needed? – By state fiscal year.
9. Who is responsible for data collection and quality? – State DARE Training Center reports this information to the LCLE.
10. Limitations of the indicator – Limited by the number of officers applying for DARE certification.

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION SHEET

Program: State Programs, Objective III.1

Date: 06/2028

1. INDICATOR NAME – NUMBER OF NEW OFFICERS CERTIFIED ANNUALLY
2. Indicator type – Output.
3. Rationale – Measures the number of new officers becoming DARE certified at the elementary level.
4. Data collection procedures – Count derived by number of new DARE officers applying for and receiving DARE certification.
5. Frequency and timing of (a) collection, (b) reporting – Data is collected on an ongoing basis. This data is reported on a state fiscal year basis.
6. Calculation methodology – Total number of newly certified DARE officers.
7. Definitions of any unclear terms – DARE certified means becoming certified to present DARE at the elementary school level.
8. What aggregations or disaggregations of the indicator are needed? – By state fiscal year.
9. Who is responsible for data collection and quality? – State DARE Training Center reports this information to the LCLE.
10. Limitations of the indicator – Limited by the number of officers applying for DARE certification.

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION SHEET

Program: State Programs, Objective III.1

Date: 06/2028

1. INDICATOR NAME – NUMBER OF AGENCIES RECEIVING STATE DARE FUNDS
2. Indicator type – Output.
3. Rationale – Resource allocation and funding needs.
4. Data collection procedures – With the assistance of the State DARE Training Center, eligible agencies are identified based on the ability to deliver the DARE Program.
5. Frequency and timing of (a) collection, (b) reporting – Updates are collected throughout the year. The indicator is reported on a state fiscal year basis.
6. Calculation methodology – Number of agencies receiving a DARE subgrant in a state fiscal year.
7. Definitions of any unclear terms – Not applicable.
8. What aggregations or disaggregations of the indicator are needed? – By state fiscal year.
9. Who is responsible for data collection and quality? – LCLE fiscal section.
10. Limitations of the indicator – Limited by the number of agencies who have certified DARE officers available to present DARE.

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION SHEET

Program: State Programs, Objective III.1

Date: 06/2028

1. INDICATOR NAME – DOLLAR AMOUNT OF SUBGRANTS AWARDED
2. Indicator type – Output.
3. Rationale – Measures the amount of funding requested and received by each agency, less any pro-rata cuts due to the lack of funds for all agencies.
4. Data collection procedures – Count derived from the LCLE Egrants System.
5. Frequency and timing of (a) collection, (b) reporting – Data is collected during the fiscal year. Data is reported on a state fiscal year basis.
6. Calculation methodology – Number of agencies receiving a DARE subgrant and the dollar amount awarded in a state fiscal year.
7. Definitions of any unclear terms – Not applicable.
8. What aggregations or disaggregations of the indicator are needed? – By state fiscal year.
9. Who is responsible for data collection and quality? – LCLE fiscal section.
10. Limitations of the indicator – Limited by the amount of funds available each fiscal year.

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION SHEET

Program: State Programs, Objective III.1

Date: 06/2028

1. INDICATOR NAME – PERCENTAGE CHANGE IN THE NUMBER OF STUDENTS RECEIVING DARE PRESENTATION
2. Indicator type – Outcome.
3. Rationale – Increase/decrease in the number of students targeted for DARE instruction.
4. Data collection procedures – Data collected by the local agencies presenting DARE and reported to the LCLE.
5. Frequency and timing of (a) collection, (b) reporting – Ongoing collection of information with reporting conducted on a state fiscal year basis.
6. Calculation methodology – Tabulate number of students targeted for instruction in each state fiscal year.
7. Definitions of any unclear terms – Not applicable.
8. What aggregations or disaggregations of the indicator are needed? – By state fiscal year.
9. Who is responsible for data collection and quality? – Local law enforcement agencies presenting DARE who report these figures to the LCLE.
10. Limitations of the indicator – Limited by the number of officers certified to teach DARE.

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION SHEET

Program: State Programs, Objective III.1

Date: 06/2028

1. INDICATOR NAME – DIFFERENCE IN PRE/POST TEST SCORES AMONG DARE CORE STUDENTS.
2. Indicator type – Outcome.
3. Rationale – The indicator assesses student outcomes attributable to the DARE core curriculum.
4. Data collection procedures – The Pre/Post Test is administered in the classroom by DARE officers. Completed tests are then tabulated and analyzed by the State DARE Training Center or a designee of the State DARE Training Center.
5. Frequency and timing of (a) collection, (b) reporting – Data is collected throughout the school year and reported to the LCLE at the conclusion of assessment.
6. Calculation methodology – Analysis of variance.
7. Definitions of any unclear terms – The core curriculum refers to the curriculum presented to students in the elementary exit grade, either fifth or sixth grade, whichever applies.
8. What aggregations or disaggregations of the indicator are needed? – By state fiscal year.
9. Who is responsible for data collection and quality? – The State DARE Training Center.
10. Limitations of the indicator – Resources to conduct and analyze results.

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION SHEET

Program: State Programs, Objective III.1

Date: 06/2028

1. INDICATOR NAME – COST PER STUDENT RECEIVING DARE PRESENTATION
2. Indicator type – Efficiency.
3. Rationale – Determines funding distribution.
4. Data collection procedures – Data collected by the LCLE.
5. Frequency and timing of (a) collection, (b) reporting – Data collected during the application process. Indicator reported on a state fiscal year basis.
6. Calculation methodology – Cost per target student per classroom material needed.
7. Definitions of any unclear terms – Not applicable.
8. What aggregations or disaggregations of the indicator are needed? – By state fiscal year.
9. Who is responsible for data collection and quality? – Applicant agencies and the LCLE.
10. Limitations of the indicator – Limited by funding made available and number of certified DARE officers qualified to present the DARE program.

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION SHEET

Program: State Programs, Objective III.1

Date: 06/2028

1. INDICATOR NAME – ADMINISTRATIVE COSTS AS A PERCENTAGE OF THE TOTAL ANNUAL APPROPRIATION
2. Indicator type – Efficiency.
3. Rationale – The percentage of funding used for administrative functions.
4. Data collection procedures – Collected by the LCLE fiscal section.
5. Frequency and timing of (a) collection, (b) reporting – Ongoing collection, reported on a state fiscal year basis.
6. Calculation methodology – The amount expended for administrative efforts as opposed to the amount expended for local projects.
7. Definitions of any unclear terms – Not applicable.
8. What aggregations or disaggregations of the indicator are needed? – By state fiscal year.
9. Who is responsible for data collection and quality? – The LCLE fiscal section.
10. Limitations of the indicator – Appropriated state funds.

B. STATE PROGRAMS, OBJECTIVES III.2 – III.5

- 1. Provide a brief statement identifying the principal clients and users of each program and the specific service or benefit derived by such persons or organizations.**

The Peace Officer Standards and Training (POST) staff carries out the staff functions of the Louisiana POST Council. Decisions and policies mandated by the Council directly affect all municipal officers, deputy sheriffs, state police, wildlife agents, and all other persons defined as full-time peace officers, as defined by state law. These agencies receive training services as outlined in Objectives III.2 – III.5.

- 2. Identify the potential external factors that are beyond the control of the entity and that could significantly affect the achievement of its goals or objectives.**

As POST is the staff function of the LA POST Council, its objectives could be affected by decisions made by the Council. The Council is in a continual process of evaluation and development of training standards for peace officers. These standards are directly affected by a number of factors including judicial actions, scientific findings in the field of peace officer training, and legislative actions.

Funding sources for POST operations and programs are based primarily upon ACT 440 funds. These funds are directly dependent upon the judicial process specifically pertaining to the number of persons convicted of a felony, misdemeanor or violations of an ordinance of any local government to provide for the amount of assessment, \$2, to provide for the use of the proceeds for training law enforcement officers and assisting law enforcement agencies. These collections are outside the control of POST. Should there be a shortfall, POST programs would be directly affected.

- 3. Provide a description of any program evaluation used to develop objectives and strategies.**

The Council also establishes minimum POST certification requirements for academy and certain other law enforcement instructors, certifies trainees at three different possible levels upon successful completion of a corresponding basic course, and accredits police training facilities and training courses. Staff functions of the Council are carried out by LCLE personnel assigned to the POST program.

BASIC

Basic Peace Officer Training (Level 1)

The Louisiana Legislature Ratified Act 108 in 1998. One of its provisions was that any person who began employment as a “peace officer” subsequent to January 1, 1986 must successfully complete a full POST–certified training program as well as a POST comprehensive examination within one calendar year from the date of initial employment. Any person failing to comply with these requirements shall be prohibited from exercising the authority of a peace officer, although administrative duties will be an allowable function.

Certified basic training, as prescribed by state law, is designed to provide officers with a basic knowledge of the law enforcement function. Course curriculum currently includes, but is not limited to, Louisiana law and related legal subjects, use of firearms, patrol procedures, traffic services, juvenile matters, officer survival, report writing, courtroom testimony, use of force, investigations, domestic violence, vehicle stops, first aid, and more. POST currently requires a minimum of 496 hours for basic training, but course length varies among academies—ranging from slightly above 496 hours to over 1,100 hours. After successful completion of the academy attended, including at least 80% accuracy on the POST firearms qualification course, students must score 70% or above on the POST Comprehensive Exam (currently comprised of 100 questions). This certification exam is now administered each year to nearly 1,300 officers.

A Law Enforcement Training and Education Job Task Analysis was re–conducted by the Peace Officer Training Study Committee that was created by Act 108. This independent and comprehensive analysis was completed in 1999 based on the information contained in 1500 questionnaires received from a sample of “rookie” officers and their patrol supervisors across the state. The POST Council used the researcher’s results and made changes to update and increase the minimum hours included in the POST Basic Training Manual. The goal of this undertaking was that all POST academy graduates have a thorough foundation of knowledge and abilities currently necessary in their first years on the job in Louisiana. Another benefit of the analysis resulted in POST requirements being more court defensible.

Basic Correctional Peace Officer Training (Level 2)

This certification level was enacted January 1, 1999, as an option for Louisiana “peace officers” whose main duties are the care, custody and control of inmates. It requires a minimum of 249 basic training hours, going beyond the 90-hour correctional course to include some Basic Training instruction. After completing the 90-hour course and successfully passing the certification exam, students must complete additional hours in legal aspects, first aid, report writing, officer survival, firearms and investigations. They are then required to earn at least 70% on a comprehensive exam administered by POST staff that covers the additional training. POST firearms certification was optional for these officers. As of March 26, 2001, the POST Council voted to make firearms certification mandatory for completion of level 2.

Jailer Training (Level 3)

Federal court decisions affecting Louisiana parish jails conspicuously point out the tremendous need to adequately train jail personnel. To meet this need, the Louisiana POST Council instituted an 80-hour program to provide the correctional officer with a fundamental knowledge of the duties and responsibilities associated with his job. A revised 90-hour curriculum was implemented in 1997 to better accommodate the needs of local administrators, and also to include the sheriffs’ jail guidelines. The new course gives officers the opportunity to receive certification from POST. POST firearms qualification is not required for these officers. Currently POST awards this corrections certification yearly to more than 1,100 officers assigned to local jails. Parish sheriffs have become very receptive of this course, with the demand for the training increasing each year.

Instructor Development Training

To better prepare experienced law enforcement officers to be effective instructors for their agencies and academies, the Council provides instructor development training on a regional basis. As presented by the Federal Bureau of Investigation, the course focuses on principles of learning, the police officer as an adult learner, determining training needs, and defining instructional objectives. Students become familiar with effective communications and teaching strategies and are required to make presentations using lesson plans, visual support materials, and contemporary teaching techniques. Response to this course has been overwhelming. Certification has been awarded annually to approximately sixty to eighty new instructors in specialized fields.

4. **Provide an explanation of how duplication of effort shall be avoided when the operations of more than one program are directed at achieving a single goal, objective, or strategy.**

Duplication of effort is not possible with this program. The Louisiana POST Council is the only authority in the determination of training standards in the state, as mandated by law.

Funding projects carried out by POST are not duplicated, as POST is the only recipient and dispenser of ACT 440 Funds.

5. **Documentation as to the validity, reliability, and appropriateness of each performance indicator, as well as the method used to verify and validate the performance indicators as relevant measures of each program's performance.**

See attached Performance Indicator Matrix and Performance Indicator Documentation Sheets.

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR MATRIX

Objective	Input	Output	Outcome	Efficiency
III.2	Funds available for basic peace officer training	Number of basic peace officer training courses conducted annually	Number of peace officers who successfully completed all aspects of POST minimum standards of training and successfully pass the state POST certification test	Number of persons successfully completing all aspects of POST basic peace officer training as a percentage of the total number of students enrolled in classes graduating in a state fiscal year
	Number of accredited regional training centers	Dollar amount of funds reimbursed to agencies based on the number of peace officers successfully certified at accredited regional training centers	Number of peace officers who have successfully completed all aspects of POST minimum standards of training and who have successfully completed the state POST certification re-test (this number is actually included in the total outcome of all certifications for reporting purposes, although a different test is given in the re-test)	
	Number of students initially enrolled in basic peace officer training			

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR MATRIX

Objective	Input	Output	Outcome	Efficiency
III.3	Funds available for basic correctional peace officer training	Number of basic correctional peace officer training courses conducted annually	Number of correctional peace officers who successfully complete all aspects of POST minimum standards of training and successfully pass the state POST certification test	Number of persons successfully completing all aspects of POST basic correctional peace officer training as a percentage of the total number of students enrolled in classes graduating in a state fiscal year
	Number of accredited regional training centers and satellite centers	Dollar amount of funds reimbursed to agencies based on the number of peace officers successfully certified at accredited regional training centers or satellite centers	Number of correctional peace officers who have successfully completed all aspects of POST minimum standards of training and who have successfully completed the state POST certification re-test (this number is actually included in the total outcome of all certifications for reporting purposes, although a different test is given in the re-test)	
	Number of students initially enrolled in basic correctional peace officer training			

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR MATRIX

Objective	Input	Output	Outcome	Efficiency
III.4.	Funds available for correctional (jailer) training	Dollar amount of funds reimbursed to local agencies based on the number of successful certifications of correctional (jailer) officers	Number of newly certified correctional (jailer) officers	Average reimbursement per correctional (jailer) officer
III.5	Total funds available for mandated in-service and specialized training	Dollar amount reimbursed to local agencies for mandated in-service and specialized training	Number of persons trained	Average cost per officer trained
III.6	Amount of funds available	Number of instructor development courses offered	Number of instructor development certifications awarded annually	Percentage of course participants successfully completing the program
	Number of POST master instructors available	Number of instructor development course participants		

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION SHEET

Program: State Programs, Objective III.2

Date: 06/2028

1. INDICATOR NAME – FUNDS AVAILABLE FOR BASIC PEACE OFFICER TRAINING
2. Indicator type – Input.
3. Rationale – Measures the number of resources available for implementation for the basic peace officer training program.
4. Data collection procedures – Data is collected and maintained by the LCLE POST staff utilizing the POST PLUS Information System.
5. Frequency and timing of (a) collection, (b) reporting – Funds are allocated annually and reported on a state fiscal year basis.
6. Calculation methodology – Not applicable.
7. Definition of unclear terms – Not applicable.
8. What aggregations or disaggregations of the indicators are needed? – By state fiscal year.
9. Who is responsible for data collection and quality? – LCLE POST staff.
10. Limitations of the indicators – Availability of revenues.

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION SHEET

Program: State Programs, Objective III.2

Date: 06/2028

1. INDICATOR NAME: NUMBER OF ACCREDITED REGIONAL TRAINING CENTERS
2. Indicator type: Input.
3. Rationale: All basic training occurs in an accredited Regional Training Center. This indicator measures the number of facilities available to support basic training.
4. Data collection procedures – The number of accredited regional training centers is established by the POST Council.
5. Frequency and timing of (a) collection, (b) reporting – This information is collected on an ongoing basis and is on file with the LCLE POST staff. It is reported by State Fiscal Year.
6. Calculation methodology – Simple count.
7. Definition of unclear terms – An accredited Regional Training Center is an accredited POST certified school, academy, or institute which conducts law enforcement training according to standards and curricula approved by the POST Council.
8. What aggregations or disaggregations of the indicators are needed? – By state fiscal year.
9. Who is responsible for data collection and quality? – LCLE POST staff.
10. Limitations of the indicators – Number of accredited regional training centers is set by the POST Council.

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION SHEET

Program: State Programs, Objective, III.2

Date: 06/2028

1. INDICATOR NAME: NUMBER OF STUDENTS INITIALLY ENROLLED IN BASIC PEACE OFFICER TRAINING
2. Indicator type – Input.
3. Rationale – Measures the number of persons entering the basic training process.
4. Data collection procedures – The number of students enrolled in basic courses at the accredited regional training centers is determined by the request of the local and state agencies, available training slots, and department needs. The data is collected by the accredited regional training centers.
5. Frequency and timing of (a) collection, (b) reporting – Collected on an ongoing basis during the year as trainings are held. The number is reported on forms supplied by the Louisiana POST Council and provided to the Louisiana Commission on Law Enforcement (Examination Request Form). The information is collected on an ongoing basis and reported on a state fiscal year basis by LCLE.
6. Calculation methodology – Simple addition.
7. Definition of unclear terms – Not applicable.
8. What aggregations or disaggregations of the indicators are needed? – By state fiscal year.
9. Who is responsible for data collection and quality? – The accredited Regional Training Centers report this information to the LCLE, and are responsible for its collection and quality.
10. Limitations of the indicators – The number of students enrolled is determined by the number of students requesting training, available training slots, and agency needs.

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION SHEET

Program: State Programs, Objective III.2

Date: 06/2028

1. INDICATOR NAME – NUMBER OF BASIC PEACE OFFICER TRAINING COURSES CONDUCTED ANNUALLY
2. Indicator type – Output.
3. Rationale – Measures the number of basic training courses conducted which is a primary output of the basic training process.
4. Data collection procedures – The accredited Regional Training Centers determine the convening of an academy and report to the LCLE on forms supplied by the POST Council (Examination Request Form).
5. Frequency and timing of (a) collection, (b) reporting – This information is collected on an ongoing basis by the Regional Training Center and reported to the LCLE. LCLE reports this indicator on a state fiscal year basis.
6. Calculation methodology – Simple addition.
7. Definition of unclear terms – Not applicable.
8. What aggregations or disaggregations of the indicators are needed? – By state fiscal year.
9. Who is responsible for data collection and quality? – Accredited Regional Training Centers collect this information, and provide it to the LCLE POST staff. The Centers are responsible for its collection and quality.
10. Limitations of the indicators – Number of basic training courses conducted annually is determined by the accredited Regional Training Centers.

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION SHEET

Program: State Programs, Objective, III.2

Date: 06/2028

1. INDICATOR NAME – DOLLAR AMOUNT OF FUNDS REIMBURSED TO AGENCIES BASED ON THE NUMBER OF PEACE OFFICERS SUCCESSFULLY CERTIFIED AT ACCREDITED REGIONAL TRAINING CENTERS
2. Indicator type – Output.
3. Rationale – Measures output of dollars to support basic peace officer training in the state.
4. Data collection procedures – Collected by the LCLE POST staff through an in-house POST Management Information System.
5. Frequency and timing of (a) collection, (b) reporting – This information is collected on an ongoing basis, and reported on a state fiscal year basis.
6. Calculation methodology – Simple addition.
7. Definition of unclear terms – Not applicable.
8. What aggregations or disaggregations of the indicators are needed? – By state fiscal year.
9. Who is responsible for data collection and quality? – LCLE POST staff.
10. Limitations of the indicators – Number of officers successfully completing basic peace officer training and passing POST exam, ability and desire of officers to complete and pass requirements, and quality of training providers.

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION SHEET

Program: State Programs, Objective, III.2

Date: 06/2028

1. INDICATOR NAME – NUMBER OF PEACE OFFICERS WHO SUCCESSFULLY COMPLETED ALL ASPECTS OF POST MINIMUM STANDARDS OF TRAINING AND SUCCESSFULLY PASS THE STATE POST CERTIFICATION TEST
2. Indicator type – Outcome.
3. Rationale – Measures the number of people successfully completing all aspects of basic peace officer training, and receiving certification as a peace officer from the state.
4. Data collection procedures – Information is initially collected by the accredited Regional Training Centers and reported to LCLE.
5. Frequency and timing of (a) collection, (b) reporting – This information is collected on an ongoing basis and reported to LCLE. POST examinations are administered at the conclusion of basic peace officer training by LCLE POST. This data is reported by LCLE on a state fiscal year basis.
6. Calculation methodology – Simple addition.
7. Definition of unclear terms – Not applicable.
8. What aggregations or disaggregations of the indicators are needed? – By state fiscal year.
9. Who is responsible for data collection and quality? – The Regional Training Centers are responsible for the data collection and quality. The LCLE POST staff is responsible for administration of examinations, and maintaining these files.
10. Limitations of the indicators – Number of officers successfully completing basic peace officer training and passing POST exam, ability and desire of officers to complete and pass requirements, and quality of training providers.

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION SHEET

Program: State Programs, Objective, III.2

Date: 06/2028

1. INDICATOR NAME – NUMBER OF PEACE OFFICERS WHO HAVE SUCCESSFULLY COMPLETED ALL ASPECTS OF POST MINIMUM STANDARDS OF TRAINING AND WHO HAVE SUCCESSFULLY COMPLETED THE STATE POST CERTIFICATION RE-TEST (THIS NUMBER IS ACTUALLY INCLUDED IN THE TOTAL OUTCOME OF ALL CERTIFICATIONS FOR REPORTING PURPOSES, ALTHOUGH A DIFFERENT TEST IS GIVEN IN THE RE-TEST)
2. Indicator type – Outcome.
3. Rationale – Measures the number of persons successfully completing all aspects of basic peace officer training, and receive certification as a peace officer from the state after re-test.
4. Data collection procedures – Data is collected by LCLE POST staff from a list of those officers who did not pass the POST examination.
5. Frequency and timing of (a) collection, (b) reporting – Collected on an ongoing basis and reported by LCLE POST staff.
6. Calculation methodology – Simple addition.
7. Definition of unclear terms – Not applicable.
8. What aggregations or disaggregations of the indicators are needed? – By state fiscal year.
9. Who is responsible for data collection and quality? – LCLE POST staff.
10. Limitations of the indicators – Number of peace officers successfully completing basic training and not passing the POST exam and qualifying for retake of the POST exam, ability and desire of officers to complete and pass requirements, and quality of training providers.

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION SHEET

Program: State Programs, Objective III.2

Date: 06/2028

1. INDICATOR NAME – NUMBER OF PERSONS SUCCESSFULLY COMPLETING ALL ASPECTS OF POST BASIC PEACE OFFICER TRAINING AS A PERCENTAGE OF THE TOTAL NUMBER OF STUDENTS ENROLLED IN CLASSES GRADUATING IN A STATE FISCAL YEAR
2. Indicator type – Efficiency.
3. Rationale – Measures the percentage of successful completion of POST certification out of the total population enrolled.
4. Data collection procedures – Enrollment figures are collected and reported to LCLE by the Regional Training Centers. Numbers passing the POST examinations are collected and maintained by LCLE POST staff.
5. Frequency and timing of (a) collection, (b) reporting – Collected on an ongoing basis and reported on a state fiscal year basis.
6. Calculation methodology – Number of students initially enrolled in basic peace officer training classes during a state fiscal year divided by the number of persons successfully completing all aspects of basic peace officer training, with the result multiplied by 100.
7. Definition of unclear terms – “Successfully completing all aspects of basic training” is operationally defined as the number of persons awarded POST Peace Officer Certifications.
8. What aggregations or disaggregations of the indicators are needed? – By state fiscal year.
9. Who is responsible for data collection and quality? – LCLE POST staff.
10. Limitations of the indicators – Number of officers successfully completing basic peace officer training, ability and desire of officers to complete and pass requirements, and quality of training providers.

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION SHEET

Program: State Programs, Objective III.3

Date: 06/2028

1. INDICATOR NAME – FUNDS AVAILABLE FOR BASIC CORRECTIONAL PEACE OFFICER TRAINING
2. Indicator type – Input.
3. Rationale – Measures the number of resources available for implementation for the basic, correctional peace officer training program.
4. Data collection procedures – Data is collected and maintained by LCLE POST staff utilizing the POST PLUS Management Information System.
5. Frequency and timing of (a) collection, (b) reporting – Funds are allocated annually and reported on a state fiscal year basis.
6. Calculation methodology – Not applicable.
7. Definition of unclear terms – Not applicable.
8. What aggregations or disaggregations of the indicators are needed? – By state fiscal year.
9. Who is responsible for data collection and quality? – LCLE POST staff.
10. Limitations of the indicators – Availability of revenues.

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION SHEET

Program: State Programs, Objective III.3

Date: 06/2028

1. INDICATOR NAME – NUMBER OF CERTIFIED REGIONAL TRAINING CENTERS AND SATELLITE CENTERS
2. Indicator type – Input.
3. Rationale – All basic training occurs in an accredited Regional Training Center or satellite center. This indicator measures the number of facilities available to support basic correctional peace officer training.
4. Data collection procedures – The number of certified regional training centers is established by the POST Council.
5. Frequency and timing of (a) collection, (b) reporting – This information is collected on an ongoing basis and is on file with LCLE POST staff. It is reported by State Fiscal Year.
6. Calculation methodology – Simple count.
7. Definition of unclear terms – An accredited Regional Training Center or satellite center is a POST certified school, academy, or institute which conducts law enforcement training according to standards and curricula approved by the POST Council.
8. What aggregations or disaggregations of the indicators are needed? – By state fiscal year.
9. Who is responsible for data collection and quality? – LCLE POST staff.
10. Limitations of the indicators – Number of accredited regional training centers or satellite centers is set by the POST Council.

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION SHEET

Program: State Programs, Objective, III.3

Date: 06/2028

1. INDICATOR NAME – NUMBER OF STUDENTS INITIALLY ENROLLED IN BASIC CORRECTIONAL PEACE OFFICER TRAINING
2. Indicator type – Input.
3. Rationale – Measures the number of persons entering the basic correctional peace officer training process.
4. Data collection procedures – The number of students enrolled in basic courses at the accredited regional training centers or satellite centers is determined by the request of the local and state agencies, available training slots, and department needs. The data is collected by the accredited regional training centers, or satellite centers.
5. Frequency and timing of (a) collection, (b) reporting – Collected on an ongoing basis during the year as trainings are held. The number is reported on forms supplied by the Louisiana POST Council and provided to the Louisiana Commission on Law Enforcement (Examination Request Form). The information is collected on an ongoing basis and reported on a state fiscal year basis by LCLE.
6. Calculation methodology – Simple addition.
7. Definition of unclear terms – Not applicable.
8. What aggregations or disaggregations of the indicators are needed? – By state fiscal year.
9. Who is responsible for data collection and quality? – The accredited Regional Training Centers or satellite centers report this information to the LCLE, and are responsible for its collection and quality.
10. Limitations of the indicators – The number of students enrolled is determined by the number of students requesting training, available training slots, and agency needs.

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION SHEET

Program: State Programs, Objective III.3

Date: 06/2028

1. INDICATOR NAME – NUMBER OF BASIC CORRECTIONAL PEACE OFFICER TRAINING COURSES CONDUCTED ANNUALLY
2. Indicator type – Output.
3. Rationale – Measures the number of basic correctional peace officer training courses conducted which is a primary output of the basic training process.
4. Data collection procedures – The accredited Regional/Satellite Training Centers determine the convening of an academy and report to the LCLE on forms supplied by the POST Council (Examination Request Form).
5. Frequency and timing of (a) collection, (b) reporting – This information is collected on an ongoing basis by the Regional/Satellite Training Center and reported to the LCLE. LCLE reports this indicator on a state fiscal year basis.
6. Calculation methodology – Simple addition.
7. Definition of unclear terms – Not applicable.
8. What aggregations or disaggregations of the indicators are needed? – By state fiscal year.
9. Who is responsible for data collection and quality? – Accredited Regional/Satellite Training Centers collect this information, and provide it to the LCLE POST staff. The Centers are responsible for its collection and quality.
10. Limitations of the indicators – Number of basic correctional peace officer training courses conducted annually is determined by the accredited Regional Training Centers, or satellite centers.

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION SHEET

Program: State Programs, Objective, III.3

Date: 06/2028

1. INDICATOR NAME – DOLLAR AMOUNT OF FUNDS REIMBURSED TO AGENCIES BASED ON THE NUMBER OF PEACE OFFICERS SUCCESSFULLY CERTIFIED AT ACCREDITED REGIONAL TRAINING CENTERS OR SATELLITE CENTERS
2. Indicator type – Output.
3. Rationale – Measures output of dollars to support basic correctional peace officer training in the state.
4. Data collection procedures – Collected by the LCLE POST staff through an in-house POST Management Information System.
5. Frequency and timing of (a) collection, (b) reporting – This information is collected on an ongoing basis, and reported on a state fiscal year basis.
6. Calculation methodology – Simple addition.
7. Definition of unclear terms – Not applicable.
8. What aggregations or disaggregations of the indicators are needed? – By state fiscal year.
9. Who is responsible for data collection and quality? – LCLE POST staff.
10. Limitations of the indicators – Number of officers successfully completing basic correctional peace officer training and passing POST exam, ability and desire of officers to complete and pass requirements, and quality of training providers.

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION SHEET

Program: State Programs, Objective, III.3

Date: 06/2028

1. INDICATOR NAME – NUMBER OF CORRECTIONAL PEACE OFFICERS WHO SUCCESSFULLY COMPLETE ALL ASPECTS OF POST MINIMUM STANDARDS OF TRAINING AND SUCCESSFULLY PASS THE STATE POST CERTIFICATION TEST
2. Indicator type – Outcome.
3. Rationale – Measures the number of people successfully completing all aspects of basic correctional peace officer training, and receiving certification as a correctional peace officer from the state.
4. Data collection procedures – Information is initially collected by the certified Regional/Satellite Training Centers and reported to LCLE.
5. Frequency and timing of (a) collection, (b) reporting – This information is collected on an ongoing basis and reported to the LCLE. POST examinations are administered at the conclusion of basic correctional peace officer training by the LCLE POST. This data is reported by the LCLE on a state fiscal year basis.
6. Calculation methodology – Simple addition.
7. Definition of unclear terms – Not applicable.
8. What aggregations or disaggregations of the indicators are needed? – By state fiscal year.
9. Who is responsible for data collection and quality? – The Regional/Satellite Training Centers are responsible for the data collection and quality. The LCLE POST staff is responsible for administration of examinations, and maintaining these files.
10. Limitations of the indicators – Number of officers successfully completing basic correctional peace officer training and passing POST exam, ability and desire of officers to complete and pass requirements, and quality of training providers.

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION SHEET

Program: State Programs, Objective III.3

Date: 06/2028

1. INDICATOR NAME – NUMBER OF CORRECTIONAL PEACE OFFICERS WHO HAVE SUCCESSFULLY COMPLETED ALL ASPECTS OF POST MINIMUM STANDARDS OF TRAINING AND WHO HAVE SUCCESSFULLY COMPLETED THE STATE POST CERTIFICATION RE-TEST (THIS NUMBER IS ACTUALLY INCLUDED IN THE TOTAL OUTCOME OF ALL CERTIFICATIONS FOR REPORTING PURPOSES, ALTHOUGH A DIFFERENT TEST IS GIVEN IN THE RE-TEST)
2. Indicator type – Outcome.
3. Rationale – Measures the number of persons successfully completing all aspects of basic correctional peace officer training, and receives certification as a peace officer from the state after re-test.
4. Data collection procedures – Data is collected by LCLE POST staff from a list of those officers who did not pass the POST examination.
5. Frequency and timing of (a) collection, (b) reporting – Collected on an ongoing basis and reported by the LCLE POST staff.
6. Calculation methodology – Simple addition.
7. Definition of unclear terms – Not applicable.
8. What aggregations or disaggregations of the indicators are needed? – By state fiscal year.
9. Who is responsible for data collection and quality? – LCLE POST staff.
10. Limitations of the indicators – Number of peace officers successfully completing basic correctional peace officer training and not passing the POST exam and qualifying for retake of the POST exam, ability and desire of officers to complete and pass requirements, and quality of training providers.

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION SHEET

Program: State Programs, Objective III.3

Date: 06/2028

1. INDICATOR NAME – NUMBER OF PERSONS SUCCESSFULLY COMPLETING ALL ASPECTS OF POST BASIC CORRECTIONAL PEACE OFFICER TRAINING AS A PERCENTAGE OF THE TOTAL NUMBER OF STUDENTS ENROLLED IN CLASSES GRADUATING IN A STATE FISCAL YEAR
2. Indicator type – Efficiency.
3. Rationale – Measures the percentage of successful completion of POST certification out of the total population enrolled.
4. Data collection procedures – Enrollment figures are collected and reported to the LCLE by the Regional Training Centers. Numbers passing the POST examinations are collected and maintained by the LCLE POST staff.
5. Frequency and timing of (a) collection, (b) reporting – Collected on an ongoing basis and reported on a state fiscal year basis.
6. Calculation methodology – Number of students initially enrolled in basic peace officer training classes during a state fiscal year divided by the number of persons successfully completing all aspects of basic peace officer training, with the result multiplied by 100.
7. Definition of unclear terms – “Successfully completing all aspects of basic training” is operationally defined as the number of persons awarded Correctional Peace Officer Certifications.
8. What aggregations or disaggregations of the indicators are needed? – By state fiscal year.
9. Who is responsible for data collection and quality? – LCLE POST staff.
10. Limitations of the indicators – Number of officers successfully completing basic correctional peace officer training, ability and desire of officers to complete and pass requirements, and quality of training providers.

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION SHEET

Program: State Programs, Objective III.4

Date: 06/2028

1. INDICATOR NAME – FUNDS AVAILABLE FOR CORRECTIONAL (JAILER) TRAINING
2. Indicator type – Input.
3. Rationale – Measures the resources available for implementation for basic jailer training program.
4. Data collection procedures – Data is collected and maintained by the LCLE POST staff utilizing the POST PLUS Management Information System.
5. Frequency and timing of (a) collection, (b) reporting – Funds are allocated annually and reported on a state fiscal year basis.
6. Calculation methodology – Not applicable.
7. Definition of unclear terms – Not applicable.
8. What aggregations or disaggregations of the indicators are needed? – By state fiscal year.
9. Who is responsible for data collection and quality? – LCLE POST staff.
10. Limitations of the indicators – Availability of revenues.

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION SHEET

Program: State Programs, Objective III.4

Date: 06/2028

1. INDICATOR NAME – DOLLAR AMOUNT OF FUNDS REIMBURSED TO LOCAL AGENCIES BASED ON THE NUMBER OF SUCCESSFUL CERTIFICATIONS OF CORRECTIONAL (JAILER) OFFICERS
2. Indicator type – Output.
3. Rationale – Measures output of dollars to support correctional training in the state.
4. Data collection procedures – Correctional Jailer Instructors to sign a form supplied provided by the POST Council indicating that students have successfully met the minimum standards established by the POST Council, and these forms are submitted to the LCLE.
5. Frequency and timing of (a) collection, (b) reporting – This information is collected on an ongoing basis, and reported by State Fiscal Year.
6. Calculation methodology – Simple addition.
7. Definition of unclear terms – Certified Correctional (Jailer) Instructor is an instructor who has completed requirements necessary for certification and has been approved by the POST Council.
8. What aggregations or disaggregations of the indicators are needed? – By state fiscal year.
9. Who is responsible for data collection and quality? – Certified Correctional (Jailer) Instructors are responsible for data collection and quality, and report this information to the LCLE.
10. Limitations of the indicators – Training of correctional (jailer) officers is on an as-needed basis determined by instructors based on agencies requesting training.

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION SHEET

Program: State Programs, Objective III.4

Date: 06/2028

1. INDICATOR NAME – NUMBER OF NEWLY CERTIFIED CORRECTIONAL (JAILER) OFFICERS
2. Indicator type – Outcome.
3. Rationale – Measures the number of new officers obtaining POST correctional (jailer) certification.
4. Data collection procedures – Collected and verified by Correctional Instructors. Correctional (jailer) officers sign a form supplied by the POST Council indicating that students have successfully met the minimum standards established by the POST Council.
5. Frequency and timing of (a) collection, (b) reporting – This is collected on an ongoing basis and reported to the LCLE. It is reported by the LCLE on a state fiscal year basis.
6. Calculation methodology – Simple addition.
7. Definition of unclear terms – Not applicable.
8. What aggregations or disaggregations of the indicators are needed? – By state fiscal year.
9. Who is responsible for data collection and quality? – Certified Correctional (Jailer) Instructors are responsible for data collection and quality, and report this information to the LCLE.
10. Limitations of the indicators – Training of correctional (jailer) officers is on an as needed basis determined by instructors based on local agency requests.

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION SHEET

Program: State Programs, Objective III.4

Date: 06/2028

1. INDICATOR NAME – AVERAGE REIMBURSEMENT PER CORRECTIONAL (JAILER) OFFICER
2. Indicator type – Efficiency.
3. Rationale – Measures average cost to the state for reimbursement of costs per correctional (jailer) officer for correctional training.
4. Data collection procedures – LCLE staff would collect this indicator from lists of officers passing correctional (jailer) training and the dollar amount reimbursed for this certification.
5. Frequency and timing of (a) collection, (b) reporting – Collected on an ongoing basis and reported on a state fiscal year basis.
6. Calculation methodology – Dollar amount reimbursed divided by the number of correctional (jailer) officers receiving correctional certification.
7. Definition of unclear terms – Not applicable.
8. What aggregations or disaggregations of the indicators are needed? – By state fiscal year.
9. Who is responsible for data collection and quality? – LCLE POST staff.
10. Limitations of the indicators – Limited by the number of correctional (jailer) officers/agencies requesting correctional training and number of correctional officers passing correctional training.

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION SHEET

Program: State Programs, Objective III.5

Date: 06/2028

1. INDICATOR NAME – TOTAL FUNDS AVAILABLE FOR MANDATED IN-SERVICE AND SPECIALIZED TRAINING
2. Indicator type – Input.
3. Rationale – Measures the resources available for mandated in-service and specialized training.
4. Data collection procedures – Data is collected and maintained by the LCLE POST staff utilizing the POST Management Information System.
5. Frequency and timing of (a) collection, (b) reporting – Funds are allocated annually and reported on a state fiscal year basis.
6. Calculation methodology – Not applicable.
7. Definition of unclear terms – Not applicable.
8. What aggregations or disaggregations of the indicators are needed? – By state fiscal year.
9. Who is responsible for data collection and quality? – LCLE POST staff.
10. Limitations of the indicators – Availability of revenues.

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION SHEET

Program: State Programs, Objective III.5

Date: 06/2028

1. INDICATOR NAME – DOLLAR AMOUNT REIMBURSED TO LOCAL AGENCIES FOR MANDATED IN-SERVICE AND SPECIALIZED TRAINING.
2. Indicator Type – Output.
3. Rationale – Measures the amount of funding actually reimbursed to local agencies to support mandated in-service and specialized training.
4. Data collection procedures – This information is collected and maintained by the LCLE POST staff and captured on the LCLE POST PLUS Management Information System.
5. Frequency and timing of (a) collection, (b) reporting – This information is collected on an ongoing basis and reported on a state fiscal year basis.
6. Calculation methodology – Simple addition.
7. Definition of unclear terms – Not applicable.
8. What aggregations or disaggregations of the indicators are needed? – By state fiscal year.
9. Who is responsible for data collection and quality? – LCLE POST staff.
10. Limitations of the indicators – Number of mandated in-service course participants based upon monies available, and number of specialized schools is determined by the in-service training committee.

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION SHEET

Program: State Programs, Objective III.5

Date: 06/2028

1. INDICATOR NAME – NUMBER OF PERSONS TRAINED
2. Indicator type – Outcome.
3. Rationale – Measures number of mandated in–service participants and number of specialized course participants.
4. Data collection procedures – Conclusion of in–service course, district law enforcement planning council offices will report these numbers to the LCLE staff.
5. Frequency and timing of (a) collection, (b) reporting – Data is collected on an ongoing basis and submitted to the LCLE POST staff. Indicator is reported on a state fiscal year basis.
6. Calculation methodology – Simple addition.
7. Definition of unclear terms – Not applicable.
8. What aggregations or disaggregations of the indicators are needed? – By state fiscal year.
9. Who is responsible for data collection and quality? – Law Enforcement Planning District staff and LCLE POST staff.
10. Limitations of the indicators – The number of mandated in–service and specialized training participants is heavily conditioned by the funding available for this purpose.

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION SHEET

Program: State Programs, Objective III.5

Date: 06/2028

1. INDICATOR NAME – AVERAGE COST PER OFFICER TRAINED
2. Indicator type – Efficiency.
3. Rationale – Measures the average cost to the state for mandated in-service and specialized training.
4. Data collection procedures – LCLE staff would collect this indicator from lists of officers receiving mandated in-service and specialized training and the dollar amount reimbursed for this training.
5. Frequency and timing of (a) collection, (b) reporting – Collected on an ongoing basis and reported on a state fiscal year basis.
6. Calculation methodology – Dollar amounts reimbursed divided by the number of officers receiving training.
7. Definition of unclear terms – Not applicable.
8. What aggregations or disaggregations of the indicators are needed? – By state fiscal year.
9. Who is responsible for data collection and quality? – LCLE POST staff.
10. Limitations of the indicators – Limited by the number of officers requesting and receiving mandated in-service and specialized training, and funds available.

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION SHEET

Program: State Program, Objective III.6

Date: 06/2028

1. INDICATOR NAME – AMOUNT OF FUNDS AVAILABLE
2. Indicator type – Input.
3. Rationale – Measures the resources available for instructor development and certification.
4. Data collection procedures – Data is available on the POST Management Information System located at the LCLE.
5. Frequency and timing of (a) collection, (b) reporting – Data is collected on an annual basis by State Fiscal Year when allocations of POST funds are made. Indicator is reported annually at the end of the state fiscal year.
6. Calculation methodology – Not applicable.
7. Definitions of any unclear terms – Not applicable.
8. What aggregations or disaggregations of the indicator are needed? – By state fiscal year.
9. Who is responsible for data collection and quality? – LCLE POST staff is responsible for the collection of data and assuring its accuracy.
10. Limitations of the indicator – Funding is based on collections from the courts under Act 440 and such appropriations as the legislature may make for this purpose.

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION SHEET

Program: State Program, Objective III.6

Date: 06/2028

1. INDICATOR NAME – NUMBER OF POST MASTER INSTRUCTORS AVAILABLE
2. Indicator type – Input.
3. Rationale – All instructor development courses are conducted by POST Master Instructors. The number of such instructors available, therefore, is a major factor in the number of instructor development courses which can be offered.
4. Data collection procedures – Data on availability of POST Master Instructors is maintained by the POST staff. The source of information relative to availability is the POST Master Instructor training coordinator.
5. Frequency and timing of (a) collection, (b) reporting – Data collection is ongoing during the year, with the indicator report to be made annually at the end of the state fiscal year.
6. Calculation methodology – Simple count.
7. Definitions of any unclear terms – A POST Master Instructor is an individual who has been certified by POST in the area of instructor development.
8. What aggregations or disaggregations of the indicator are needed? – By state fiscal year.
9. Who is responsible for data collection and quality? – POST staff is responsible for both data collection, and ensuring that the data is timely, complete and accurate.
10. Limitations of the indicator – The availability of POST Master Instructors is not under the control of LCLE.

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION SHEET

Program: State Program, Objective III.6

Date: 06/2028

1. INDICATOR NAME – NUMBER OF INSTRUCTOR DEVELOPMENT COURSES OFFERED
2. Indicator type – Output.
3. Rationale – The number of instructor development courses offered is the indicator which satisfied the terms of Objective III.6. It is the primary output of the project in this area.
4. Data collection procedures – Original documents are created by the POST staff. All records, files and additional information pertaining to this indicator are contained in the POST files at the LCLE.
5. Frequency and timing of (a) collection, (b) reporting – Data collection is ongoing as instructor development courses are offered during a given year. Reporting will be annually, at the end of the state fiscal year.
6. Calculation methodology – Simple count.
7. Definitions of any unclear terms – Not applicable.
8. What aggregations or disaggregations of the indicator are needed? – By state fiscal year.
9. Who is responsible for data collection and quality? – POST staff is responsible for the source documents, data collection, quality assurance and reporting.
10. Limitations of the indicator – The number of instructor development courses offered is determined by the funding available for this purpose and the availability of POST Master Instructors.

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION SHEET

Program: State Program, Objective III.6

Date: 06/2028

1. INDICATOR NAME – NUMBER OF INSTRUCTOR DEVELOPMENT COURSE PARTICIPANTS
2. Indicator type – Output.
3. Rationale – The number of instructor development course participants is a companion indicator to the number of courses offered. This indicator measures the actual number of instructors participating in the instructor development program.
4. Data collection procedures – Source documents are prepared by the POST staff. All records and information relating to this indicator are contained in the POST files at the LCLE.
5. Frequency and timing of (a) collection, (b) reporting – Data collection is ongoing as instructor development classes are offered during a given year. Reporting shall be annually at the end of the state fiscal year.
6. Calculation methodology – Simple addition.
7. Definitions of any unclear terms – Not applicable.
8. What aggregations or disaggregations of the indicator are needed? – By state fiscal year.
9. Who is responsible for data collection and quality? – POST staff is responsible for source documents, record maintenance, data collection, quality assurance, and reporting.
10. Limitations of the indicator – The number of participants is determined by the funding available for this purpose, the availability of POST Master Instructors, and the number of courses conducted.

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION SHEET

Program: State Program, Objective III.6

Date: 06/2028

1. INDICATOR NAME – NUMBER OF INSTRUCTOR DEVELOPMENT CERTIFICATIONS AWARDED ANNUALLY
2. Indicator type – Outcome.
3. Rationale – Where the number of participants and number of courses are the primary output indicators, the outcome sought is an adequate number of certified instructors. This indicator directly measures the number of persons certified as instructors each year.
4. Data collection procedures – Source documents include a copy of the certificate issued to each certified instructor. These records are maintained by the POST staff in the certified instructor files in the POST offices of the LCLE.
5. Frequency and timing of (a) collection, (b) reporting – Data collection is ongoing as certifications are issued to instructors successfully completing all requirements as established by POST. Reporting is on an annual basis, at the end of a state fiscal year.
6. Calculation methodology – Simple count.
7. Definitions of any unclear terms – Not applicable.
8. What aggregations or disaggregations of the indicator are needed? – By state fiscal year.
9. Who is responsible for data collection and quality? – POST staff is responsible for the maintenance, quality assurance, collection and reporting of data for this indicator.
10. Limitations of the indicator – The number of instructors certified during any reporting period is dependent upon the number of courses offered and the ability and effort put forth by the individual student.

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION SHEET

Program: State Program, Objective III.6

Date: 06/2028

1. INDICATOR NAME – PERCENTAGE OF COURSE PARTICIPANTS SUCCESSFULLY COMPLETING THE PROGRAM
2. Indicator type – Efficiency.
3. Rationale – This indicator measures how successful the program is in increasing the pool of certified POST instructors.
4. Data collection procedures – Source documents are the course participant lists and the certificates issued to instructors upon completion of all requirements as established by the POST Council.
5. Frequency and timing of (a) collection, (b) reporting – Data collection is ongoing as courses are offered and certification conducted. Reporting is annually at the end of the state fiscal year.
6. Calculation methodology – Number of persons certified as instructors during a given fiscal year is divided by the number of participants in instructor development courses offered during the fiscal year, and the result is multiplied by 100.
7. Definitions of any unclear terms – Not applicable.
8. What aggregations or disaggregations of the indicator are needed? – By state fiscal year.
9. Who is responsible for data collection and quality? – POST staff is responsible for all source documents, data collection, quality assurance, and calculations and reporting.
10. Limitations of the indicator – The number of participants is heavily conditioned by the funding available and availability of POST Master Instructors. The number of persons attaining certification is dependent upon the abilities and desire of the individual student.

B. STATE PROGRAMS, OBJECTIVE III.7

- 1. Provide a brief statement identifying the principal clients and users of each program and the specific service or benefit derived by such persons or organizations.**

Victims of violence and their families must deal with emotional, physical, and financial aftermath of crime. The Louisiana Crime Victims Reparations Fund helps innocent victims and their families when they have no other means of paying for the financial cost of crime.

- 2. Identify the potential external factors that are beyond the control of the entity and that could significantly affect the achievement of its goals or objectives.**

Shortfall of fines that support the CVR fund, mail delivery, budgetary reductions by appropriating authorities.

- 3. Provide a description of any program evaluation used to develop objectives and strategies.**

Prior CVR Performance/programmatic audit, input from Board members, and federal program input and requirements.

- 4. Provide an explanation of how duplication of effort shall be avoided when the operations of more than one program are directed at achieving a single goal, objective, or strategy.**

Crime victim assistance programs (VOCA) are geared to assisting front-line providers who, in turn, provide services directly to victims. The crime victim reparations program is geared to offering financial assistance directly to victims. The distinction between the two programs is that the crime victim reparations program provides financial assistance directly to victims, whereas victim assistance programs (VOCA) provide subgrants to victim service providers who assist victims.

- 5. Documentation as to the validity, reliability, and appropriateness of each performance indicator, as well as the method used to verify and validate the performance indicators as relevant measures of each program's performance.**

Please refer to the Attached Performance Indicator Matrix and Performance Indicator Documentation Sheets.

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR MATRIX

Objective	Input	Output	Outcome	Efficiency
III.7	Number of reparations claims received by LCLE	Number of reparations claims processed	Total dollar amount of compensation awarded	Average LCLE time to process a claim
		Number of crime victims compensated by the reparations program		

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION SHEET

Program: State Program, Objective III.7

Date: 06/2028

1. INDICATOR NAME – NUMBER OF REPARATIONS CLAIMS RECEIVED BY LCLE
2. Indicator type – Input.
3. Rationale – Receipt of reparations claim is the initial stage of the crime victim reparations process. The number of claims received indicates the initial demand for service at the state program level.
4. Data collection procedures – Source documents are the original claim forms by victims through the Sheriff’s crime victim reparations investigator. These documents are maintained in the files of the CVR program.
5. Frequency and timing of (a) collection, (b) reporting – Data collection is on-going, while reporting is annual at the end of the state fiscal year.
6. Calculation methodology – Simple count.
7. Definitions of any unclear terms – None.
8. What aggregations or disaggregations of the indicator are needed? – By state fiscal year.
9. Who is responsible for data collection and quality? – The CVR staff is responsible for receiving claims and maintaining the files. The quality of the information contained on the form is the responsibility of the person filing the claim and the Sheriff’s investigator.
10. Limitations of the indicator – Number of claims received is dependent upon the claimants completing the requisite forms and processing by the Sheriff’s investigator.

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION SHEET

Program: State Program, Objective III.7

Date: 06/2028

1. INDICATOR NAME – NUMBER OF REPARATION CLAIMS PROCESSED
2. Indicator type – Output.
3. Rationale – Number of reparations claims processed is indicative of the numbers of victims that the program is reaching.
4. Data collection procedures – This information is captured by the LCLE CVR Software program.
5. Frequency and timing of (a) collection, (b) reporting – Collection of data is ongoing. Reporting of this indicator is done on a federal fiscal year basis and state fiscal year basis, since program receives both state and federal funding. Data is reported in a calendar year format required by R.S. 46:1818 for the CVR Annual Report.
6. Calculation methodology – Total number of claims processed in a specific timeframe.
7. Definitions of any unclear terms – Not applicable.
8. What aggregations or disaggregations of the indicator are needed? – By state fiscal year.
9. Who is responsible for data collection and quality? – The LCLE CVR program staff.
10. Limitations of the indicator – Timeliness of victim reporting an eligible crime to law enforcement, filing with the CVR program timely, having eligible expenses, having no third-party coverage, etc.

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION SHEET

Program: State Program, Objective III.7

Date: 06/2028

1. INDICATOR NAME – NUMBER OF CRIME VICTIMS COMPENSATED BY THE REPARATIONS PROGRAM
2. Indicator type – Output.
3. Rationale – Measures the number of victims/claimants who benefit from the program.
4. Data collection procedures – Information is captured by the LCLE CVR software program.
5. Frequency and timing of (a) collection, (b) reporting – Collected on an ongoing basis. Reporting of this indicator is done on a federal fiscal year basis and state fiscal year basis, since program receives both state and federal funding. Data is reported in a calendar year format required by R.S. 46:1818 for the CVR Annual Report.
6. Calculation methodology – Total number of victims/claimants compensated by the CVR Board during a specific timeframe.
7. Definitions of any unclear terms – Not applicable.
8. What aggregations or disaggregations of the indicator are needed? – By state fiscal year.
9. Who is responsible for data collection and quality? – The LCLE CVR program staff.
10. Limitations of the indicator – Limited by the timeliness of reporting an eligible crime to law enforcement, timeliness of filing a claim with the CVR Section, having eligible expenses, having no third-party payer coverage, etc.

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION SHEET

Program: State Program, Objective III.7

Date: 06/2028

1. INDICATOR NAME – TOTAL DOLLAR AMOUNT OF COMPENSATION AWARDED
2. Indicator type – Outcome.
3. Rationale – Measures the total resources provided by the CVR program to victims in need.
4. Data collection procedures – Data is captured in the CVR software program.
5. Frequency and timing of (a) collection, (b) reporting – Data is collected monthly, following Board meetings. Indicator is reported on a quarterly basis to the Legislature; on a federal fiscal year basis for federal performance report; state fiscal year basis for budgetary input; and state calendar year for annual report as required by R.S. 46:1818.
6. Calculation methodology – Total of dollars awarded each month by the Board.
7. Definitions of any unclear terms – Not applicable.
8. What aggregations or disaggregations of the indicator are needed? – By state fiscal year.
9. Who is responsible for data collection and quality? – The LCLE CVR program staff.
10. Limitations of the indicator – Limited by the timeliness of reporting an eligible crime to law enforcement, timeliness of filing a claim with the CVR Section, having eligible expenses, having no third-party payer coverage, etc.

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION SHEET

Program: State Program, Objective III.7

Date: 06/2028

1. INDICATOR NAME – AVERAGE LCLE TIME TO PROCESS A CLAIM
2. Indicator type – Efficiency.
3. Rationale – Measures the time to process a claim.
4. Data collection procedures – Captured on the LCLE CVR Software system.
5. Frequency and timing of (a) collection, (b) reporting – Collection is ongoing; reporting is done on a federal fiscal year basis for federal reporting purposes, and state fiscal year basis for state reporting purposes.
6. Calculation methodology – Time from receipt of case by LCLE to Board decision date.
7. Definitions of any unclear terms – Not applicable.
8. What aggregations or disaggregations of the indicator are needed? – By state fiscal year.
9. Who is responsible for data collection and quality? – LCLE CVR program staff.
10. Limitations of the indicator – Number of cases entering the queue at the LCLE.

B. STATE PROGRAMS, OBJECTIVE III.8

- 1. Provide a brief statement identifying the principal clients and users of each program and the specific service or benefit derived by such persons or organizations.**

Clients and users of the Louisiana Victim Information and Notification Everyday (LA VINE) include: Victim Advocates in all judicial districts, Law Enforcement Officers in Sheriffs' Offices and Police Departments, Department of Corrections, Victim Services providers, and the general public with an interest in the court/custodial status of an offender. Services/benefits include provision of information and timely notification regarding an offender's court or custodial status change.

- 2. Identify the potential external factors that are beyond the control of the entity and that could significantly affect the achievement of its goals or objectives.**

Lack of funding on an annual basis would severely impact the ability of the program to provide service. In addition, participation in the system is voluntary on the part of the Sheriffs and Police Chiefs.

- 3. Provide a description of any program evaluation used to develop objectives and strategies.**

A contractor-supplied website is utilized to determine basic utilization and performance metrics, such as:

- How many callers registered;
- How many notifications were made;
- Average duration of call; and/or
- How many notifications were successful or unsuccessful.

- 4. Provide an explanation of how duplication of effort shall be avoided when the operations of more than one program are directed at achieving a single goal, objective, or strategy.**

There is no other program providing the same or similar service within the state, and therefore, no duplication of effort.

- 5. Documentation as to the validity, reliability, and appropriateness of each performance indicator, as well as the method used to verify and validate the performance indicators as relevant measures of each program's performance.**

Please refer to the Attached Performance Indicator Matrix and Performance Indicator Documentation Sheets.

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR MATRIX

Objective	Input	Output	Outcome	Efficiency
III.8	Funds available to administer the LA VINE system	Number of parishes participating in the LA VINE system	Number of parishes with access to the LA VINE system	Number of persons accessing the LA VINE system
		Number of statewide systems participating in the LA VINE system		
		Percentage of population covered by the LA VINE system		

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION SHEET

Program: State Program, Objective III.8

Date: 06/2028

1. INDICATOR NAME – FUNDS AVAILABLE TO ADMINISTER THE LA VINE SYSTEM
2. Indicator type – Input.
3. Rationale – Measures the resources available to administer an automated victim notification system.
4. Data collection procedures – Data is collected and maintained by the LCLE LA VINE staff utilizing through contractor-supplied statistical website.
5. Frequency and timing of (a) collection, (b) reporting – Funds are allocated annually and reported on a state fiscal year basis.
6. Calculation methodology – Not applicable.
7. Definitions of any unclear terms – Not applicable.
8. What aggregations or disaggregations of the indicator are needed? – By state fiscal year.
9. Who is responsible for data collection and quality? – LCLE LA VINE staff.
10. Limitations of the indicator – Availability of revenues.

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION SHEET

Program: State Program, Objective III.8

Date: 06/2028

1. INDICATOR NAME – NUMBER OF PARISHES PARTICIPATING IN THE LA VINE SYSTEM
2. Indicator type – Output.
3. Rationale – Measures the number of parishes participating in the system.
4. Data collection procedures – Data is collected and maintained by the LCLE LA VINE staff utilizing through contractor–supplied statistical website.
5. Frequency and timing of (a) collection, (b) reporting – Funds are allocated annually and reported on a state fiscal year basis.
6. Calculation methodology – Simple addition.
7. Definitions of any unclear terms – Not applicable.
8. What aggregations or disaggregations of the indicator are needed? – By state fiscal year.
9. Who is responsible for data collection and quality? – LCLE LA VINE staff.
10. Limitations of the indicator – Participation in the system is voluntary on the part of individual sheriffs.

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION SHEET

Program: State Program, Objective III.8

Date: 06/2028

1. INDICATOR NAME – NUMBER OF STATEWIDE SYSTEMS PARTICIPATING IN THE LA VINE SYSTEM
2. Indicator type – Output.
3. Rationale – Measures the number of statewide systems participating in the system.
4. Data collection procedures – Data is collected by the LCLE LA VINE staff utilizing a contractor-supplied statistical website.
5. Frequency and timing of (a) collection, (b) reporting – Collected on an ongoing basis and reported on a state fiscal year basis.
6. Calculation methodology – Simple addition.
7. Definitions of any unclear terms – Not applicable.
8. What aggregations or disaggregations of the indicator are needed? – By state fiscal year.
9. Who is responsible for data collection and quality? – LCLE LA VINE staff.
10. Limitations of the indicator – Participation in the system is voluntary on the part of individual agencies.

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION SHEET

Program: State Program, Objective III.8

Date: 06/2028

1. INDICATOR NAME – PERCENTAGE OF POPULATION COVERED BY THE LA VINE SYSTEM
2. Indicator type – Output.
3. Rationale – Measures the percentage of the state’s population with access to the system.
4. Data collection procedures – Data is collected by the LCLE LA VINE staff utilizing a contractor–supplied statistical website.
5. Frequency and timing of (a) collection, (b) reporting – Collected on an ongoing basis and reported on a state fiscal year basis.
6. Calculation methodology – Total population of the participating parishes divided by the total population of the state multiplied by 100.
7. Definitions of any unclear terms – Not applicable.
8. What aggregations or disaggregations of the indicator are needed? – By state fiscal year.
9. Who is responsible for data collection and quality? – LCLE LA VINE staff.
10. Limitations of the indicator: None.

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION SHEET

Program: State Program, Objective III.8

Date: 06/2028

1. INDICATOR NAME – NUMBER OF PARISHES WITH ACCESS TO THE LA VINE SYSTEM
2. Indicator type – Outcome.
3. Rationale – Measures accessibility of system.
4. Data collection procedures – Data is collected by LCLE LA VINE staff, utilizing a contractor-supplied statistical website.
5. Frequency and timing of (a) collection, (b) reporting – Data collection is on an ongoing basis, and reporting is on a state fiscal year basis.
6. Calculation methodology – Simple count.
7. Definitions of any unclear terms – Not applicable.
8. What aggregations or disaggregations of the indicator are needed? – By state fiscal year.
9. Who is responsible for data collection and quality? – LCLE LA VINE staff.
10. Limitations of the indicator – Participation in the system is voluntary on the part of the individual Parish Sheriffs.

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION SHEET

Program: State Program, Objective III.8

Date: 06/2028

1. INDICATOR NAME – NUMBER OF PERSONS ACCESSING THE LA VINE SYSTEM
2. Indicator type – Efficiency.
3. Rationale – Measures the demand for service at the state level.
4. Data collection procedures – Data is collected by the LCLE LA VINE staff utilizing a contractor-supplied statistical website.
5. Frequency and timing of (a) collection, (b) reporting – Data collection is on an ongoing basis, and reporting is on a state fiscal year basis.
6. Calculation methodology – Simple count.
7. Definitions of any unclear terms – Not applicable.
8. What aggregations or disaggregations of the indicator are needed? – By state fiscal year.
9. Who is responsible for data collection and quality? – LCLE LA VINE staff.
10. Limitations of the indicator – Number of persons accessing the system is dependent on public awareness of its availability.

B. STATE PROGRAMS, OBJECTIVE III.9

- 1. Provide a brief statement identifying the principal clients and users of each program and the specific service or benefit derived by such persons or organizations.**

Local law enforcement agencies and their respective homicide/violent crime investigators will benefit from the program by having access to proven training that will allow them to utilize consistent, high quality investigative techniques in their homicide investigations. The general population of the state will also benefit as a result of this program due to the implementation of a higher standard of homicide investigation that will be consistent throughout the state.

- 2. Identify the potential external factors that are beyond the control of the entity and that could significantly affect the achievement of its goals or objectives.**

Continued appropriation of funds. Continued cooperation of local law enforcement agencies in sending homicide/violent crime investigators to the training sessions.

- 3. Provide a description of any program evaluation used to develop objectives and strategies.**

Louisiana's #1 ranking in the United States in per capita homicide by the FBI's Uniform Crime Reporting program over the last 10+ years identified the immediate need for the Homicide Investigator training program.

- 4. Provide an explanation of how duplication of effort shall be avoided when the operations of more than one program are directed at achieving a single goal, objective, or strategy.**

The implementation of the statewide, state-funded homicide investigator training program will replace locally-funded efforts in training homicide/violent crime investigators, thereby avoiding duplication of effort, and freeing up local funding that can be used for other law enforcement activities.

- 5. Documentation as to the validity, reliability, and appropriateness of each performance indicator, as well as the method used to verify and validate the performance indicators as relevant measures of each program's performance.**

Please refer to the Attached Performance Indicator Matrix and Performance Indicator Documentation Sheets.

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR MATRIX

Objective	Input	Output	Outcome	Efficiency
III.9	Funds available for homicide / violent crime investigator training	Number of homicide / violent crime investigators trained	Number of law enforcement officers successfully completing homicide / violent crime investigator training	Number of law enforcement officers successfully completing homicide / violent crime investigator training as a percentage of the total number of enrollees
	Number of law enforcement officers enrolled in training	Percentage of population covered by their agencies		

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION SHEET

Program: State Program, Objective III.9

Date: 06/2028

1. INDICATOR NAME – FUNDS AVAILABLE FOR HOMICIDE/VIOLENT CRIME INVESTIGATOR TRAINING
2. Indicator type – Input.
3. Rationale – Measures the resources available for specialized investigator training.
4. Data collection procedures – State general fund appropriation.
5. Frequency and timing of (a) collection, (b) reporting – Annually, state fiscal year cycle.
6. Calculation methodology – Not necessary.
7. Definitions of any unclear terms – Not applicable.
8. What aggregations or disaggregations of the indicator are needed? – By state fiscal year.
9. Who is responsible for data collection and quality? – LCLE fiscal section.
10. Limitations of the indicator – Limited by the amount of appropriation.

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION SHEET

Program: State Program, Objective III.9

Date: 06/2028

1. INDICATOR NAME – NUMBER OF LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICERS ENROLLED IN TRAINING
2. Indicator type – Input.
3. Rationale – Measures the number on law enforcement officers entering the training.
4. Data collection procedures – Data is collected by LCLE program staff by registration.
5. Frequency and timing of (a) collection, (b) reporting – Data is collected on an ongoing basis during the year as trainings are held, and reported on a state fiscal year basis.
6. Calculation methodology – Simple count.
7. Definitions of any unclear terms – Not applicable.
8. What aggregations or disaggregations of the indicator are needed? – By state fiscal year.
9. Who is responsible for data collection and quality? – LCLE program staff.
10. Limitations of the indicator – Trainings are limited to 30 participants each.

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION SHEET

Program: State Program, Objective III.9

Date: 06/2028

1. INDICATOR NAME – NUMBER OF HOMICIDE / VIOLENT CRIME INVESTIGATORS TRAINED
2. Indicator type – Output.
3. Rationale – Measures the number of law enforcement officers successfully completing the training.
4. Data collection procedures – Data is collected by LCLE program staff at the beginning and the end of each training event.
5. Frequency and timing of (a) collection, (b) reporting – Data is collected at each training event, and reported on a state fiscal year basis.
6. Calculation methodology – The number of successful completions is subtracted from the number of initial enrollees.
7. Definitions of any unclear terms – Not applicable.
8. What aggregations or disaggregations of the indicator are needed? – By state fiscal year.
9. Who is responsible for data collection and quality? – LCLE program staff.
10. Limitations of the indicator – Trainings are limited to 30 participants each.

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION SHEET

Program: State Program, Objective III.9

Date: 06/2028

1. INDICATOR NAME – PERCENTAGE OF POPULATION COVERED BY THEIR AGENCIES
2. Indicator type – Output.
3. Rationale – Measures the percent of state population with trained homicide investigators available in an area.
4. Data collection procedures – Data is collected by LCLE program staff, based on participating law enforcement agencies.
5. Frequency and timing of (a) collection, (b) reporting – Data is collected on an ongoing basis and reported on a state fiscal year basis.
6. Calculation methodology – The total population of parishes with trained homicide investigators is divided by the total state population times 100.
7. Definitions of any unclear terms – Not applicable.
8. What aggregations or disaggregations of the indicator are needed? – By state fiscal year.
9. Who is responsible for data collection and quality? – LCLE program staff.
10. Limitations of the indicator – None.

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION SHEET

Program: State Program, Objective III.9

Date: 06/2028

1. INDICATOR NAME – NUMBER OF LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICERS SUCCESSFULLY COMPLETING HOMICIDE/VIOLENT CRIME INVESTIGATOR TRAINING
2. Indicator type – Outcome.
3. Rationale – Measures completion rate among enrollees.
4. Data collection procedures – Data is collected by LCLE program staff at the conclusion of training events.
5. Frequency and timing of (a) collection, (b) reporting – Data is collected on an ongoing basis and reported on a state fiscal year basis.
6. Calculation methodology – Simple count.
7. Definitions of any unclear terms – Not applicable.
8. What aggregations or disaggregations of the indicator are needed? – By state fiscal year.
9. Who is responsible for data collection and quality? – LCLE program staff.
10. Limitations of the indicator – Training events are limited to 30 participants each.

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION SHEET

Program: State Program, Objective III.9

Date: 06/2028

1. INDICATOR NAME – NUMBER OF LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICERS SUCCESSFULLY COMPLETING HOMICIDE/VIOLENT CRIME INVESTIGATOR TRAINING AS A PERCENTAGE OF THE TOTAL NUMBER OF ENROLLEES
2. Indicator type – Efficiency.
3. Rationale – Measures the number of enrollees successfully completing all aspects of homicide investigator training.
4. Data collection procedures – Data is collected by LCLE program staff at the conclusion of training events.
5. Frequency and timing of (a) collection, (b) reporting – Data collection is ongoing and reported on a state fiscal year basis.
6. Calculation methodology – The number of law enforcement officers successfully completing homicide/violent crime investigator training divided by the number of law enforcement officers initially enrolled for the training.
7. Definitions of any unclear terms – Not applicable.
8. What aggregations or disaggregations of the indicator are needed? – By state fiscal year.
9. Who is responsible for data collection and quality? – LCLE program staff.
10. Limitations of the indicator – Limited by the ability and desire of the participants, and quality of the trainers.

B. STATE PROGRAMS, OBJECTIVE III.10

- 1. Provide a brief statement identifying the principal clients and users of each program and the specific service or benefit derived by such persons or organizations.**

The general population of the state will benefit as a result of the LCLE's efficient and effective administration of state programs that continue to advance outcome goal of public safety.

- 2. Identify the potential external factors that are beyond the control of the entity and that could significantly affect the achievement of its goals or objectives.**

Continued appropriation of state general funds at current level is vital to the performance of this activity.

- 3. Provide a description of any program evaluation used to develop objectives and strategies.**

This activity is non-programmatic and the evaluation will be based on how efficient and effective the LCLE manages its state programs.

- 4. Provide an explanation of how duplication of effort shall be avoided when the operations of more than one program are directed at achieving a single goal, objective, or strategy.**

The implementation of more efficient and effective administrative policies and procedures for the LCLE state programs will ensure that duplication of effort is avoided.

- 5. Documentation as to the validity, reliability, and appropriateness of each performance indicator, as well as the method used to verify and validate the performance indicators as relevant measures of each program's performance.**

Please refer to the Attached Performance Indicator Matrix and Performance Indicator Documentation Sheets.

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR MATRIX

Objective	Input	Output	Outcome	Efficiency
III.10	Funds available for oversight administration of state statutory mandated programs	Oversight administration cost as a percent of the overall budget	Actual percent of oversight administration cost to the overall budget	How successful the agency is in meeting projected administrative efficiency and effectiveness standards

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION SHEET

Program: State Program, Objective III.10

Date: 06/2028

1. INDICATOR NAME – FUNDS AVAILABLE FOR OVERSIGHT ADMINISTRATION OF STATE STATUTORY MANDATED PROGRAMS
2. Indicator type – Input.
3. Rationale – Measures the resources available for administration of state programs.
4. Data collection procedures – State general fund appropriation.
5. Frequency and timing of (a) collection, (b) reporting – Annually, state fiscal year cycle.
6. Calculation methodology – Not necessary.
7. Definitions of any unclear terms – Not applicable.
8. What aggregations or disaggregations of the indicator are needed? – By state fiscal year.
9. Who is responsible for data collection and quality? – LCLE fiscal section.
10. Limitations of the indicator – Limited by the amount of appropriation.

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION SHEET

Program: State Program, Objective III.10

Date: 06/2028

1. INDICATOR NAME – OVERSIGHT ADMINISTRATION COST AS A PERCENT OF THE OVERALL BUDGET.
2. Indicator type – Output.
3. Rationale – Measures the agency oversight cost as a percent of the budget.
4. Data collection procedures – Data is collected by LCLE Fiscal staff at the end of each fiscal quarter and the end of each fiscal year.
5. Frequency and timing of (a) collection, (b) reporting – Data is collected at the end of each fiscal quarter and reported at the end of each a state fiscal year.
6. Calculation methodology – The percent of administration cost to the overall programmatic cost of the agency.
7. Definitions of any unclear terms – Not applicable.
8. What aggregations or disaggregations of the indicator are needed? – By state fiscal year.
9. Who is responsible for data collection and quality? – LCLE Fiscal staff.
10. Limitations of the indicator – State general fund availability.

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION SHEET

Program: State Program, Objective III.10

Date: 06/2028

1. INDICATOR NAME – ACTUAL PERCENT OF OVERSIGHT ADMINISTRATION COST TO THE OVERALL BUDGET.
2. Indicator type – Outcome.
3. Rationale – Measures the agency’s actual cost as a percent of the overall budget.
4. Data collection procedures – Data is collected by LCLE’s Fiscal staff at the end of each fiscal quarter and the end of each fiscal year.
5. Frequency and timing of (a) collection, (b) reporting – Data is collected on an ongoing basis and reported on a state fiscal year basis.
6. Calculation methodology – The percent of administration cost to the overall programmatic cost of the agency.
7. Definitions of any unclear terms – Not applicable.
8. What aggregations or disaggregations of the indicator are needed? – By state fiscal year.
9. Who is responsible for data collection and quality? – LCLE Fiscal staff.
10. Limitations of the indicator – State general fund availability.

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION SHEET

Program: State Program, Objective III.10

Date: 06/2028

1. INDICATOR NAME – HOW SUCCESSFUL THE AGENCY IS IN MEETING PROJECTED ADMINISTRATIVE EFFICIENCY AND EFFECTIVENESS STANDARDS.
2. Indicator type – Efficiency.
3. Rationale – Measures the success of the agency in relationship to efficiency.
4. Data collection procedures – Data is collected by LCLE’s Fiscal staff at the end of each fiscal quarter and the end of each fiscal year.
5. Frequency and timing of (a) collection, (b) reporting – Data collection is ongoing and reported on a state fiscal year basis.
6. Calculation methodology – The percent of administration cost to the overall programmatic cost of the agency.
7. Definitions of any unclear terms – Not applicable.
8. What aggregations or disaggregations of the indicator are needed? – By state fiscal year.
9. Who is responsible for data collection and quality? – LCLE Fiscal staff.
10. Limitations of the indicator – State general fund availability.

B. STATE PROGRAMS, OBJECTIVE III.11

- 1. Provide a brief statement identifying the principal clients and users of each program and the specific service or benefit derived by such persons or organizations.**

Truant student and their families will be the principal clients of the Centers, and will receive the most benefit from the program. Individual schools and the participating school districts will also benefit from the program.

- 2. Identify the potential external factors that are beyond the control of the entity and that could significantly affect the achievement of its goals or objectives.**

Lack of funding on an annual basis would severely impact the effectiveness of the program, and could result in some Centers shutting down thereby eliminating the much-needed services to address truancy issues in the participating school districts.

- 3. Provide a description of any program evaluation used to develop objectives and strategies.**

Each Center posts data into the TASC database where it is reviewed and analyzed as part of the evaluation process. Data will show how many truant students were served each month, and the treatment protocol for each student. The results are used to establish goals and objectives for each Center, as well as an overall strategy for the program itself.

- 4. Provide an explanation of how duplication of effort shall be avoided when the operations of more than one program are directed at achieving a single goal, objective, or strategy.**

There is no other statewide program, providing the services TASC provides to the truant students. Therefore, no duplication of effort is possible.

- 5. Documentation as to the validity, reliability, and appropriateness of each performance indicator, as well as the method used to verify and validate the performance indicators as relevant measures of each program's performance.**

Please refer to the attached Performance Matrix and Performance Indicator Documentation Sheet.

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR MATRIX

OBJECTIVE	INPUT	OUTPUT	OUTCOME	EFFICIENCY
Objective 1: III.11	Funds available for TASC program by annual state appropriation	Number of TASC program participants.	Number of truant students with less than 10 unexcused absences after referral to TASC.	Number of children accessing program
		Number of new Informal Family Service Plan Agreements (IFSPA) completed during reporting period		
		Percentage of Informal Family Service Plan Agreements (IFSPA) completed within six months	Number of new referrals that move to the next academic level	
		Percent of children in the TASC program school attendance verified within 60 days		

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION WORKSHEET

Program: State Programs, Objective III.11

Date: 06/2028

1. INDICATOR NAME – FUNDS AVAILABLE FOR TASC PROGRAM BY ANNUAL STATE APPROPRIATION
2. Indicator type – Input.
3. Rationale – Funds available for TASC program by annual state appropriation.
4. Data collection procedures – LCLE staff will monitor budget process and will determine the amount available for TASC centers upon budget finalization.
5. Frequency and timing of (a) collection, (b) reporting – Annual at final passage of budget.
6. Calculation methodology – Budget line item.
7. Definitions of any unclear terms – “IFSPA” is an acronym for Informal Family Service Plan Agreements.
8. What aggregations or disaggregations of the indicator are needed? – None.
9. Who is responsible for data collection and quality? – LCLE program staff.
10. Limitations of the indicator – Dependency on funds being budgeted to TASC program on a yearly basis.

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION WORKSHEET

Program: State Programs, Objective III.11

Date: 06/2028

1. INDICATOR NAME – NUMBER OF TASC PROGRAM PARTICIPANTS
2. Indicator type – Output.
3. Rationale – Tracking the number of TASC participants will allow for calculation of cost per participant.
4. Data collection procedures – LCLE staff will collect participant count from TASC sites to determine total number of participants for entire program.
5. Frequency and timing of (a) collection, (b) reporting – Collection and reporting will be conducted/received at the end of each month during the school semester.
6. Calculation methodology – Addition to determine number of participants, division to calculate cost per participant.
7. Definitions of any unclear terms – Not applicable.
8. What aggregations or disaggregations of the indicator are needed? – None.
9. Who is responsible for data collection and quality? – TASC site directors and LCLE staff.
10. Limitations of the indicator – None.

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION WORKSHEET

Program: State Programs, Objective III.11

Date: 06/2028

1. INDICATOR NAME – NUMBER OF NEW INFORMAL FAMILY SERVICE PLAN AGREEMENTS (IFSPA) COMPLETED DURING REPORTING PERIOD
2. Indicator type – Output.
3. Rationale – The number of new Informal Family Service Plan Agreements (IFSPAs) completed during each reporting period are an indicator of the number of family agreements entered into at each TASC site. Each IFSPA is for a six-month period of time, but can be extended an additional six months, if needed.
4. Data collection procedures – LCLE staff will collect the number of new IFSPAs completed during each reporting period from TASC sites to determine the total number of new IFSPAs for the entire program.
5. Frequency and timing of (a) collection, (b) reporting – Collection and reporting will be conducted/received at the end of each month, during the school semester.
6. Calculation methodology – Addition.
7. Definitions of any unclear terms – Not applicable.
8. What aggregations or disaggregations of the indicator are needed? – None.
9. Who is responsible for data collection and quality? – TASC site directors and LCLE staff.
10. Limitations of the indicator – None.

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION WORKSHEET

Program: State Programs, Objective III.11

Date: 06/2028

1. INDICATOR NAME – PERCENTAGE OF INFORMAL FAMILY SERVICE PLAN AGREEMENTS (IFSPA) COMPLETED WITHIN SIX MONTHS
2. Indicator type – Output.
3. Rationale – To determine the success rate of the Informal Family Service Plan Agreements (IFSPAs) entered into by each TASC site in order to determine if the services offered by the TASC site meet the needs of the families; or to determine if it is the families who are not cooperating with the TASC.
4. Data collection procedures – LCLE staff will collect the data and analyze the data for this indicator.
5. Frequency and timing of (a) collection, (b) reporting – Collection and reporting will be conducted/received at the end of each month during the school semester.
6. Calculation methodology – Total number of IFSPAs divided by the number completed in six months.
7. Definitions of any unclear terms – Not applicable.
8. What aggregations or disaggregations of the indicator are needed? – None.
9. Who is responsible for data collection and quality? – TASC site directors and LCLE staff.
10. Limitations of the indicator – None.

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION WORKSHEET

Program: State Programs, Objective III.11

Date: 06/2028

1. INDICATOR NAME – PERCENT OF CHILDREN IN THE TASC PROGRAM SCHOOL ATTENDANCE VERIFIED WITHIN 60 DAYS
2. Indicator type – Output.
3. Rationale – To determine if the services offered to the truant and their family by the TASC site is being accepted, and if it has had a positive effect on the truant student.
4. Data collection procedures – LCLE staff will collect the data from the TASC sites for this indicator.
5. Frequency and timing of (a) collection, (b) reporting – Collection and reporting will be conducted/received at the end of each month during the school semester.
6. Calculation methodology – Number of TASC participants divided by number of participants whose attendance has been verified over sixty (60) days.
7. Definitions of any unclear terms – Not applicable.
8. What aggregations or disaggregations of the indicator are needed? – None.
9. Who is responsible for data collection and quality? – TASC site directors and LCLE staff.
10. Limitations of the indicator – None.

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION WORKSHEET

Program: State Programs, Objective III.11

Date: 06/2028

1. INDICATOR NAME – NUMBER OF TRUANT STUDENTS WITH LESS THAN 10 UNEXCUSED ABSENCES AFTER REFERRAL TO TASC
2. Indicator type – Outcome.
3. Rationale – To determine if the services offered to the truant and their family by the TASC site is being accepted, and if it has had a positive effect on the truant student.
4. Data collection procedures – LCLE staff will collect the data from the TASC sites for this indicator.
5. Frequency and timing of (a) collection, (b) reporting – Collection and reporting will be conducted/received at the end of each month during the school semester.
6. Calculation methodology – Add the number of unexcused absences for each truant participating with the TASC sites on a monthly basis.
7. Definitions of any unclear terms – Not applicable.
8. What aggregations or disaggregations of the indicator are needed? – None.
9. Who is responsible for data collection and quality? – TASC site directors and LCLE staff.
10. Limitations of the indicator – None.

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION WORKSHEET

Program: State Programs, Objective III.11

Date: 06/2028

1. INDICATOR NAME – NUMBER OF NEW REFERRALS THAT MOVE TO THE NEXT ACADEMIC LEVEL
2. Indicator type – Outcome.
3. Rationale – To determine if the services offered to the truant and their family by the TASC site is being accepted, and if it has had a positive effect on the truant student.
4. Data collection procedures – LCLE staff will collect the data from the TASC sites for this indicator.
5. Frequency and timing of (a) collection, (b) reporting – Collection and reporting will be conducted/received at the end of the school year.
6. Calculation methodology – Simple addition.
7. Definitions of any unclear terms – Not applicable.
8. What aggregations or disaggregations of the indicator are needed? – None.
9. Who is responsible for data collection and quality? – TASC site directors and LCLE staff.
10. Limitations of the indicator – None.

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION WORKSHEET

Program: State Programs, Objective III.11

Date: 06/2028

1. INDICATOR NAME – NUMBER OF CHILDREN ACCESSING PROGRAM
2. Indicator type – Efficiency.
3. Rationale – To determine if TASC services are needed in the affected school district.
4. Data collection procedures – LCLE staff will collect the data from the TASC sites for this indicator.
5. Frequency and timing of (a) collection, (b) reporting – Collection and reporting will be conducted/received at the end of each month during the school semester.
6. Calculation methodology – Simple addition.
7. Definitions of any unclear terms – Not applicable.
8. What aggregations or disaggregations of the indicator are needed? – None.
9. Who is responsible for data collection and quality? – TASC site directors and LCLE staff.
10. Limitations of the indicator – None.

APPENDIX B

LCLE OBJECTIVE

STATE OUTCOME GOALS OBJECTIVE

I.1 – I.7	Public Safety goal of less crime for Louisianans of all ages and being able to live in a safe environment at work, home, and while traveling.
II.1 – II.2	Public Safety goal of less crime for Louisianans of all ages and being able to live in a safe environment at work, home, and while traveling.
II.3 – II.4	Public Safety goal of less crime for Louisianans of all ages and being able to live in a safe environment at work, home, and while traveling
III.1 – III.6	Public Safety goal of less crime for Louisianans of all ages and being able to live in a safe environment at work, home, and while traveling.
III.7	Public Safety goal of less crime for Louisianans of all ages and being able to live in a safe environment at work, home, and while traveling.
III.8	Public Safety goal of less crime for Louisianans of all ages and being able to live in a safe environment at work, home, and while traveling.
III.9	Public Safety goal of less crime for Louisianans of all ages and being able to live in a safe environment at work, home, and while traveling.
III.10	Public Safety goal of less crime for Louisianans of all ages and being able to live in a safe environment at work, home, and while traveling.
III.11	Public Safety goal of less crime for Louisianans of all ages and being able to live in a safe environment at work, home, and while traveling.

APPENDIX C

LCLE OBJECTIVE

RETENTION SCHEDULE

- I.1 – I.7 Retention Schedule – Louisiana Commission on Law Enforcement adheres to the Records Retention Schedule as approved by the Secretary of State Records Manager. Please refer to the attachment. All documents used in the development of the strategic plan and data used for the completion of quarterly performance reports as presented through the Louisiana Performance Accountability System (LaPAS) are maintained, monitored, and evaluated by the appropriate LCLE staff person.
- II.1 – II.2 Retention Schedule – Louisiana Commission on Law Enforcement adheres to the Records Retention Schedule as approved by the Secretary of State Records Manager. Please refer to the attachment. All documents used in the development of the strategic plan and data used for the completion of quarterly performance reports as presented through the Louisiana Performance Accountability System (LaPAS) are maintained, monitored, and evaluated by the appropriate LCLE staff person.
- II.3 – II.4 Retention Schedule – Louisiana Commission on Law Enforcement adheres to the Records Retention Schedule as approved by the Secretary of State Records Manager. Please refer to the attachment. All documents used in the development of the strategic plan and data used for the completion of quarterly performance reports as presented through the Louisiana Performance Accountability System (LaPAS) are maintained, monitored, and evaluated by the appropriate LCLE staff person.
- III.1 – III.6 Retention Schedule – Louisiana Commission on Law Enforcement adheres to the Records Retention Schedule as approved by the Secretary of State Records Manager. Please refer to the attachment. All documents used in the development of the strategic plan and data used for the completion of quarterly performance reports as presented through the Louisiana Performance Accountability System (LaPAS) are maintained, monitored, and evaluated by the appropriate LCLE staff person.

LCLE OBJECTIVE

RETENTION SCHEDULE

- III.7 Retention Schedule – Louisiana Commission on Law Enforcement adheres to the Records Retention Schedule as approved by the Secretary of State Records Manager. Please refer to the attachment. All documents used in the development of the strategic plan and data used for the completion of quarterly performance reports as presented through the Louisiana Performance Accountability System (LaPAS) are maintained, monitored, and evaluated by the appropriate LCLE staff person.
- III.8 Retention Schedule – Louisiana Commission on Law Enforcement adheres to the Records Retention Schedule as approved by the Secretary of State Records Manager. Please refer to the attachment. All documents used in the development of the strategic plan and data used for the completion of quarterly performance reports as presented through the Louisiana Performance Accountability System (LaPAS) are maintained, monitored, and evaluated by the appropriate LCLE staff person.
- III.9 Retention Schedule – Louisiana Commission on Law Enforcement adheres to the Records Retention Schedule as approved by the Secretary of State Records Manager. Please refer to the attachment. All documents used in the development of the strategic plan and data used for the completion of quarterly performance reports as presented through the Louisiana Performance Accountability System (LaPAS) are maintained, monitored, and evaluated by the appropriate LCLE staff person.
- III.10 Retention Schedule – Louisiana Commission on Law Enforcement adheres to the Records Retention Schedule as approved by the Secretary of State Records Manager. Please refer to the attachment. All documents used in the development of the strategic plan and data used for the completion of quarterly performance reports as presented through the Louisiana Performance Accountability System (LaPAS) are maintained, monitored, and evaluated by the appropriate LCLE staff person.

LCLE OBJECTIVE

RETENTION SCHEDULE

III.11

Retention Schedule – Louisiana Commission on Law Enforcement adheres to the Records Retention Schedule as approved by the Secretary of State Records Manager. Please refer to the attachment. All documents used in the development of the strategic plan and data used for the completion of quarterly performance reports as presented through the Louisiana Performance Accountability System (LaPAS) are maintained, monitored, and evaluated by the appropriate LCLE staff person.