

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA SUPERIOR COURT
Overview

<u>FY 2003 Enacted</u>		<u>FY 2004 Enacted</u>		<u>FY 2005 Request</u>		<u>Difference</u>	
<u>FTE</u>	<u>Obligations</u>	<u>FTE</u>	<u>Obligations</u>	<u>FTE</u>	<u>Obligations</u>	<u>FTE</u>	<u>Obligations</u>
940	81,339,000	940	83,387,000	958	88,714,000	18	5,327,000

Introduction

The Superior Court of the District of Columbia is unique among the nation’s trial courts. It accounts for among the highest number of case filings per capita in the United States (as reported by the National Center for State Courts for several years) as it serves all those residing, visiting, and conducting business in the Nation’s Capital. It receives its funding directly from the Federal government and operates in the nation’s most visible arena. With the support of 104 judicial officers, including 62 active judges, 18 senior judges, and 24 magistrate judges, the Superior Court is the court of general jurisdiction over virtually all local legal matters. Supported by 836 non-judicial FTE, the Court operates six major divisions, the Special Operations Division (including the Tax Office), the Domestic Violence Unit, and the Crime Victims Compensation Program. The major divisions are--

- **Civil Division**, which has general jurisdiction over any civil action at law or in equity brought in the District of Columbia, regardless of the amount in controversy, including Small Claims and Landlord and Tenant cases;
- **Criminal Division**, which has jurisdiction over defendants who are charged with criminal offenses under any law applicable exclusively to the District of Columbia;
- **Family Court**, which serves children and families in the District; the Division’s Marriage Bureau issues marriage licenses;
- **Probate Division**, which supervises the administration of all decedents’ estates, guardianships of minors, conservatorships and guardianships of adults, certain trusts, and assignments for the benefit of creditors;
- **Multi-Door Dispute Resolution Division**, which provides a variety of alternative dispute resolution services to assist citizens in resolving their problems without litigation; and
- **Social Services Division**, which is the juvenile probation system for the District of Columbia and provides information and recommendations to assist the Court in decision-making, court-supervised alternatives to incarceration, and support services to youth within the Court’s purview.

Caseload and case filings

During FY 2002, 142,517 new cases were filed with the Superior Court, a reduction of 1% below the FY 2001 level of 143,786. Of the total new filings, 61% were civil cases; 22% were criminal cases; 9% were family cases; 6% were domestic violence cases and the remaining 2% were probate, and tax cases. In addition to new case filings, as of September 30, 2001, there were 55,961 cases pending. In FY 2002, the Court's caseload management practices resulted in a case clearance rate of 115%. In addition, the Superior Court reduced the number of cases waiting to be resolved by 6 percent. Tables 1 and 2 provide Superior Court caseload data.

Table 1
District of Columbia Superior Court Caseload
(Calendar Years 1998-2002)

Calendar Year	New Cases	Start-of-Year Pending Cases	Total Cases*
1998	156,820	54,513	237,612
1999	144,245	48,544	224,528
2000	139,882	44,303	206,685
2001	144,188	53,674	213,862
2002	136,084	56,186	206,499

*Note: Columns do not add because total cases include reinstatements and cases at issue.

Table 2
District of Columbia Superior Court
Efficiency Measures
(Fiscal Year 2002 data)

	Dispositions	New Filings	Clearance Rate*	Pending Cases**		
				01-Oct	30-Sep	Change
Civil	88,300	86,315	102%	16,029	15,150	-6%
Criminal	40,590	32,303	126%	7,077	5,103	-28%
Domestic Violence	8,443	8,268	102%	1,175	1,004	-15%
Family	24,251	12,627	192%	24,251	23,462	9%
Probate	2,767	2,854	97%	7,166	7,317	2%
Tax	78	150	52%	263	355	34%
Total	164,429	142,517	115%	55,961	52,391	-6%

* Ratio of cases disposed to cases filed in a given year. A standard efficiency measure is 100%, meaning one case disposed for each case filed.

** Includes prior year pending cases; new filings; and reactivated, certified or transferred cases; less cases disposed.

FY 2005 Request

The D.C. Courts' mission is to protect rights and liberties, uphold and interpret the law, and resolve disputes peacefully, fairly and effectively in the Nation's Capital. To perform the mission and realize their vision of a court that is open to all, trusted by all, and provides justice for all, the Courts have identified 5 strategic issues, which comprise the centers of our strategic goals:

- **Strategic Issue 1:** Enhancing the administration of justice;
- **Strategic Issue 2:** Broadening access to justice and service to the public;
- **Strategic Issue 3:** Promoting competence, professionalism and civility;
- **Strategic Issue 4:** Improving Court facilities and technology; and
- **Strategic Issue 5:** Building trust and confidence.

The Superior Court has aligned its FY 2005 request around these five issues.

In FY 2005, the Superior Court requests \$88,714,000 and 958 FTE, an increase of \$5,327,000 (6.4%) and 18 FTE above the FY 2004 Enacted level. The request includes increases to support the following Court goals:

Strategic Issue 1: Enhancing the administration of justice -- \$1,990,000 and 13 FTEs

The Superior Court's FY 2005 request includes \$1,990,000 and 13 FTEs to address the Courts' strategic issue of enhancing the administration of justice, including \$1,000,000 to make probate real property records available in a timely manner; \$394,000 and 5 FTEs to monitor and process probate cases in a more timely manner; \$116,000 and 2 FTEs to assist victims of violent crimes; \$106,000 to update the library's collection; \$64,000 and 1 FTE to enhance customer service in Landlord and Tenant cases; \$180,000 and 2 FTEs to manage the new centralized intake center in the Family Court and to coordinate the Family Court's new Family Treatment Court; and \$53,000 and 1 FTE to enhance service to incapacitated adults.

Strategic Issue 2: Broadening access to justice and service to the public -- \$365,000 and 5 FTEs

The Superior Court's FY 2005 request includes \$365,000 and 5 FTEs to address the Courts' strategic issue of broadening access to justice and service to the public, including \$212,000 and 3 FTE to staff a Family Court Self-Help Center and \$153,000 and 2 FTEs to enhance interpreter services.

Strategic Issue 3: Promoting competence, professionalism and civility -- \$178,000

The Superior Court's FY 2005 request includes \$178,000 to address the Courts' strategic goal of promoting competence, professionalism and civility through an initiative to invest in Human Resources.

Strategic Issue 4: Improving Court facilities and technology -- \$55,000

The Superior Court's FY 2005 request includes \$55,000 to address the Courts' strategic goal of improving court facilities and technology through an investment in technology to enhance service to jurors.

**DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA SUPERIOR COURT
Budget Authority by Object Class**

	2003 Enacted	2004 Enacted	2005 Request	Difference FY 2004/2005
11 - Personnel Compensation	54,928,304	56,975,000	60,057,000	3,082,000
12 - Personnel Benefits	10,629,052	12,163,000	13,033,000	870,000
Subtotal Personnel Cost	65,557,356	69,138,000	73,090,000	3,952,000
21 - Travel, Transportation of Persons	272,000	276,000	280,000	4,000
22 - Transportation of Things	9,000	9,000	9,000	-
23 - Rent, Communications & Utilities	5,065,081	5,093,000	5,169,000	76,000
24 - Printing & Reproduction	473,037	477,000	484,000	7,000
25 - Other Services	8,543,223	6,976,000	8,086,000	1,110,000
26 - Supplies & Materials	788,296	785,000	792,000	7,000
31 - Equipment	631,007	633,000	804,000	171,000
Subtotal Non Personnel Cost	15,781,644	14,249,000	15,624,000	1,375,000
TOTAL	81,339,000	83,387,000	88,714,000	5,327,000
FTE	940	940	958	18

**DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA SUPERIOR COURT
JUDGES AND CHAMBERS STAFF**

<u>FY 2003 Enacted</u>		<u>FY 2004 Enacted</u>		<u>FY 2005 Request</u>		<u>Difference FY 2004/2005</u>	
FTE	Obligations	FTE	Obligations	FTE	Obligations	FTE	Obligations
203	17,920,198	203	20,075,000	203	20,772,000	-	697,000

The Superior Court of the District of Columbia is the court of general jurisdiction over virtually all local legal matters. The Court consists of ten divisions and offices, which provide for all local litigation functions including criminal, civil (e.g., landlord and tenant, and small claims), family (including abuse and neglect, juvenile, and domestic relations cases), probate, and tax. In FY 2002, Superior Court judges processed more than 164,000 cases. Judges of the Superior Court rotate to each division on a scheduled basis, with judges in the Family Court of the Superior Court serving renewable three or five year terms. A law clerk and a secretary support each Superior Court judge.

FY 2005 Request

In FY 2005, the Courts request \$20,772,000 for Judges and Chambers Staff, an increase of \$697,000 (3%) above the FY 2004 Enacted level. The requested increase consists entirely of built-in cost increases.

Table 1
**JUDGES AND CHAMBERS STAFF
Budget Authority by Object Class**

	2003 Enacted	2004 Enacted	2005 Request	Difference FY 2004/2005
11 - Personnel Compensation	16,309,238	17,241,000	17,839,000	598,000
12 - Personnel Benefits	1,517,960	2,741,000	2,838,000	97,000
Subtotal Personnel Cost	<i>17,827,198</i>	<i>19,982,000</i>	<i>20,677,000</i>	<i>695,000</i>
21 - Travel, Transportation of Persons				
22 - Transportation of Things				
23 - Rent, Communications & Utilities				
24 - Printing & Reproduction	5,000	5,000	5,000	-
25 - Other Services				
26 - Supplies & Materials	48,000	48,000	49,000	1,000
31 - Equipment	40,000	40,000	41,000	1,000
Subtotal Non Personnel Cost	<i>93,000</i>	<i>93,000</i>	<i>95,000</i>	<i>2,000</i>
TOTAL	<i>17,920,198</i>	<i>20,075,000</i>	<i>20,772,000</i>	<i>697,000</i>
FTE	203	203	203	-

Table 2
JUDGES AND CHAMBERS STAFF
Detail, Difference FY 2004/FY 2005

Object Class	Description of Request	Total	Cost	Difference FY 2004/FY 2005
11 - Personnel Compensation	Current Positions WIG	203	11,000	
	Current Positions COLA	203	587,000	
Subtotal				598,000
12 - Personnel Benefits	Current Positions WIG	203	3,000	
	Current Positions COLA	203	94,000	
Subtotal				97,000
21 - Travel, Transportation of Persons				
22 - Transportation of Things				
23 - Rent, Communications & Utilities				
24 - Printing & Reproduction				
25 - Other Services				
26 - Supplies & Materials				1,000
31 - Equipment				1,000
Total				697,000

**DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA SUPERIOR COURT
MAGISTRATE JUDGES**

<u>FY 2003 Enacted</u>		<u>FY 2004 Enacted</u>		<u>FY 2005 Request</u>		<u>Difference</u> <u>FY 2004/2005</u>	
FTE	Obligations	FTE	Obligations	FTE	Obligations	FTE	Obligations
46	5,315,083	46	5,263,000	46	5,441,000	-	178,000

Magistrate Judges in the Family Court and the Domestic Violence Unit of the Superior Court are responsible for the following: (1) administering oaths and affirmations and taking acknowledgements; (2) conducting hearings, making findings and entering judgments in connection with questions of child support handled by the Family Court and Domestic Violence Unit, including establishing temporary support obligations and entering default orders; (3) making findings and entering interim and final orders or judgments in other contested or uncontested proceedings in the Family Court and the Domestic Violence Unit, except for jury trials or felony trials; and (4) ordering imprisonment of up to 180 days for contempt.

Magistrate Judges serving in other areas of the Superior Court are responsible for the following: (1) administering oaths and affirmations and taking acknowledgements; (2) determining conditions of release on bond or personal recognizance, or detention pending trial of persons charged with criminal offenses; (3) conducting preliminary examinations and initial probation revocation hearings in all criminal cases to determine if there is probable cause to believe that an offense has been committed and that the accused committed it; and (4) with the consent of the parties involved, making findings and entering final orders or judgments in other contested or uncontested proceedings in the Civil and Criminal Divisions, except for civil jury trials or felony trials.

Ten judicial law clerks, seven secretaries, and one paralegal support the twenty-four Magistrate Judges and eight part-time members of the Commission on Mental Health (2 FTEs).

FY 2005 Request

In FY 2005, the Courts request \$5,441,000 for Magistrate Judges and Staff, an increase of \$178,000 (3%) above the FY 2004 Enacted level. The requested increase consists entirely of built-in cost increases.

Table 1
MAGISTRATE JUDGES AND STAFF
Budget Authority by Object Class

	2003 Enacted	2004 Enacted	2005 Request	Difference FY 2004/2005
11 - Personnel Compensation	4,471,325	4,271,000	4,416,000	145,000
12 - Personnel Benefits	827,758	976,000	1,009,000	33,000
Subtotal Personnel Cost	5,299,083	5,247,000	5,425,000	178,000
21 - Travel, Transportation of Persons				
22 - Transportation of Things				
23 - Rent, Communications & Utilities				
24 - Printing & Reproduction	2,000	2,000	2,000	-
25 - Other Services				
26 - Supplies & Materials	8,000	8,000	8,000	-
31 - Equipment	6,000	6,000	6,000	-
Subtotal Non Personnel Cost	16,000	16,000	16,000	-
TOTAL	5,315,083	5,263,000	5,441,000	178,000
FTE	46	46	46	0

Table 2
MAGISTRATE JUDGES AND STAFF
Detail, Difference FY 2004/FY 2005

Object Class	Description of Request	FTE	Cost	Difference FY 2004/FY 2005
11 - Personnel Compensation	Current Positions WIG	44	-	
	Current Positions COLA	44	145,000	
Subtotal				145,000
12 - Personnel Benefits	Current Positions WIG	44	-	
	Current Positions COLA	44	33,000	
Subtotal				33,000
21 - Travel, Transportation of Persons				
22 - Transportation of Things				
23 - Rent, Communications & Utilities				
24 - Printing & Reproduction				
25 - Other Services				
26 - Supplies & Materials				
31 - Equipment				
Total				178,000

**DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA SUPERIOR COURT
OFFICE OF THE CLERK OF THE COURT**

<u>FY 2003 Enacted</u>		<u>FY 2004 Enacted</u>		<u>FY 2005 Request</u>		<u>Difference FY 2004/2005</u>	
FTE	Obligations	FTE	Obligations	FTE	Obligations	FTE	Obligations
5	490,000	5	526,000	5	548,000	-	22,000

The Clerk of the Court manages the day-to-day operations of the Superior Court. The Clerk provides policy guidance, administrative direction, and supervision for ten divisions and offices within Superior Court, reviews and issues final decisions in employee disciplinary actions and grievances, approves division requests for staff, equipment and other resources, plans and monitors the implementation of court improvement projects, and develops the Superior Court’s annual budget. Court divisions and offices under the administrative authority of the Clerk of the Court include the Family Court; Civil Division; Criminal Division; Probate Division; Multi-Door Dispute Resolution Division; Social Services Division; Special Operations Division (including the Jurors’ Office, Appeals Coordinator’s Office, Tax Office, Superior Court Library, Juror and Witness Child Care Center); Domestic Violence Unit; and Crime Victims Compensation Program. The Clerk of the Court also administers the Micrographics Office, which converts paper records into microfilm images.

The Office of the Clerk of the Court is staffed by five FTEs, including the Clerk of the Court, two Senior Operations Managers, and two administrative support staff.

FY 2005 Request

In FY 2005, the Courts request \$548,000 for the Office of the Clerk of the Court, an increase of \$22,000 (4%) above the FY 2004 Enacted level. The requested increase is for built-in cost increases.

Table 1
OFFICE OF THE CLERK OF THE COURT
Budget Authority by Object Class

	2003 Enacted	2004 Enacted	2005 Request	Difference FY 2004/2005
11 - Personnel Compensation	406,000	419,000	436,000	17,000
12 - Personnel Benefits	78,000	101,000	106,000	5,000
Subtotal Personnel Cost	<i>484,000</i>	<i>520,000</i>	<i>542,000</i>	<i>22,000</i>
21 - Travel, Transportation of Persons				
22 - Transportation of Things				
23 - Rent, Communications & Utilities				
24 - Printing & Reproduction				
25 - Other Services				
26 - Supplies & Materials	5,000	5,000	5,000	-
31 - Equipment	1,000	1,000	1,000	-
Subtotal Non Personnel Cost	<i>6,000</i>	<i>6,000</i>	<i>6,000</i>	-
TOTAL	490,000	526,000	548,000	22,000
FTE	5	5	5	-

Table 2
OFFICE OF THE CLERK OF THE COURT
Detail, Difference FY 2004/FY 2005

Object Class	Description of Request	FTE	Cost	Difference FY 2004/FY 2005
11 - Personnel Compensation	Current Positions WIG	5	3,000	
	Current Positions COLA	5	14,000	
Subtotal				17,000
12 - Personnel Benefits	Current Positions WIG	5	1,000	
	Current Positions COLA	5	4,000	
Subtotal				5,000
21 - Travel, Transportation of Persons				
22 - Transportation of Things				
23 - Rent, Communications & Utilities				
24 - Printing & Reproduction				
25 - Other Services				
26 - Supplies & Materials				
31 - Equipment				
Total				22,000

Table 3
OFFICE OF THE CLERK OF THE COURT
Detail of Full-Time Equivalent Employment

	2003 Enacted	2004 Enacted	2005 Request
JS-3			
JS-4			
JS-5			
JS-6			
JS-7			
JS-8	1	1	1
JS-9			
JS-10			
JS-11	1	1	1
JS-12			
JS-13			
JS-14	2	2	2
JS-15			
JS-16			
JS-17	1	1	1
Ungraded			
JS-Salary	\$490,000	\$526,000	\$548,000
Total, End-of-year (EOY)	5	5	5
Total Full-Time Equivalent (FTE)	5	5	5

**DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA SUPERIOR COURT
CIVIL DIVISION**

<u>FY 2003 Enacted</u>		<u>FY 2004 Enacted</u>		<u>FY 2005 Request</u>		<u>Difference FY 2004/2005</u>	
FTE	Obligations	FTE	Obligations	FTE	Obligations	FTE	Obligations
100	5,351,000	103	5,774,000	104	6,043,000	1	269,000

The Civil Division has jurisdiction over any civil action at law or in equity (excluding family matters) brought in the District of Columbia except where jurisdiction is exclusively vested in the Federal court. The Division is comprised of four branches, described below. The Division’s mission is to deliver quality services to all users of the civil case processing system thereby increasing the public's trust and confidence in the Court. Additionally, the Division supports the decision-making role of the judiciary to facilitate issuance of timely dispositions in civil cases and to continually move toward the goals outlined in the Court's strategic plan.

Organizational Background

The Division is comprised of a Director’s Office that has 3 FTEs and four branches.

1. The Civil Actions Branch receives and processes all new civil cases filed in the District of Columbia where the amount in controversy exceeds \$5,000, including cases requesting equitable relief. Responsibilities also include providing procedural information to the public, accurately maintaining the official court record and the storage of all civil cases, physically and electronically. This branch has 30 FTEs.
2. The Civil Assignment Branch monitors compliance with time limits imposed by the civil delay reduction mandates; processes all types of post-judgment executions; schedules events in civil actions cases, including landlord & tenant and small claims jury cases; issues notices and manages courtroom staffing and operations. This branch has 32 FTEs.
3. The Landlord and Tenant Branch processes all actions for the possession of rental property and violations of lease agreements filed by landlords. This branch has 17 FTEs.
4. The Small Claims and Conciliation Branch oversees the processing, scheduling and adjudication of cases where the amount in controversy is \$5,000 or less. This branch has 18 FTEs.

Divisional Objectives

- To ensure prompt and efficient processing of all cases filed within its jurisdictional authority and to accurately record all information related to case filings;
- To allow easy access to data related to civil cases in a prompt and accurate manner;
- To provide quality customer service in a prompt, professional and courteous manner;
- To maintain vital links to the community, local government agencies, and the Bar to address issues of concern to these entities;

- To provide ongoing and continuous evaluation of all work units and processes to ensure maximum efficiency in civil case processing;
- To ensure a capable, ethical and productive staff through implementation of a systematic program of human resources management and skills development.

Workload Restructuring

During FY 2002, the Division refined several customer service initiatives in the Civil Actions Branch established in FY 2001 by re-engineering position functions. In FY 2003 the Division has established a more comprehensive staff training plan, participated in the design of the Integrated Justice Information System (IJIS), and planned for the relocation of the Landlord and Tenant and Small Claims branches. A public-oriented video information system for the Landlord and Tenant and Small Claims branches is in production. In FY 2004, the Division will build on public outreach efforts by providing brochures, forms, and the Civil Actions Handbook in both English and Spanish in the Civil Actions, Small Claims and Landlord and Tenant Branches. The Division is also completing the Landlord and Tenant Handbook, which will be translated into Spanish.

Workload Data

As shown in Table 1, below, the Civil Division disposed of over 88,000 cases in fiscal year 2002, including more than 8,800 civil actions; 56,000 landlord and tenant cases; and 22,000 small claims cases.

The Division has established time standards and goals for processing cases and reducing the length of time between filing and final disposition. For example: a performance goal of the resolution of 90% of all civil cases in less than 18 months. The Civil Division's caseload and efficiency measures are reflected in Table 2.

Table 1
CIVIL DIVISION
Caseload and Efficiency Measures
(Fiscal Year 2002 Data)

	<u>Dispositions</u>	<u>New Filings</u>	<u>Clearance Rate*</u>	<u>Pending Cases**</u>		
				<u>1-Oct</u>	<u>30-Sep</u>	<u>Change</u>
Civil Actions: Civil I	94	65	145%	568	600	6%
Civil Actions: Civil II	8,727	8,387	104%	7,904	8,223	4%
Unassigned Civil Actions	1,162	1,315	88%	195	357	83%
Landlord & Tenant	56,229	55,343	102%	4,901	4,355	-11%
Small Claims	<u>22,088</u>	<u>21,205</u>	104%	<u>2,461</u>	<u>1,615</u>	-34%
Total	88,300	86,315	102%	16,029	15,150	-6%

* Ratio of cases disposed to cases filed in a given year. A standard efficiency measure is 100%, meaning one case disposed for each case filed.

** Includes prior year pending cases; new filings; and reactivated, certified, or transferred cases; less cases disposed.

Table 2
CIVIL DIVISION
Caseload and Efficiency Measures
(Fiscal Year 2002 Data)

Type of Indicator	Performance Indicator	Data Source	Actual FY 2001	Actual FY 2002	Projection FY 2003	Projection FY 2004
Input	Number of cases filed	Court reports	84,353	86,315	88,128	89,979
Output	Number of cases disposed	Civil Case Processing System	86,356	88,300	91,000	93,000
Outcome	Cases disposed in < 18 months	Court's Monthly Statistical Report	77%	76%	71%	78%

FY 2005 Request

In FY 2005, the Courts request \$6,043,000 for the Civil Division, an increase of \$269,000 or 5% above the FY 2004 Enacted level. The requested increase consists of \$64,000 for 1 FTE to enhance customer service in the Landlord and Tenant Branch and \$205,000 for built-in increases.

**FTE Request: Enhancing Customer Service in Landlord & Tenant Branch
L & T Law Clerk, JS-11, \$64,000**

Problem Statement. The Superior Court's Civil Division processes those cases which most directly impact the broadest number of District citizens, namely landlord and tenant matters. In 2002, nearly 50,000 landlord and tenant cases were filed, representing the Court's single largest caseload. Landlord and tenant matters typically involve lower income litigants unable to keep

up with rent payments or unwilling to pay rent for substandard living conditions. The D.C. Courts’ Standing Committee on Fairness and Access has taken a special interest in ensuring that these matters are handled in the most fair and equitable manner, and that litigants understand the proceedings which often pit residents against attorneys for landlords.

The Landlord and Tenant Branch has redesigned work processes to enhance the administration of justice and broaden public access to services. Notwithstanding recent reengineering efforts and the redesign of work processes, the volume of the work in this branch necessitates additional resources to assist judges in effectively managing the caseload and providing high quality service to litigants. The Court requests funding for a Landlord and Tenant (L&T) Law Clerk. The L&T Law Clerk will provide judges with relevant case information, oversee the preparation of calendars, draft judgments and orders, and ensure continuity of case processing.

Relationship to Court Mission and Goals. The requested position will support the Courts’ goal of enhancing the administration of justice by ensuring informed judicial decision-making. The requested position would provide knowledgeable and skilled staff to review pleadings and to prepare pleadings at the direction of the Landlord and Tenant Court judge.

Relationship to Divisional Objectives. The requested position would impact divisional objectives by increasing the Landlord and Tenant Branch's capacity to process cases, enter judgments, set up payment schedules for tenants, order landlords to complete necessary repairs and, when necessary, order evictions at an expedited rate.

Proposed Solution. The proposed solution is to increase the Landlord and Tenant Branch staff by one FTE.

Methodology. The grade level and salary for the requested FTE were classified pursuant to the D.C. Courts’ personnel policies.

Expenditure Plan. The position would be recruited and hired pursuant to the D.C. Courts’ personnel policies.

Table 2
CIVIL DIVISION
New Positions Requested

Positions	Grade	Number	Salary	Benefits	Total Personnel Cost
Law Clerk	JS-11	1	52,000	12,000	64,000

Table 3
CIVIL DIVISION
Budget Authority by Object Class

	2003 Enacted	2004 Enacted	2005 Request	Difference FY 2004/2005
11 - Personnel Compensation	4,343,000	4,611,000	4,828,000	217,000
12 - Personnel Benefits	952,000	1,107,000	1,159,000	52,000
Subtotal Personnel Cost	<i>5,295,000</i>	<i>5,718,000</i>	<i>5,987,000</i>	<i>269,000</i>
21 - Travel, Transportation of Persons				0
22 - Transportation of Things				0
23 - Rent, Communications & Utilities				0
24 - Printing & Reproduction	17,000	17,000	17,000	0
25 - Other Services			0	0
26 - Supplies & Materials	19,000	19,000	19,000	0
31 - Equipment	20,000	20,000	20,000	0
Subtotal Non Personnel Cost	<i>56,000</i>	<i>56,000</i>	<i>56,000</i>	<i>0</i>
TOTAL	<i>5,351,000</i>	<i>5,774,000</i>	<i>6,043,000</i>	<i>269,000</i>
FTE	100	103	104	1

Table 4
CIVIL DIVISION
Detail, Difference FY 2004/FY 2005

Object Class	Description of Request	FTE	Cost	Difference FY 2003/FY 2004
11 - Personnel Compensation	Law Clerk	1	52,000	
	Current Positions WIGS		9,000	
	Current Positions COLA		157,000	
Subtotal				218,000
12 - Personnel Benefits	Law Clerk	1	12,000	
	Current Positions WIGS		2,000	
	Current Positions COLA		37,000	
Subtotal				51,000
21 - Travel, Transportation of Persons				
22 - Transportation of Things				
23 - Rent, Communications & Utilities				
24 - Printing & Reproduction				
25 - Other Services				
26 - Supplies & Materials				
31 - Equipment				
Total				269,000

Table 5
CIVIL DIVISION
Detail of Full-Time Equivalent Employment

	2003 Enacted	2004 Enacted	2005 Request
JS-3			
JS-4	11	11	11
JS-5	1	1	1
JS-6	19	19	19
JS-7	21	23	24
JS-8	8	8	8
JS-9	21	22	21
JS-10	5	5	6
JS-11	3	3	4
JS-12	5	5	4
JS-13	4	4	4
JS-14	1	1	1
JS-15	1	1	1
JS-16			
JS-17			
Ungraded			
JS-Salary	\$4,343,000	\$4,611,000	\$4,828,000
Total, End-of-year (EOY)	100	103	104
Total Full-Time Equivalent (FTE)	100	103	104

**DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA SUPERIOR COURT
CRIME VICTIMS COMPENSATION PROGRAM**

<u>FY 2003 Enacted</u>		<u>FY 2004 Enacted</u>		<u>FY 2005 Request</u>		<u>Difference FY 2004/2005</u>	
FTE	Obligations	FTE	Obligations	FTE	Obligations	FTE	Obligations
7	558,000	7	608,000	9	746,000	2	138,000

The mission of the Crime Victims Compensation Program is to provide assistance to victims and their families with the financial burden of violent crime. The program provides expedient assistance, in a fair and consistent manner with sensitivity to the dignity of the victim. The program assists innocent victims of violent crime, as well as the survivors of homicide victims and dependent family members, with crime-related expenses including medical, counseling and funeral bills; lost wages and support; the cost of temporary emergency housing and moving expenses for the health and safety of the victim; replacement of clothing held as evidence; and costs associated with cleaning a crime scene. Applications are filed, investigated, and adjudicated by Compensation Program staff. Through the services provided by Victim Advocates, crime victims also are provided with assistance in filing applications, locating other victim service programs, support groups, mental health counseling, and many of the other quality of life issues that arise after victimization.

Organizational Background

The D.C. Superior Court assumed administrative responsibility for the Crime Victims Compensation Program in December 1996. During fiscal year 2003, the Compensation Program was staffed by a Director, Program Accountant, Secretary, two Legal Claims Examiners, and two Victim Advocates. There are a total of seven employees paid for from the D.C. Courts' budget.

Division Objectives

The objectives of the Crime Victims Compensation Program are as follows:

- To provide victims of violent crime with financial assistance to pay for crime-related expenses
- To increase the number of victims filing for compensation by at least 5% annually
- To pay claims for assistance within 6 weeks of the date of application

Relationship between Base Budget and Courtwide Strategic Goals

- Enhancing the administration of justice. For victims, the Crime Victims Compensation Program serves as a very tangible form of justice. Most victims of violent crime suffer some unexpected financial consequence as a result of the incident, such as out-of-pocket medical expenses, lost wages, funeral expenses, mental health counseling, etc. In providing prompt processing of claims, victims are relieved of some of the collateral burdens, such as the damage to their credit history for non-payment of bills, or loss of real and personal property.

The base budget permits the Crime Victims Compensation Program to perform community outreach, as mandated by the Official Code of the District of Columbia §4-503(c)(6), the result of which is to serve a greater number of victims. The base budget further finances knowledgeable and skilled staff to review claims fairly and to pay them in a timely fashion.

- Broadening access to justice and service to the public. The Crime Victims Compensation Program broadens access to justice and service to the public by providing services that help to ensure the safety of the victim. Currently, the Crime Victims Compensation Program provides the cost of temporary emergency shelter to victims to prevent further harm. The Crime Victims Compensation Program provides the cost of mental health counseling to address the anger attendant to victimization that can often lead to reprisal and further violence in the community.
- Building trust and confidence. The Crime Victims Compensation Program provides a tremendous support system to victims of violent crime. In addition to financial assistance for crime-related expenses, the services of the Victim Advocates in providing information and referral can lead to greater trust and confidence in the overall criminal justice system, thus increasing collaboration with law enforcement, (which is a requirement for eligibility) and facilitating the successful prosecution of crime through witness cooperation.

Table 1
CRIME VICTIMS COMPENSATION PROGRAM
Performance Measurement Table

Type of Indicator	Performance Indicator	Data Source	Actual FY 2002	Estimated FY 2003	Projection FY 2004 ¹	Projection FY 2005 ²
Input	# Of new claims filed	Case Management Software	1,885	2,230	2,631	3,105
Output	# Of claims processed	Case Management Software	1,702	2,008	2,369	2,795
Output	# Of payments ³	Case Management Software	4,341	5,122	6,043	7,130
Outcome	Dollar amount of payments	Case Management Software	\$4,557,104	\$5,377,383	\$6,345,312	\$7,487,468
Outcome	Avg. claim processing time ⁴	Case Management Software	11 weeks	13 weeks	15 weeks	18 weeks

¹ All projections for 2004 based upon increases from FY 2002 to 2003 (18%).

² All projections for FY 2005 are based upon an 18% increase.

³ Includes supplemental payments made on previously approved claims.

⁴ Projections based on current staffing levels (7FTE's)

Table 2
CRIME VICTIMS COMPENSATION PROGRAM
Caseload Overview

	FY2002	FY 2003 Estimated	% Change
New Cases filed	1,885	2,230	18%
Determinations Made	1,702	2,008	18%
Percentage of Cases Pending at end of Fiscal Year	10%	10%	-0%

Division Restructuring or Work Process Redesign

Booz-Allen-Hamilton Report on Division Activities

The major activities of the Crime Victims Compensation Program are case processing, record management, outreach, and administrative functions. The activities associated with case processing account for almost all functions of the office and affect every position. The major tasks associated with case processing are victim interview, input in the case management software, verification, and investigation of the claim, recommendation, review, and approval. This process is somewhat shortened for supplemental claims, (i.e. all additional payments made after the initial payment) because there is no need for an additional interview or input of information in the software system, however, verification of the additional payment must still take place to ensure that it is a crime-related expense.

Reengineering Efforts

Claims processing redesign. The Crime Victims Compensation Program is developing a plan to differentiate abandoned claims from active claims and either close the cases administratively or determine that the claimant is eligible, but there are no current payments to be made in the case. The Program Director and the Program Accountant recently attended a training from the Institute for Court Management on Caseload Management to learn ways to differentiate the Program’s caseload to address claims that require additional attention to make disposition. In FY 2002, 219, or 13% of the determinations were classified as “Eligible no payment,” where an application was filed by a claimant and no bills were ever submitted for payment, or “Administrative closures,” where the application is filed, however, insufficient information is provided to make a determination regarding eligibility. These abandoned claims burden the Program with increasing numbers of claims. In both classifications, the claim may be reopened once the claimant provides additional information; however, it is no longer regarded as a pending case.

Outreach Protocols. To strengthen program outreach, the Crime Victims Compensation Program determined that resources would be best used to establish protocols with major agencies and organizations that have direct contact with victims, such as the District of Columbia’s Metropolitan Police Department (MPD), the Children’s Hospital Child and Adolescent Protection Center, the D.C. Medical Examiner’s Office, and the Chinatown Service Center.

These protocols enhance the ability of the Compensation Program to serve greater numbers of victims of violent crime and reach victims that are likely to be eligible for compensation, reducing staff time spent with victims that the Program cannot serve and the resultant denial rate. Applications as well as informational brochures are provided to victims by these organizations. In the future, the Crime Victims Compensation Program will draft additional educational materials for claimants and service providers to strengthen the referrals made by organizations.

The Impact of Technology

Claims processing efficiency. To streamline claims processing and eliminate repetitive manual tasks, the Court continues to use a customized software system, which has allowed the Crime Victims Compensation Program to attain an average processing time of approximately 6 weeks. The use of case management software enhances the efficiency of the office, however, this software system is more than six years old, and is a DOS based system. The company that developed it no longer provides technical support for users. It presents problems when upgrades are made to the LAN system. The Compensation Program plans to procure an updated, windows-based software system with the necessary technical support, utilizing the 5% of the Compensation Fund that is available for administrative expenses.

FY 2005 Request

For FY 2005, the Courts request \$746,000 for the Crime Victims Compensation Program, an increase of \$138,000 (23%) above the FY 2004 Enacted level. The requested increase consists of \$116,000 for 2 FTEs to serve crime victims and \$22,000 for built-in cost increases.

**FTE Request: Enhancing Timely Compensation of Crime Victims
(2) Legal Claims Examiners JS-10 \$116,000**

Problem Statement

- Increase in new claims filed. New claims from victims are increasing annually and these numbers are expected to continue to rise. From FY 2000 to FY 2002, the number of new claims filed increased from 1,105 to 1,885, representing a 71 percent increase. The number of new claims filed is projected to increase by 18% in FY 2003 compared to FY 2002. There are several factors that contribute to the current and projected increases, including legislative amendments that created additional categories of expenditures to be compensated from the fund and legislatively mandated outreach and notice requirements in the Victims Rights Act of 2000, which the Metropolitan Police Department is beginning to implement.

Legislative changes, implemented June 24, 2002, expand compensable costs to include food and temporary emergency shelter for all victims (in addition to domestic violence victims); moving expenses; replacement of doors, windows and other security measures; the rental of a vehicle when the victim's car is being held as evidence; and transportation costs. The statutory limit on funeral expenses was deleted and the definition of victim was expanded to include stalking and burglary victims. In addition to these legislative

amendments, the “Crime Victims Rights Act of 2000,” Official Code of the District of Columbia §§23-1901-1906 was enacted in 2001. This Act sets forth numerous rights to which a crime victim is entitled, including notice of any restitution, crime victims compensation, crime victims assistance or other relief for which the victim may be eligible. To meet this notice requirement, the Metropolitan Police Department has developed a card, which includes contact information for the Crime Victims Compensation Program, to give victims. We expect the expanded compensable costs, coupled with the notice requirement to increase the Program’s workload, both on existing claims and by increasing the number of claims filed.

- Increase in supplemental claims. The number of claims requiring supplemental payments continues to rise as well, because a claim is not completely closed until the maximum of \$25,000 has been paid. Therefore, claims remain open for payment of crime-related expenses without regard to the year the claim was filed, when claim filings increase, so do supplemental payments, and the necessary processing of those claims increases the actual workload of the staff. Based on the increasing number of new claims and supplemental payments, additional staff is needed to ensure that victims receive timely service.
- Booz-Allen - Hamilton Staffing Study. The summary results of the Booz-Allen - Hamilton Staffing Study issued in March 2002 reported that the Crime Victims Compensation Program’s current workload requires 7.85 FTEs. This summary report is meant to serve as a baseline measurement, and it is based upon annual new claim filings of 1,538. The Crime Victims Compensation Program received 1,885 new claims in FY 2002 and estimates that 2,230 new claims will be will be filed during FY 2003. This represents an increase of 45% in excess of the amount that the Booz-Allen-Hamilton Staffing Study used as a baseline. Given that work processes have been redesigned and technology leveraged, the Program seeks to increase staffing levels to ensure that crime victims receive assistance without delay.
- Increase in clerical responsibilities. The increase in claim filings and overall processing of the existing pool of “open claims” sharply increases the support functions of the secretary. There are more claims to enter into the case management system, more phone calls, more copies to make for payment requests, more jackets to file, and more mail to distribute. The Crime Victims Compensation Program currently has only one secretary. Additional clerical help is needed due to the increased workload.

Relationship to Court Mission and Goals.

- Enhancing the administration of justice: In providing prompt processing of claims, victims are relieved of some of the collateral burdens, such as the damage to their credit history for non-payment of bills, loss of real and personal property, etc. The requested positions would provide knowledgeable and skilled staff to review claims fairly, and to pay claims in a timely fashion.

- Broadening access to justice and service to the public: The Crime Victims Compensation Program broadens access to justice and service to the public by providing services that help to ensure the safety of the victim. Services such as temporary shelter to victims, where their living arrangements invite danger to their health and safety, prevents further harm to victims, medical expenses, and mental health counseling to address the anger attendant to victimization that can often lead to reprisal and further violence in the community are provided. The additional positions would ensure the delivery of these services.
- Building trust and confidence: The Crime Victims Compensation Program provides a tremendous support system to a victim of violent crime. In addition to financial assistance for crime-related expenses, Victim Advocates provide information and referral services, which can lead to greater trust and confidence in the overall criminal justice system. These services also increase cooperation with law enforcement (which is a requirement for eligibility) and may facilitate successful prosecution of crime.

Relationship to Divisional Objectives. The requested positions would impact divisional objectives by increasing the Crime Victims Compensation Program’s capacity to process claims and make payments to victims and would permit the Program to maintain an average 6-week processing time despite the increased workload.

Proposed Solution. The proposed solution is to increase the Program staff by 2 FTEs, the positions requested.

Methodology. The grade level and salary for the requested FTEs were classified pursuant to the Courts’ personnel policies.

Expenditure Plan. The positions would be recruited and hired pursuant to the Courts’ personnel policies.

Performance Indicators. Performance of the new FTEs would be measured by the processing and payment of an estimated 2,795 claims in FY 2005 within our stated objective of an average of 6 weeks. Without the requested FTEs, we anticipate the processing time to increase to 18 weeks in FY 2005.

Table 3
CRIME VICTIMS COMPENSATION PROGRAMS
New Positions Requested

Positions	Grade	Number	Annual Salary	Benefits	Total Personnel Costs
Legal Claim Examiners	JS-10	2	93,000	23,000	116,000

Table 4
CRIME VICTIMS COMPENSATION PROGRAM
Budget Authority by Object Class

	2003 Enacted	2004 Enacted	2005 Request	Difference FY 2004/2005
11 - Personnel Compensation	452,000	477,000	586,000	109,000
12 - Personnel Benefits	89,000	114,000	141,000	27,000
Subtotal Personnel Cost	<i>541,000</i>	<i>591,000</i>	<i>727,000</i>	<i>136,000</i>
21 - Travel, Transportation of Persons				
22 - Transportation of Things				
23 - Rent, Communications & Utilities				
24 - Printing & Reproduction				
25 - Other Services	15,000	15,000	17,000	2,000
26 - Supplies & Materials	1,000	1,000	1,000	
31 - Equipment	1,000	1,000	1,000	
Subtotal Non Personnel Cost	<i>17,000</i>	<i>17,000</i>	<i>19,000</i>	<i>2,000</i>
TOTAL	558,000	608,000	746,000	138,000
FTE	7	7	9	2

Table 5
CRIME VICTIMS COMPENSATION PROGRAM
Detail, Difference FY 2004/FY 2005

Object Class	Description of Request	FTE	Cost	Difference FY 2004/FY 2005
11 - Personnel Compensation	Legal Claims Examiners	2	93,000	
	Current Positions WIG			
	Current Positions COLA		16,000	-
Subtotal				109,000
12 - Personnel Benefits	Legal Claim Examiners	2	23,000	
	Current Positions WIG			-
	Current Positions COLA		4,000	
Subtotal				27,000
21 - Travel, Transportation of Persons				
22 - Transportation of Things				
23 - Rent, Communications & Utilities				
24 - Printing & Reproduction				
25 - Other Services	Built-in			2,000
26 - Supplies & Materials				
31 - Equipment				
Total				138,000

Table 6
CRIME VICTIMS COMPENSATION PROGRAM
Detail of Full-Time Equivalent Employment

	2003 Enacted	2004 Enacted	2005 Request
JS-3			
JS-4			
JS-5			
JS-6			
JS-7			
JS-8			
JS-9	1	1	1
JS-10	2	2	4
JS-11			
JS-12	2	2	2
JS-13	1	1	1
JS-14			
JS-15	1	1	1
JS-16			
JS-17			
Ungraded			
JS Salary	452,000	477,000	586,000
Total, End-of-year (EOY)	7	7	9
Total Full-Time Equivalent (FTE)	7	7	9

**DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA SUPERIOR COURT
CRIMINAL DIVISION**

<u>FY 2003 Enacted</u>		<u>FY 2004 Enacted</u>		<u>FY 2005 Request</u>		<u>Difference</u> <u>FY 2004/2005</u>	
FTE	Obligations	FTE	Obligations	FTE	Obligations	FTE	Obligations
119	6,786,000	120	7,093,000	120	7,346,000	-	253,000

The mission of the Criminal Division is to provide quality administrative and supportive services for the Superior Court of the District of Columbia with direct courtroom support for judicial officers, uniform assignment of cases to judges, accurate daily calendars for courtroom operation, efficient case processing, and timely delivery of information regarding criminal cases to the Division’s many constituents. The Division is responsible for processing cases prosecuted by the United States Attorney and the District of Columbia Corporation Counsel involving violations of the United States Code, District of Columbia Code, and municipal and traffic regulations. The Division serves as the liaison between the Superior Court and the Department of Corrections, the Federal Bureau of Prisons, the Metropolitan Police Department, and other criminal justice agencies.

Organizational Background

The Criminal Division was created in accordance with the D.C. Code, which establishes divisions and permits further division into branches by Rule of Court. The duties of the Division include the following: analyzing and improving assignments, calendars and dockets; seeking improved services and new methods; recommending changes and improvements to rules and procedures; automating operations and services for increased and innovative uses; compiling statistical and public information; and assuming responsibilities as delegated by the Executive Officer and other Court officers.

During FY 2003, the Division implemented initiatives with its newly reorganized four branches: (1) Case Management Branch; (2) Courtroom Support Branch; (3) Special Proceedings Branch; and the (4) Quality Assurance Branch.

- The Case Management Branch, which consists of 30 FTEs, manages the effective and uniform processing of felony, misdemeanor, District and traffic cases and provides judicial officers, public law enforcement officers, and court staff with immediate access to accurate information regarding criminal cases before the Superior Court.
- The Courtroom Support Branch, which consists of 50 FTEs, is responsible for staffing all Criminal Division courtrooms with well-trained, professional courtroom clerks and for maintaining the Division’s Property Office. The Property Office receives and secures court evidence and maintains an inventory of forms used to process criminal cases in the Superior Court.

- The Special Proceedings Branch, which consists of 23 FTEs, is responsible for processing bench warrants, search warrants, arrest warrants, juror warrants, judicial summons, subpoenas, habeas corpus writs, fugitive cases, out-of-state witness cases, grand jury directives, sex offender cases, probation and parole cases, mental competency cases, expungement cases, contempt court/show cause orders; processing appeals for these cases; and maintaining closed criminal case files. This branch also responds to inquiries from the general public, judicial staff, and criminal justice agencies regarding criminal cases; enters and updates data in WALES and NCIC; microfilms criminal case files; and supervises the storage and retrieval of archived criminal cases.
- The Quality Assurance Branch, which consists of 12 FTEs, is responsible for the proper and accurate commitment or release of persons as ordered by the Superior Court; accuracy of the final disposition of cases in the court's Criminal Information System ("CIS"); and accuracy of statistical reports reflecting the prosecution of criminal cases under the jurisdiction of the Superior Court.

Division Objectives

The objectives of the Criminal Division are as follows:

- To provide the judiciary with accurate daily calendars for the efficient operation of courtrooms for the swift, fair and accessible administration of justice
- To record and process all motions, appeals and other criminal case matters within statutory and regulatory time frames to promote the swift, fair and accessible administration of justice
- To maintain the integrity of the Court by processing all warrants in accordance with federal and District requirements to enhance public safety
- To manage criminal courtrooms with courtroom clerks well-trained in the utilization of criminal case forms, the updating of cases in the CIS, and the retrieval of defendant information electronically from various criminal justice entities for swift, fair and accessible justice
- To ensure the proper and accurate commitment or release of defendants in accordance with Court orders

Workload Data

Table 1
CRIMINAL DIVISION
Caseload and Efficiency Measures
(Fiscal Year 2002 Data)

	<u>Dispositions</u>	<u>New Filings</u>	<u>Clearance Rate*</u>	<u>Pending Cases**</u>		
				<u>1-Oct</u>	<u>30-Sep</u>	<u>Change</u>
Felony Indictments***	6,550	4,846	135%	1,863	1,835	-1.50%
U.S. Misdemeanors	16,591	14,018	118%	2,399	2,182	-9.05%
D.C. Misdemeanors	3,178	2,681	119%	548	179	-67.33%
Special Proceedings	3,448	3,310	104%	128	136	6.25%
Traffic	10,823	7,448	145%	2,139	771	-63.96%
Total	40,590	32,303	126%	7,077	5,103	-27.89%

*Ratio of cases disposed to cases filed in a given year. A standard efficiency measure is 100%, meaning one case disposed for each case filed

**Includes prior year pending cases; new filings; and reactivated, certified, or transferred cases; less cases disposed.

*** In addition to indicted cases, in FY 2002, 8,108 pre-indictment felony cases were filed with the Court. In some of these cases, charges were dropped or dismissed, some were indicted and are reflected in the Felony Indictments figure, and some remain pending grand jury action.

Table 2
CRIMINAL DIVISION
Performance Measurement Table

Type of Indicator	Performance Indicator	Data Source	Actual FY 2002	Estimated FY 2003	Projection FY 2004	Projection FY 2005
Input	Number of cases filed	CIS database	32,488	26,775	25,421	24,150
Output	Number of cases disposed	CIS database	40,770	38,130	35,842	33,691
Outcome	Misdemeanor cases disposed in < 90 days	Court Report	46%	48%	50%	55%
Outcome	Felony cases disposed in < 180 days	Court Report	54%	54%	56%	56%

Relationship between base budget and court-wide strategic goals

To enhance the administration of justice the Criminal Division performs three primary functions: (1) case processing; (2) direct courtroom support; and (3) providing information to members of

the bar and public. The workload of the judicial staff assigned to the Criminal Division consists of conducting trials and other dispositions of active cases, disposition of motions in active cases and in post sentencing matters filed with the Court, probation revocations for defendants who have violated terms of probation, and dealing with other matters filed in the Division's Special Proceedings Branch. Table 2 provides data on Criminal Division case filings and dispositions, and timeliness. The Division's public information workload consists of assisting the public in filing materials with the Court and in retrieving information from Court records. In addition, the Division assists other criminal justice agencies in reviewing Court convictions and providing certified copies of Court records.

Division Restructuring or Work Process Redesign

In FY 2002, the Criminal Division continued a process redesign initiative. The initiative consists of flow-charting all major work processes and documenting all Division procedures. The purpose of this effort is to provide a framework to identify repetitive or inefficient processes that may be eliminated or re-engineered. The major focus of the re-engineering efforts has been the transformation of the case-processing plan from an "assembly line" model to a "case manager" model. This change has allowed management to use all personnel in all aspects of case processing and resulted in more efficient utilization of employees and greater accountability. In FY 2003 the reengineering initiative will continue to cross train all courtroom-based personnel in updating the Division's database directly from the courtroom, thereby increasing efficiency and providing more timely case status information.

In FY 2003 the Division continued its focus on quality control functions to ensure the accuracy of data in the Court's Criminal Information System, which regularly updates other criminal justice agencies' databases concerning defendant release status and scheduled court dates. Accurate data is essential to protecting the liberty interests of individuals in the criminal justice system. The Quality Assurance Branch will continue to coordinate Court interactions with the Department of Corrections and the Federal Bureau of Prisons, which houses all sentenced felons.

The Integrated Justice Information System (IJIS) project, a major information technology initiative to integrate the Court's 18 separate case management systems, will also enhance efficiency in the Division. A thorough review has identified several areas where improved technology can eliminate tasks that staff members now perform manually.

FY 2005 Request

In FY 2005, the Courts request \$7,346,000 for the Criminal Division, an increase of \$253,000 or 4% above the FY 2004 Enacted level. The request consists entirely built-in cost increases. In addition, \$25,000 for specialized Criminal Division training is included in the Court System Center for Education, Training, and Development budget request.

Table 3
CRIMINAL DIVISION
Budget Authority by Object Class

	2003 Enacted	2004 Enacted	2005 Request	Difference FY 2004/2005
11 - Personnel Compensation	5,457,000	5,654,000	5,857,000	203,000
12 - Personnel Benefits	1,247,000	1,357,000	1,406,000	49,000
Subtotal Personnel Cost	6,704,000	7,011,000	7,263,000	252,000
21 - Travel, Transportation of Persons				
22 - Transportation of Things				
23 - Rent, Communications & Utilities				
24 - Printing & Reproduction	40,000	40,000	41,000	1,000
25 - Other Services				
26 - Supplies & Materials	19,000	19,000	19,000	-
31 - Equipment	23,000	23,000	23,000	-
Subtotal Non Personnel Cost	82,000	82,000	83,000	1,000
TOTAL	6,786,000	7,093,000	7,346,000	253,000
FTE	119	120	120	-

Table 4
CRIMINAL DIVISION
Detail, Difference FY 2004/FY 2005

Object Class	Description of Request	FTE	Cost	Difference FY 2004/FY 2005
11 - Personnel Compensation	Current Positions WIG	120	11,000	
	Current Positions COLA	120	192,000	
Subtotal				203,000
12 - Personnel Benefits	Current Positions WIG	120	3,000	
	Current Positions COLA	120	46,000	
Subtotal				49,000
21 - Travel, Transportation of Persons				
22 - Transportation of Things				
23 - Rent, Communications & Utilities				
24 - Printing & Reproduction	Built-in			1,000
25 - Other Services				
26 - Supplies & Materials				
31 - Equipment				
Total				253,000

Table 5
CRIMINAL DIVISION
Detail of Full-Time Equivalent Employment

	2003 Enacted	2004 Enacted	2005 Request
JS-3			
JS-4	2	2	4
JS-5			
JS-6	17	13	18
JS-7	13	19	10
JS-8	23	23	20
JS-9	35	34	42
JS-10	16	17	15
JS-11		0	
JS-12	6	6	5
JS-13	4	4	4
JS-14	1	1	1
JS-15	1	1	1
JS-16			
JS-17			
Ungraded			
JS Salary	\$5,457,000	\$5,654,000	\$5,857,000
Total, End-of-year (EOY)	118	120	120
Total Full-Time Equivalent (FTE)	118	120	120

**DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA SUPERIOR COURT
DOMESTIC VIOLENCE UNIT**

<u>FY 2003 Enacted</u>		<u>FY 2004 Enacted</u>		<u>FY 2005 Request</u>		<u>Difference</u>	
<u>FTE</u>	<u>Obligations</u>	<u>FTE</u>	<u>Obligations</u>	<u>FTE</u>	<u>Obligations</u>	<u>FTE</u>	<u>Obligations</u>
25	1,410,000	25	1,561,000	25	1,617,000	-	56,000

The Superior Court’s Domestic Violence Unit is a national model program that processes civil protection orders and criminal misdemeanor, child support, custody, visitation and divorce actions in the Superior Court before one designated team of judicial officers.

Mission Statement

To provide access to judicial review and resolution of domestic violence disputes and avail both court and social services to the parties involved so that they can realize timely, fair, and individual justice and/or protection.

Organizational Background

The Domestic Violence Unit is comprised of 25 clerical staff members that support 6 judicial officers in administering justice and services to victims and perpetrators of domestic violence. The Unit processes all cases in Superior Court in which domestic violence is a significant issue before one designated team of judicial officers.

The Domestic Violence Unit was established in November 1996 as a specialized problem-solving court to serve litigants in cases in which domestic violence is the underlying issue. Some of its key features include:

- “One stop shopping” intake center for victims. Victims seeking protection, child support, visitation, custody, or criminal sanctions enter through one door and file the case(s) they need, without traveling from one agency to another;
- A three-track differentiated case processing system in which specially trained judicial officers hear cases involving each family and possess detailed knowledge of other cases and decisions concerning this same family.
- Integration of the adjudication of criminal and civil domestic violence cases so that parties obtain results for separate cases at one judicial hearing, thereby saving both court/judicial time and victim/involved parties’ time.
- Paternity and child support orders are issued during the same proceeding as the civil protection order.
- Dedicated probation/treatment/counseling is available to monitor and treat offenders.
- Continued communication holds batterers accountable for abusive behavior.

Program Objectives and Goals

- The program's main objective is to provide increased access, improved convenience, and clear, concise understanding of the court process while maintaining efficiency and quality of court services. The Unit accomplishes this objective with knowledgeable personnel to interview and respond to customer inquiries and needs, the satellite intake center in the Southeast community, and forms and service-provider information for parties via the Internet, handouts, and public service announcements.
- Provide speedy and fair justice in case processing – 80% of service packets are served without cost to the victims; 85% of petitions are adjudicated within 14 days of filing; criminal trial dates are set within 75 days of arrest. Over 95% of petitioners/respondents have their cases reviewed and negotiated by the court's attorney negotiators the same day of their hearings.
- Case disposition rates that equal or exceed filings: the clearance rate for FY 2002 is 102%, exceeding the Program's goal of 100%.
- Immediate relief for petitioners through the temporary protection order process, as 93% of new petitioners request some form of immediate relief regarding protection and services. This goal continues to be met daily.
- Hold perpetrators accountable through a deferred sentencing and judicial review process that requires them to appear in court throughout their treatment/counseling period. About 30 new cases per month are initiated by warrant or by the filing of criminal charges as a result of violating conditions of probation, counseling, or treatment.

In the fall of 2002, to improve access and community outreach, the Unit opened a satellite Intake Center, modeled after the Court's "one stop" center, at Greater Southeast Hospital. Approximately 63% of the victims seeking assistance reside in the Southeast area of the District. To better serve domestic violence victims, the Center is embracing many new technologies such as video conferencing between the satellite center and the judicial officers at the main courthouse. It is no longer necessary for a victim to physically appear before a judicial officer to obtain a temporary protection order. The victim may obtain relief at the satellite center, thereby saving travel time, transportation and parking costs and, often, child care costs.

Workload Data

In FY 2002, the Domestic Violence Unit processed 8,268 new filings and disposed of 8,443 cases. Table 1 below provides caseload data for the Domestic Violence Unit for FY 2002. Table 2 provides performance data for the Domestic Violence Unit for the Fiscal Years 2002 through 2005.

Table 1
DOMESTIC VIOLENCE UNIT
Caseload and Efficiency Measures
(Fiscal Year 2002 Data)

	<u>Dispositions</u>	<u>New Filings</u>	Clearance	Pending Cases**		
			<u>Rate*</u>	<u>02-Oct</u>	<u>30-Sep</u>	<u>Change</u>
Civil Protection Orders	4,229	4,295	98%	177	243	37%
Contempt Motions	303	299	101%	32	32	0%
U.S. Misdemeanors	3,403	3,173	107%	889	659	-26%
Paternity and Child Support	508	501	101%	77	70	9%
Total	8,443	8,268	102%	1,175	1,004	-15%

* Ratio of cases disposed to cases filed in a given year. A standard efficiency measure is 100%, meaning one case disposed for each case filed.

** Includes prior year pending cases; new filings; and reactivated, certified, or transferred cases; less cases disposed.

Table 2
DOMESTIC VIOLENCE UNIT
Performance Measurement Table

Type of Indicator	Performance Indicator	Data Source	Actual FY 2002	Estimated FY 2003	Projection FY 2004	Projection FY 2005
Output/Activity	Hearings scheduled	Yearly stats/ Random sample	24,711	25,000	25,500	25,700
Quality	% of cases reviewed and processed within 48 hours	Evaluation, survey, and random sample	89%	90%	90%	92%
End Outcome	Domestic Violence dispositions	Daily/Monthly Statistics	8,443	8,500	8,600	8,650
Productivity/ Efficiency	Case clearance rates	Yearly statistics	98%	99%	99%	99%

FY 2005 Request

The Court's FY 2005 request for the Domestic Violence Unit is \$1,617,000, an increase of \$56,000 (4%) above the 2004 Enacted level. The requested increase consists entirely of built-in cost increases.

Table 3
DOMESTIC VIOLENCE UNIT
Budget Authority by Object Class

	2003 Enacted	2004 Enacted	2005 Request	Difference FY 2004/2005
11 - Personnel Compensation	1,165,000	1,253,000	1,298,000	45,000
12 - Personnel Benefits	238,000	301,000	312,000	11,000
Subtotal Personnel Cost	<i>1,403,000</i>	<i>1,554,000</i>	<i>1,610,000</i>	<i>56,000</i>
21 - Travel, Transportation of Persons				
22 - Transportation of Things				
23 - Rent, Communications & Utilities				
24 - Printing & Reproduction				
25 - Other Services				
26 - Supplies & Materials	3,000	3,000	3,000	-
31 - Equipment	4,000	4,000	4,000	-
Subtotal Non Personnel Cost	<i>7,000</i>	<i>7,000</i>	<i>7,000</i>	<i>-</i>
TOTAL	1,410,000	1,561,000	1,617,000	56,000
FTE	25	25	25	-

Table 4
DOMESTIC VIOLENCE UNIT
Detail, Difference FY 2004/FY 2005

Object Class	Description of Request	FTE	Cost	Difference FY 2004/FY 2005
11 - Personnel Compensation	Current Position WIG	25	2,000	
	Current Position COLA	25	43,000	
Subtotal				45,000
12 - Personnel Benefits	Current Position WIG	25	-	
	Current Position COLA	25	11,000	
Subtotal				11,000
21 - Travel, Transportation of Persons				
22 - Transportation of Things				
23 - Rent, Communications & Utilities				
24 - Printing & Reproduction				
25 - Other Services				
26 - Supplies & Materials				
31 - Equipment				
Total				56,000

Table 5
DOMESTIC VIOLENCE UNIT
Detail of Full-Time Equivalent Employment

	2003 Enacted	2004 Enacted	2005 Request
JS-3			
JS-4			
JS-5			
JS-6	5	2	2
JS-7	2	5	4
JS-8	4	4	5
JS-9	8	8	8
JS-10	2	2	2
JS-11			
JS-12			
JS-13	2	3	3
JS-14	1		
JS-15	1	1	1
JS-16			
JS-17			
Ungraded			
JS salary	\$1,165,000	\$1,253,000	\$1,298,000
Total, End-of-year (EOY)	25	25	25
Total Full-Time Equivalent (FTE)	25	25	25

**DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA SUPERIOR COURT
FAMILY COURT**

<u>FY 2003 Enacted</u>		<u>FY 2004 Enacted</u>		<u>FY 2005 Request</u>		<u>Difference</u> <u>FY 2004/2005</u>	
FTE	Obligations	FTE	Obligations	FTE	Obligations	FTE	Obligations
193	14,028,179	193	15,896,000	198	16,754,000	5	858,000

Mission Statement

The mission of the Family Court is to protect and support children brought before it, strengthen families in trouble, provide permanency for children, and decide disputes involving families fairly and expeditiously, while treating all parties with dignity and respect.

Organizational Background

On January 8, 2002, the District of Columbia Family Court Act of 2001 (“the Act”) was enacted, resulting in significant reforms of what was formerly the Family Division of the Superior Court. The intent of the Act is to ensure the safety and well being of children and families in the District of Columbia. Specifically, the Act mandates the recruitment of specially trained and qualified judges to serve on the Family Court and specifies three to five year terms of service. It requires that all family cases remain assigned to judges serving on the Family Court. The Act also requires the implementation of a one judge/one family case management model to facilitate more informed decision making, improve the delivery of services to a family, avoid the risk of conflicting orders, and reduce the number of court appearances for a family.

The jurisdiction of the Family Court is unchanged from that of the former Family Division. The Family Court remains responsible for the processing and adjudication of all familial actions. Seven administrative branches or programs make up the Family Court:

- The Domestic Relations Branch processes divorce, annulment, custody, and adoption cases.
- The Paternity and Child Support Branch processes all actions seeking to establish paternity and child support, issues wage-withholding orders to employers of non-custodial parents to satisfy court-ordered support, and maintains financial accounts for the collection and disbursement of child support.
- The Juvenile and Neglect Branch is responsible for cases involving children alleged to be delinquent, neglected, abused or otherwise in need of supervision.
- The Counsel for Child Abuse and Neglect (CCAN) Office recruits, trains and assigns attorneys to provide representation for children, eligible parents, and caretakers in proceedings of child abuse and neglect.
- The Mental Health /Mental Retardation Branch is responsible for matters involving the commitment of individuals who are mentally ill or substantially retarded.

- The Marriage Bureau issues licenses and authorizations for marriages in the District of Columbia.
- The Quality Control Office supports all branches by processing prisoner transfer requests, preparing daily assignments for courtroom clerks and court aides, reviewing juvenile files post hearing, and conducting limited reviews of abuse and neglect files to facilitate compliance with the Adoptions and Safe Families Act (ASFA).

Division Objectives

The Chief Judge of the Superior Court created the Family Court Implementation Committee to oversee implementation of the Act. The committee is comprised of judicial staff, Court staff, and representatives from numerous governmental entities involved in child welfare. The objectives of the Family Court were established in collaboration with the Family Court Implementation Committee. The primary goals of the Family Court can be summarized as follows:

- Make child safety, prompt permanency, early intervention, and diversion primary considerations in decisions involving children and families through the selection and retention of well-trained judicial and non-judicial personnel;
- Increase the use of alternative dispute resolution (ADR);
- Effectively use technology for case tracking; and
- Continue close collaboration with the child welfare community and agencies.

More specifically, the objectives include--

- To cross reference 100% of new case filings in the Family Court to determine the existence of related cases involving the same family and/or household members;
- To notify judicial officers with existing cases of any related case filings within 1 day of filing;
- To coordinate the bundling of all related cases filed to the judicial officer with the existing case involving the family;
- To increase the number of abuse and neglect cases referred to mediation to 100%;

Work Process Redesign

In consultation with consultants Straub and Associates, the division undertook the Family Court Reengineering Project, designed to critically review work processes within the context of the Family Court Act. The goal of this effort was to eliminate unnecessary or non-value processes to promote a more streamlined and efficient set of processes thereby broadening access to justice and efficiency of court operations. A more efficient court furthers the Courts' strategic goal of building trust and confidence in the judicial system.

Workload Data

Table 1
FAMILY COURT
Caseload and Efficiency Measures
(Fiscal Year 2002 Data)

	Dispositions	New Filings	Clearance Rate*	Pending Cases**		
				1-Oct	30-Sep	Change
Divorce/Custody/Miscellaneous	6,432	3,988	161%	6,432	6,142	-4.51%
Adoption	764	583	131%	764	700	-8.38%
Juvenile	816	2,250	36%	816	936	14.71%
Abuse & Neglect	5,180	1,244	416%	5,180	5,019	-3.11%
Mental Health/Mental Retardation	2,460	2,006	123%	2,460	2,976	20.98%
Paternity & Child Support	8,599	2,556	336%	8,599	7,689	-10.58%
Total	24,251	12,627	192%	24,251	23,462	9.11%
*Ratio of cases disposed to cases filed in a given year. Standard efficiency measure is 100%, meaning one case disposed for each case filed.						
**Includes prior year pending cases; new filings; and reactivated, certified, or transferred cases; less cases disposed.						

FY 2005 Request

The Courts' FY 2005 request for the Family Court is \$16,754,000, an increase of \$858,000, or 5%, above the FY 2004 Enacted level. The request consists of \$212,000 for 3 FTEs to provide service to self-represented litigants; \$90,000 for 1 FTE to manage the reorganized intake center; \$90,000 for 1 FTE to coordinate the Family Treatment Court; and \$466,000 to cover built-in cost increases.

FTE Request— Family Court Self Help Center Staff (\$212,000)

Problem Statement. The Courts request a Family Law Facilitator, Assistant Facilitator, and Paralegal for the Family Court Self Help Center. Self represented or pro se parties filed an estimated 65% of the 4,086 cases filed in 2001 in the Domestic Relations Branch. In the Paternity & Support Branch, the Office of the Corporation Counsel (OCC) filed approximately 95% of the 2,578 cases filed in 2001. Approximately 75% of those not represented by the OCC were *pro se* litigants. In recognition of the substantial number of litigants who are not represented by attorneys, the Family Court in collaboration with volunteers from the D.C. Bar developed the Center to provide much needed legal assistance to this population. Volunteers of the Center began serving customers in November 2002 and the Center celebrated its open house in April 2003.

Relationship to the Courts' Vision, Mission, and Goals. Operation of the on-site Family Court Self Help Center improves service to the public by broadening access to justice for families. The confusion and frustration experienced by many self-represented parties is eliminated by providing them with relevant legal information. The existence of the Center improves service to the public by broadening access to justice for families. Providing this quality service to litigants in domestic relations and paternity and support cases increases the speed and efficiency of case processing, resulting in the enhanced administration of justice.

Relationship to Core or Priority Functions. The requested positions would support the Family Court in its ability to fairly and expeditiously resolve disputes involving families and children.

Relationship to Existing Funding. There are no existing Court resources to fund the requested positions. The Center is currently staffed part time with volunteers from members of the D.C. Bar with 2 deputy clerks from the Paternity and Support and Domestic Relations Clerks' Offices providing assistance on a rotating basis. The Bar's commitment to the Court is for a limited period and the Family Court is expected to assume responsibility for staffing the Center. Funding is requested for the positions of Family Law Facilitator, Assistant Facilitator, and Paralegal to continue to fill this crucial need in the Family Court.

Methodology. Staff funding information for the Self Help Center was obtained from information collected by the volunteer lawyers from courts in other jurisdictions providing a similar service to the public. The requested staffing and grade levels are consistent with this research based on the skills, abilities, and knowledge required of the positions.

Expenditure Plan. The new FTEs will be recruited and hired according to the Courts' personnel policies and practices.

Performance Indicators. The Court indicated in the Family Court Transition Plan that an evaluation study will be conducted of the Family Court Self Help Center. Specific performance measures will be developed in collaboration with appropriate stakeholders.

FTE Request— Chief, Centralized Intake Center, JS-13 (\$90,000)

The Problem. The Family Court Act of 2001 mandates that the Court adopt a one family, one judge, case management model to ensure that the best decisions are made for children and that judicial officers have full knowledge of all issues impacting the children's lives. To facilitate the identification and coordination of related cases, the Court is developing a Centralized Intake Center for all family case filings. Currently, Family Court cases are filed in four separate locations and administrative branches. A centralized location for filing and fee collection will enhance access to services and provide the public with the convenience of completing their transactions in one location. It also will facilitate case coordination and the implementation of one judge, one family. A center supervisor (Chief, Centralized Intake Center), is needed to manage the operations and staff of the new intake center.

Relationship to the Courts' Vision, Mission, and Goals. The development of the Centralized Intake Center will eliminate the current inconvenience to the public caused by the current

bifurcated process within the Family Court of filing cases in multiple offices and making fee payments in a separate office. The requested position is necessary to the successful operation of the Unit and furthers the Courts' goal of enhancing the administration of justice by broadening access and service to the public.

Relationship to Core or Priority Functions. The requested position would support the Family Court in its ability to fairly and expeditiously resolve disputes involving families and children.

Relationship to Existing Funding. There are no existing resources to fund this request. Adequate space must be constructed before the Centralized Intake Center can begin its operations. This construction is projected to be completed in the fall of 2004.

Methodology. The requested funding for the Chief of the Centralized Intake Center is based on the level of pay for comparable positions in the D.C. Courts.

Expenditure Plan. The new FTE will be recruited and hired according to the Courts' personnel policies and practices.

Performance Indicators. The Court indicated in its Family Court Transition Plan that an evaluation study will be conducted of the Centralized Intake Center. Specific performance measures will be developed in collaboration with the appropriate stakeholders.

FTE Request— Family Treatment Court Coordinator, JS-13 (\$90,000)

Problem Statement. A significant obstacle to securing permanent homes for abused and neglected children in the District's foster care system is parental drug use. To address this problem, the Court developed a Family Treatment Court to provide the services needed by substance abusing parents trying to regain the care and custody of their children. Started as a pilot program in May 2003, the Family Treatment Court is managed by a Coordinator currently funded by a Court Improvement Project grant from the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services. The Family Treatment Court Coordinator is responsible for handling the day-to-day program activities. The position is critical to the continued operation of the Family Treatment Court and the Court seeks funds to make this position permanent.

Relationship to the Courts' Vision, Mission, and Goals. The mission of the Family Treatment Court (FTC) is to promote safe and permanent homes for children through a collaborative effort with stakeholders to develop readily accessible services that are family focused. The position of the Family Treatment Court Coordinator is necessary for the effective management of the FTC and supports the Courts' strategic goal of enhancing the administration of justice by addressing the problem of substance abuse and its impact on cases involving abuse and neglect. The success of this program further supports the Courts' goal of building trust and confidence.

Relationship to Core or Priority Functions. The requested positions would support the Family Court in its ability to fairly and expeditiously resolve disputes involving families and children.

Relationship to Existing Funding. The Family Treatment Court Coordinator’s position is currently funded under a Court Improvement Project grant received from the Department of Health and Human Services. There is no funding available to support this program independent of the grant.

Methodology. The position description for the Family Treatment Court Coordinator was rated and classified by the Courts’ Human Resources Division. The requested funding is consistent with that rating.

Expenditure Plan. The new FTE will be recruited and hired in accordance with the Courts’ personnel policies and practices.

Performance Indicators. The Research and Development Division of the Court, in conjunction with the Family Court, is currently developing the evaluation design for the Family Treatment Court Pilot. The results of this effort will guide the performance measures for the Family Treatment Court after the pilot period.

Table 3
FAMILY COURT
New Positions Requested

Position	Grade	Number	Annual Salary	Benefits	Total Personnel Costs
Self-Help Coordinator	JS-13	1	73,000	17,000	90,000
Chief, Centralized Intake	JS-13	1	73,000	17,000	90,000
Family Treatment Court Coordinator	JS-13	1	73,000	17,000	90,000
Paralegal	JS-11	1	51,000	13,000	64,000
Paralegal	JS-10	1	47,000	11,000	58,000
TOTAL		5	317,000	75,000	392,000

Table 4
FAMILY COURT
Budget Authority by Object Class

	2003 Enacted	2004 Enacted	2005 Request	Difference FY 2004/2005
11 - Personnel Compensation	7,169,741	8,531,000	9,160,000	629,000
12 - Personnel Benefits	1,540,494	2,047,000	2,198,000	151,000
Subtotal Personnel Cost	<i>8,710,235</i>	<i>10,578,000</i>	<i>11,358,000</i>	<i>780,000</i>
21 - Travel, Transportation of Persons				
22 - Transportation of Things				
23 - Rent, Communications & Utilities	3,230,081	3,230,000	3,278,000	48,000
24 - Printing & Reproduction	11,037	11,000	11,000	
25 - Other Services	1,755,723	1,756,000	1,782,000	26,000
26 - Supplies & Materials	27,096	27,000	27,000	
31 - Equipment	294,007	294,000	298,000	4,000
Subtotal Non Personnel Cost	<i>5,317,944</i>	<i>5,318,000</i>	<i>5,396,000</i>	<i>78,000</i>
TOTAL	14,028,179	15,896,000	16,754,000	858,000
FTE	193	193	198	5

Table 5
FAMILY COURT
Detail, Difference FY 2004/FY 2005

Object Class	Description of Request	FTE	Cost	Difference FY 2004/FY 2005
11 - Personnel Compensation	Self-help Coordinator	1	73,000	
	Chief, Centralized Intake	1	73,000	
	Family Treatment Court Coordinator	1	73,000	
	Paralegal	1	51,000	
	Paralegal	1	47,000	
	Current Positions WIG	193	21,000	
	Current Positions COLA	193	291,000	
Subtotal				629,000
12 - Personnel Benefits	Self-help Coordinator	1	17,000	
	Chief, Centralized Intake	1	17,000	
	Family Treatment Court Coordinator	1	17,000	
	Paralegal	1	13,000	
	Paralegal	1	11,000	
	Current Positions WIG	193	5,000	
	Current Positions COLA	193	71,000	
Subtotal				151,000
21 - Travel, Transportation of Persons				
22 - Transportation of Things				
23 - Rent, Communications & Utilities	Built-in			48,000
24 - Printing & Reproduction				
25 - Other Services	Built-in			26,000
26 - Supplies & Materials				
31 - Equipment	Built-in			4,000
Total				858,000

Table 6
FAMILY COURT
Detail of Full-Time Equivalent Employment

	FY 2003 Enacted	FY 2004 Enacted	FY 2005 Request
JS-3			
JS-4	9	9	9
JS-5			
JS-6	41	22	22
JS-7	41	52	52
JS-8	30	32	32
JS-9	35	41	41
JS-10	8	8	9
JS-11	10	10	11
JS-12	6	6	6
JS-13	11	11	14
JS-14	1	1	1
JS-15	1	1	1
JS-16			
JS-17			
Ungraded			
JS-Salary	7,170,000	8,532,000	9,160,000
Total, End-of-year (EOY)	193	193	198
Total Full-Time Equivalent (FTE)	193	193	198

**DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA SUPERIOR COURT
MICROGRAPHICS UNIT**

<u>FY 2003 Enacted</u>		<u>FY 2004 Enacted</u>		<u>FY 2005 Request</u>		<u>Difference FY 2004/2005</u>	
FTE	Obligations	FTE	Obligations	FTE	Obligations	FTE	Obligations
6	326,200	-	-	-	-	-	-

In FY 2003 the Courts determined that the function of the Micrographics Unit, microfilming court documents for retention and storage, could more efficiently be outsourced. The savings were distributed among three Superior Court divisions to enhance operations and service to the public. FY 2003 Budget Authority is shown below.

Table 1
MICROGRAPHICS UNIT
Budget Authority by Object Class

	2003 Enacted	2004 Enacted	2005 Request	Difference FY 2004/2005
11 - Personnel Compensation	250,000	-	-	-
12 - Personnel Benefits	66,000	-	-	-
Subtotal Personnel Cost	316,000	-	-	-
21 - Travel, Transportation of Persons				
22 - Transportation of Things				
23 - Rent, Communications & Utilities				
24 - Printing & Reproduction				
25 - Other Services				
26 - Supplies & Materials	9,200	-	-	-
31 - Equipment	1,000	-	-	-
Subtotal Non Personnel Cost	10,200	-	-	-
TOTAL	326,200	-	-	-
FTE	6	-	-	-

**DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA SUPERIOR COURT
MULTI-DOOR DISPUTE RESOLUTION DIVISION**

<u>FY 2003 Enacted</u>		<u>FY 2004 Enacted</u>		<u>FY 2005 Request</u>		<u>Difference</u> <u>FY 2004/2005</u>	
FTE	Obligations	FTE	Obligations	FTE	Obligations	FTE	Obligations
21	2,162,000	21	2,180,000	21	2,249,000	-	69,000

Mission Statement

The mission of the Multi-Door Dispute Resolution Division is to facilitate the fast, efficient, and fair settlement of disputes through the use of alternative dispute resolution (ADR).

Organizational Background

The Multi-Door Dispute Resolution Division (“Multi-Door”) provides mediation and other ADR services to assist in the settlement of disputes brought to the D.C. Courts. The individual who serves as the mediator, arbitrator, evaluator, or conciliator is identified as a neutral. The neutral is responsible for facilitating agreement. Multi-Door is organized in three branches: Civil ADR; Family and Community ADR; and Program Development.

- The *Civil ADR Branch* provides binding and non-binding arbitration, mediation, or neutral case evaluation for most of the Court’s civil cases. Mediation also is provided for small claims cases, complex civil matters, and probate and tax assessment cases. Landlord-tenant mediation has been offered as a pilot program since March 2003.
- The *Family and Community ADR Branch* includes three programs that serve Family Court: Child Protection Mediation, Community Information and Referral, and Family Mediation. Child Protection Mediation addresses service plans and legal issues in child neglect cases. The Community Information and Referral Program provides resource information, agency referrals, conciliation, and mediation to individuals and families. The program addresses landlord-tenant, consumer fraud, contract, domestic relations, and personal injury issues before a case is filed. The Family Mediation Program addresses domestic relations issues of custody, support, visitation, and property distribution. The most recent addition to the Family and Community Branch is the Workplace Resolution Center, which facilitates the resolution of employee workplace disputes within the Courts.
- The *Program Development Branch* coordinates the training, evaluation, and support of 450 neutrals, who are lawyers, social workers, government employees, retirees, and others providing ADR services to the community. Multi-Door staff also provides program information, guided ADR observations, and technical assistance to international and domestic judges, lawyers, government officials, and court administrators (usually under the sponsorship of USIA or AID) who seek to establish or improve ADR programs in their own jurisdictions.

Table 1
MULTI-DOOR DISPUTE RESOLUTION DIVISION
Caseload Overview

	Cases Referred	ADR Performed	Cases Closed	Cases Settled	Settlement Rate
FY 2002	6,235	5,871	5,047	2,674	46%
FY 2003*	6,901	4,887	4,477	2,772	57%

*Projection

Division Objectives

Multi-Door’s objectives are summarized as follows:

- **Quality** – ADR services will be of the highest quality possible;
- **Responsiveness** – ADR services will be timely and responsive; and
- **Settlement** – ADR services will facilitate the settlement of cases filed at Superior Court.

These objectives are quantified through annual target goals that are measured through caseload and qualitative performance measures. The “settlement” objective is measured through quantitative caseload measures (cases referred, ADR performed, cases closed, cases settled, and settlement rate); the “responsiveness” and “quality” objectives are measured through quality performance indicators of the ADR process, outcome, and neutral performance. These quality indicators measure client satisfaction through user surveys implemented at the end of FY 2001.

Performance Data

Multi-Door activities and budget are directly aligned with the D.C. Courts’ mission and strategic issues. ADR provided through Multi-Door assures that the Courts’ mission of “*resolv[ing] disputes peacefully, fairly and effectively in the Nation’s Capital*” is a reality. The Courts’ strategic goals of enhancing the administration of justice, and broadening access to justice and service to the public are promoted by ADR programs that foster early settlement, self-determination, and genuine participation by all parties to a conflict. ADR promotes the Courts’ strategic goal of promoting competence, professionalism, and civility as lawyers and parties in mediation maximize settlement opportunities through careful and thorough analysis and decision-making, and by exercising respect and civility during the ADR session. Finally, ADR supports the Courts’ strategic goal of building trust and confidence as it broadens participation by litigants, encourages self-determination (the ability of litigants to craft their own outcomes), and addresses conflict on multiple levels. Litigants who participate in the ADR processes of Superior Court report high levels of satisfaction with the process, outcomes, and performance of the neutrals. These overall findings are reported below as new quality performance indicators of Multi-Door, and are described more fully below.

Performance of ADR requires quality service delivery – skilled staff and neutrals who understand the facts and interests of a case, and who provide a process perceived to be fair, open, unbiased, informative, and meaningful in addressing and resolving the issues comprising the conflict. Participants in ADR processes without such quality tend not to settle – settlement of cases and quality of ADR have a positive causal relationship. Therefore, Multi-Door developed three new performance indicators in calendar 2001 to measure quality of ADR:

- ADR Process – measures the quality of the process, including the ability to discuss issues openly, the fairness of the process, length of session, and any perceived coercion by party or neutral;
- ADR Outcome – measures whether a full or partial agreement was reached, fairness of outcome, level of understanding of opposing party’s concerns, impact upon communications with opposing party, and impact upon time spent pursuing the case; and
- Neutral Performance – measures the quality of the neutral’s performance, in terms of the neutral’s providing an understandable explanation of the process, an explanation of the neutral’s role, an opportunity for parties to fully explain issues; the neutral’s understanding of the issues; whether the neutral gained the parties’ trust; and any bias on the part of the neutral.

These quality performance indicators are measured through participant surveys developed in 2001 and distributed to all participants in Multi-Door ADR processes. Responses are tabulated monthly and reported with caseload statistical measures. The statistics report the percentage of respondents who report being either “satisfied” or “highly satisfied” with the overall ADR process, outcome, and neutral performance. Multi-Door staff reviews these statistical measures monthly and determines initiatives to improve overall program performance. These performance initiatives are designed to improve ADR quality in an effort to increase case settlement rates.

Multi-Door will continue to exercise best efforts to achieve its objectives of quality, responsiveness, and settlement in ADR service delivery. The Division has identified performance goals to achieve these objectives. These performance goals are—1) to achieve settlement rates of at least 50% in every ADR program; and 2) to achieve ratings of “highly satisfied” by at least 50% of respondents in each of the three quality performance indicators (ADR process, ADR outcome, and neutral performance).

Workload Data

Workload data indicators are designed to provide an in-depth understanding of ADR performance. The input indicator of cases referred measures the numbers of cases referred by the Superior Court or by the disputants. The output measure of ADR performed is a quantitative measure of the services the Division produces for the community. The quantitative outcome measure is the case settlement rate. The last three measures are both outcome and quality measures – Process Performance, Outcome Satisfaction, and Neutral Performance. Multi-Door’s reliance upon “compensated volunteer” neutrals results in a highly efficient organization, as each of the Division’s 12 programs is staffed by an average of 1.75 employees per program.

Table 2
MULTI-DOOR DISPUTE RESOLUTION DIVISION
Civil ADR Programs
Performance Measurement Table

Type of Indicator	Performance Indicator	Data Source	Actual FY 2002	Estimated FY 2003	Projection FY 2004	Projection FY 2005
Input	Cases referred	M-D & IT databases	4,208	4,765	4,850	4,950
Output	ADR performed	Multi-Door database	3,809	3,205	3,400	3,550
Outcome	Case settlement rate	Multi-Door database	41%	44%	45%	46%
Outcome/Quality	Process Performance	SPSS database	88%	89%	90%	91%
Outcome/Quality	Outcome Satisfaction	SPSS database	73%	78%	79%	80%
Outcome/Quality	Neutral Performance	SPSS database	86%	90%	91%	92%

Table 3
MULTI-DOOR DISPUTE RESOLUTION DIVISION
Family and Community Programs
Performance Measurement Table

Type of Indicator	Performance Indicator	Data Source	Actual FY 2002	Estimated FY 2003	Projection FY 2004	Projection FY 2005
Input	Cases referred	Multi-Door database	2,027	2,136	2,400	2,600
Output	ADR performed	Multi-Door database	2,062	1,682	2,100	2,300
Outcome	Case settlement rate	Multi-Door database	54%	81%	82%	83%
Outcome/Quality	Process Performance	SPSS database	85%	87%	88%	89%
Outcome/Quality	Outcome Satisfaction	SPSS database	74%	61%	64%	66%
Outcome/Quality	Neutral Performance	SPSS database	87%	66%	68%	70%

Division Restructuring or Work Process Redesign

The Courts initiated an effort to redesign work processes in FY 2000. As a first step in that initiative, the Multi-Door Division created flowcharts of existing work processes for Division

programs. In FY 2002, these flowcharts were provided to consultants from Booz –Allen-Hamilton to perform phase 1 of a staffing study, in which tasks within every significant work process were quantified. A software management tool developed by the consultant is intended to provide the Division the means to assess and simplify processes to achieve greater efficiencies. Work process improvements will allow Multi-Door to utilize existing resources more efficiently, which will have two major impacts. First, output can be increased with existing resources, resulting in more timely case dispositions. Second, more resources can be directed to enhancing the conditions, such as quality of case management, preparation by clients and counsel, understanding of processes and roles, completion of discovery, rulings on dispositive motions, and the skill and persistence of the neutral, which determine the quality of outcomes for the community. Focus on these indicia for effective ADR will result both in higher settlement rates and a higher quality in the areas of ADR process, outcomes, and neutral performance.

Multi-Door is redesigning its four major business processes – case management/scheduling, neutrals management, statistical reporting, and financial management/reporting – in conjunction with the development of the Integrated Justice Information Systems (IJIS) project. Multi-Door is a participant in the initial customization of IJIS, and therefore is redesigning these business processes so that they are consistent for all ADR programs, and integrated with the case management of the D.C. Courts. It is anticipated that such redesign will yield more timely and comprehensive access to data, resulting in more effective ADR service delivery.

Information technology plays a critical role in improving Multi-Door's efficiency and reducing costs, and will permit Multi-Door to automate many work processes to achieve greater efficiency. For example, voucher production for neutrals occurs monthly, and involves the manual printing and signature of approximately 300 vouchers each month. Full automation of this process will result in greater accuracy and efficiency in stipend voucher production, and more timely payments to Multi-Door neutrals. More significant and timely information technology upgrades and training can boost Multi-Door productivity by up to 20%.

FY 2005 Request

In FY 2005, the Courts request \$2,249,000 for the Multi-Door Dispute Resolution Division, an increase of \$69,000 or 3% above the FY 2004 Enacted level. The requested increase consists entirely of built-in increases.

Table 5
MULTI-DOOR DISPUTE RESOLUTION DIVISION
Budget Authority by Object Class

	2003 Enacted	2004 Enacted	2005 Request	Difference FY 2004/2005
11 - Personnel Compensation	1,274,000	1,284,000	1,332,000	48,000
12 - Personnel Benefits	300,000	308,000	320,000	12,000
Subtotal Personnel Cost	<i>1,574,000</i>	<i>1,592,000</i>	<i>1,652,000</i>	<i>60,000</i>
21 - Travel, Transportation of Persons				
22 - Transportation of Things				
23 - Rent, Communications & Utilities				
24 - Printing & Reproduction				
25 - Other Services	578,000	578,000	587,000	9,000
26 - Supplies & Materials	6,000	6,000	6,000	-
31 - Equipment	4,000	4,000	4,000	-
Subtotal Non Personnel Cost	<i>588,000</i>	<i>588,000</i>	<i>597,000</i>	<i>9,000</i>
TOTAL	2,162,000	2,180,000	2,249,000	69,000
FTE	21	21	21	-

Table 6
MULTI-DOOR DISPUTE RESOLUTION DIVISION
Detail, Difference FY 2004/ FY 2005

Object Class	Description of Request	FTE Total	Total Cost	Difference FY 2004/FY 2005 Total
11 - Personnel Compensation	Current Positions WIG	21	4,000	
	Current Positions COLA	21	44,000	
Subtotal				48,000
12 - Personnel Benefits	Current Positions WIG	21	1,000	
	Current Positions COLA	21	11,000	
Subtotal				12,000
21 - Travel, Transportation of Persons				
22 - Transportation of Things				
23 - Rent, Communications & Utilities				
24 - Printing & Reproduction				
25 - Other Services	Built-in			9,000
26 - Supplies & Materials				
31 - Equipment				
Total				69,000

Table 7
MULTI-DOOR DISPUTE RESOLUTION DIVISION
Detail of Full-Time Equivalent Employment

	2003 Enacted	2004 Enacted	2005 Request
JS-3			
JS-4			
JS-5			
JS-6			
JS-7			
JS-8	1	1	1
JS-9	2	2	2
JS-10	7	7	7
JS-11	5	5	5
JS-12	1	1	1
JS-13	4	4	4
JS-14			
JS-15	1	1	1
JS-16			
JS-17			
Ungraded			
JS-Salary	\$1,274,000	\$1,284,000	\$1,332,000
Total, End-of-year (EOY)	21	21	21
Total Full-Time Equivalent (FTE)	21	21	21

**DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA SUPERIOR COURT
PROBATE DIVISION/OFFICE OF THE REGISTER OF WILLS**

<u>FY 2003 Enacted</u>		<u>FY 2004 Enacted</u>		<u>FY 2005 Request</u>		<u>Difference FY 2004/2005</u>	
FTE	Obligations	FTE	Obligations	FTE	Obligations	FTE	Obligations
46	3,004,000	46	3,587,000	54	5,241,000	8	1,654,000

Mission Statement

The mission of the Probate Division/Office of the Register of Wills is to fairly; promptly and effectively record and maintain wills and case proceedings, provide clerical services, monitor supervised estates, audit fiduciary accounts and review and make recommendation to judges on all *ex parte* filings, in matters over which the Superior Court has probate jurisdiction.

Organizational Background

The Probate Division/Office of the Register of Wills has jurisdiction over decedents' estates, trusts, guardianships of minors, and guardianships and conservatorships of incapacitated adults. The organizational components are the Office of the Register of Wills and two branches, Auditing and Appraisals and Probate Operations. The Office of the Register of Wills consists of the Register of Wills, who is responsible for the management and supervision of the two branches, and four deputies. The primary duties of the deputies, however, is to review pleadings and prepare recommendations to the judges on uncontested matters, advise attorneys and the general public on procedures, and appear at hearings to ensure fiduciaries comply with reporting requirements. The Auditing and Appraisals Branch audits accounts of fiduciaries under court supervision, examines requests for compensation, prepares reports, recommendations and proposed orders for judges, advises attorneys and fiduciaries on accounting procedures and conducts appraisals of tangible property. The Probate Operations, is comprised of three sections, the Small Estates section, which processes petitions in decedents estates having assets of \$40,000 or less; the Decedents Estates and Guardianships section, which processes decedents' estates with assets valued in excess of \$40,000 and guardianships of minors; and the Intervention and Trusts section, which processes guardianships and conservatorships of adults and trusts.

FTE Distribution

Organization	FY 2004	FY 2003
Office of the Register of Wills	6	7
Auditing & Appraisals	18	18
Administrative Services		
Small Estates Section	4	4
Decedents Estates and Guardianships Section	13	14
Interventions and Trusts Section	4	4
Total	45	47

Division Objectives

The four major objectives of the Office of the Register of Wills/Probate Division are to:

1. Prepare, maintain and preserve an accurate record of probate court proceedings and ensure ready public access to the record in accordance with statutory mandates, D.C. Code §§ 11-2101-2104 and Court Performance Standards pertaining to the Preservation of Records.
2. Accurately review pleadings for compliance with court rules within 20 minutes of tender for filing and prepare written recommendations to judges within 5 days of ripeness for disposition in accordance with authority vested by SCR-PD 2.
3. Timely monitor fiduciaries to gain compliance with reporting requirements in accordance with SCR-PD 18, 121, 305, 309 (a) & 441.
4. Audit accounts within 75 days of filing and dispose of them within 90 days in accordance with D.C. Code § 11-2104 (a) (1), (4), National Fiduciary Accounting Standards, and Court Performance Standards.

Performance Data

Table 1
PROBATE DIVISION
Performance Measurement Data

Type of Indicator	Performance Indicator	Data Source	Actual FY 2002	Projection FY 2003	Projection FY 2004	Projection FY 2005
Output	New Filings	Monthly Reports	2,854	3,070	3,195	3,195
Output	Pleadings Reviewed	Monthly Reports	13,319	13,500	13,500	13,500
Output	Recommendations Prepared – Pleadings	Monthly Reports	7,439	7,500	7,500	7,500
Output	Recommendations Prepared – Compensation	Monthly Reports	1,408	1,400	1,400	1,400
Output	Fiduciaries Monitored	Monthly Reports	7,000	7,000	7,000	7,000
Output	Accounts Audited	Monthly Reports	1,875	1,995	1,995	1,995

Division Restructuring or Work Process Redesign

The four FY 2005 Objectives in the Probate Division are outlined above. Within the last several years the Division has absorbed a 22% reduction in workforce with a constant trend in case filings and work demand. Work processes have been redesigned to maximize efficiency without an increase in human resources. The FY 2005 budget now includes minimal increases in human resources necessary to accomplish the Division objectives. In FY 2004, it was envisioned that the installation of a modern case management system and automation of the review of petitions for compensation would further enhance efficiency, and obviate the need for seven positions supported by an independent 2002 Booz-Allen-Hamilton staffing study. The FY 2005 budget anticipates installation of the modern case management system, which is currently scheduled for FY 2004, but does not anticipate the automation of the review of petitions for compensation

within the next five years. Implementation of the new case management system under the Courts' IJIS project and relocation of the Division to another facility under the Courts' Master Plan have taken priority over the development of the initiative to automate the review of requests for compensation. These initiatives will require substantial time and resources. In addition, time standards for case processing are being shortened and operations reorganized in response to public demand. Consequently, the FY 2005 budget departs from the FY 2004 budget plan and now includes the seven positions supported by the independent staffing study, as well as one other position for a total increase of eight FTEs.

FY 2005 Request

For FY 2005, the Courts request \$5,241,000 for the Probate Division, an increase of \$1,654,000 (46%) above the FY 2004 enacted level. The request includes \$1,000,000 for public access to land records; \$471,000 for 7 FTE to enhance timely disposition of probate cases; \$53,000 and 1 FTE to enhance Court service to incapacitated adults; and \$130,000 for built-in increases.

Contractual Services Request: Preservation of Probate Records, \$1,000,000

Problem Statement. Original documents pertaining to all probate actions in the District of Columbia are historical documents that are required, by statute, to be securely preserved and maintained permanently. The statute also requires that the Court provide the public ready access to copies of all probate records. Pursuant to D.C. Code Section 11-2102 (a) (2), the Register of Wills is required to record the decrees and orders of the probate court and all wills proved before the Register of Wills or the court. Section 2104 (b) (3) and (4) require the records (i.e. copies) to be made separately and the originals to be maintained in places of safety designated by the court.

Since the transfer of probate records from the U.S. District Court in the early seventies, the Superior Court of the District of Columbia has attempted to maintain copies of all probate orders and wills in bound books housed on-site for ready access to the public in accordance with the foregoing law. As a result of space constraints, however, many of the bound books were dispensed with or were sent for storage to archival record centers. Retrieval for public viewing necessarily results in lengthy delays and does not serve the public well. Reproduction of the records using modern technology will enable on-site storage of probate court records, thereby better meeting the needs of the public and ensuring the long-term preservation of these important records.

Relationship to Courts Vision, Mission, and Goals. The proposed reproduction of records will enable to the Courts to provide accurate, timely, and complete probate records to judges, court personnel, and other court participants in alignment with the Courts' strategic goal of enhancing the administration of justice.

Relationship to Core Priority Functions. The Register of Wills/Clerk of the Probate Division is required by law to maintain copies of probate records for ready public access while maintaining the originals in places of safety. The proposed reproduction of records is in alignment with the FY 2005 Probate Division's objective to prepare, maintain, and preserve accurate records of

probate court proceedings and ensure ready public access to the records in accordance with statutory mandates.

Relationship to Existing Funding. Existing resources are insufficient to assume the task of reproducing the required records, which are located off site.

Methodology. The proposed funding requirement is derived from a cost estimate based upon a review of the scope of work.

Expenditure Plan. A contract will be awarded and payments made in accordance with the Courts' Procurement Policies.

Performance Indicators. The court receives ten or more requests for archived records daily from the general public, including real estate title companies, attorneys, heirs, legatees, and creditors. The public waits approximately three to six weeks to review them. The impact upon the interested persons is costly resulting in significant delay in the sale of real estate, for example, or delay in related court actions. Moreover, the original records are placed at risk of being damaged or destroyed each time they are accessed. The completion of this project would significantly enhance the response time for the retrieval of archived records from the existing three to six weeks to a matter of minutes and maintain the security of originals. Successful completion of the contract will ensure the Courts' compliance with law.

FTE Request: Four (4) Auditors, JS-12, \$304,000, and one (1) Supervisory Auditor, JS 13, \$90,000.

Problem Statement. To protect and monitor the estates and assets of minor children, incapacitated adults and the deceased, the Probate Division conducts audits of accounts and guardianship petitions. Each year approximately 3,500 account and petition filings are received at the Court. This volume of work is difficult to keep pace with at current staffing levels. Today there are approximately 1,050 pending accountings and guardianship petitions awaiting review in the Auditing & Appraisals Branch of the Probate Division, representing 30% the annual filings. Over 50% of the accounts and petitions remain pending beyond 90 days. Delays in dispositions of these matters can result in lengthy and costly administration of estates and hardship to minor children, incapacitated adults, and beneficiaries of decedents estates and trusts. Additional staff will enable the Court to process timely the fiduciary accounts, thereby improving services and reducing costs for children, incapacitated adults, and estate beneficiaries.

Relationship to Courts' Vision, Mission, and Goals. The addition of four auditors and one supervisory auditor will enable the timely and accurate processing and disposition of fiduciary accounts, supporting the Courts' mission to protect the rights and liberties of minor children, incapacitated adults, and beneficiaries of decedents estates and trusts. It is aligned with the Courts' strategic goal of enhancing the administration of justice through the development of processes and systems that ensure administrative efficiencies and utilize best practices.

Relationship to Core or Priority Functions. The FY 2005 Probate Division Objective 4 consists of an interim goal to audit all accounts within 75 days of filing, with an outcome goal to dispose

of them within 90 days of filing. This objective is in alignment with the Courts' strategic goal to institute case management plans that utilize best practices and time standards. Additionally, petitions for compensation from the public Guardianship Fund must be disposed within 30 days of filing pursuant to court rule designed to facilitate payment within a 45-day time period mandated by the appropriations law. The increase in FTEs will enable the Courts' compliance with these goals and mandates.

Relationship to Existing Funding. There are 18 FTEs in the Auditing & Appraisals Branch of the Probate Division, consisting of one Branch Manager, JS 14; one Supervisory Auditor, JS 13; one Appraiser, JS 11; one Deputy Clerk II, JS 6/7/8 and 14 Auditors, JS 12, at a total personal services cost of \$1, 259,714. Because the work of the 14 auditors requires detailed supervisory scrutiny, they are divided into two teams with seven reporting to the Supervisory Auditor and seven reporting directly to the Branch Manager. The Appraiser and the Deputy Clerk II also report directly to the Branch Manager. The Branch annually audits approximately 2,000 fiduciary accounts preparing substantive written reports for judicial consideration; and reviews approximately 1,500 petitions for compensation preparing written analyses and proposed court orders disposing of the petitions. The additional human resources would allow auditors to more promptly dispose of accounts and petitions for compensation, ultimately decreasing the pending caseload by at least 67%. The addition of a Supervisory Auditor will provide direct supervision for one of the two teams of auditors that currently reports directly to the Branch Manager. That would extend time to the Branch Manager to concentrate on managerial responsibilities. The lack of funding in this area will result in continuing delays in dispositions of accounts and requests for compensation escalating the expense in the administration of estates under court supervision.

Methodology. A 2002 independent staffing analysis by Booz-Allen-Hamilton and an in-house productivity/efficiency study both concluded that 5 additional FTEs are necessary to effectively perform the required tasks of the Auditing and Appraisals Branch of the Probate Division. The proposed grade levels of the additional FTEs are consistent with the Courts' personnel policies.

Expenditure Plan. New FTEs will be recruited and hired according to the Courts' personnel policies.

Performance Indicators. With the additional resources, baseline performance levels will improve. Currently, only 92% of Guardianship Fund requests are approved within 30 days of filing; the rate is expected to increase to 100% as required by court rule. As a result, payouts of interest on compensation payable from the public Guardianship Fund administered by the Courts will be minimized. With existing resources, only 45% of fiduciary accounts are disposed within 90 days of filing. At least 75% will be disposed within 90 days of filing with the additional FTEs. Success will be measured by compiling statistics on the time between filing and disposition of accounts and petitions for compensation.

FTE Request – Two (2) Deputy Clerks JS-6/7/8 - \$77,000

Problem Statement. Current staffing is inadequate to provide timely and efficient completion of critical functions in the Operations Branch of the Interventions and Trusts Section of the Probate

Division, resulting in persistent backlogs in case processing tasks that necessarily raise concerns about the adequacy of the protection afforded incapacitated adults whose personal and financial affairs are under court supervision. Although it is anticipated that timeliness will improve and the backlog in the delinquency notice system will dissipate with the installation of the new IJIS case management system planned for FY 2004, two additional FTEs are needed to perform other case processing tasks that are now being delayed or performed by supervisory staff.

Relationship to Courts' Vision, Mission, and Goals. The proposed addition of two Deputy Clerks would assure compliance with operating standards and is aligned with the Courts' strategic goal of enhancing the administration of justice through the development of processes and systems that ensure administrative efficiencies and utilize best practices, and the institution of case management plans.

Relationship to Core or Priority Functions. Two additional Deputy Clerks would support the FY 2005 Probate Division's objective to timely monitor fiduciaries to gain compliance with reporting requirements in accordance with statutory mandates and court rules.

Relationship to Existing Funding. There are four FTEs in the Interventions and Trusts Section, consisting of a Supervisor, JS 12, two Deputy Clerks, JS 6/7/8, and one Courtroom Clerk, JS 8/9. The Section provides clerical support for approximately 2,500 cases involving incapacitated adults and trusts including docketing and calendaring, issuing letters of administration and instructions to fiduciaries, monitoring reporting, issuing notices and mailing court orders.

Methodology. A 2002 Booz-Allen-Hamilton staffing study supports two additional FTE in the Probate Operations Branch. Division management believes the two positions are most needed in the Interventions & Trusts Section of the Branch to address the above concerns. The grade level of the Deputy Clerks has been determined in accordance with the Courts' classification policies.

Expenditure Plan. The new Deputy Clerks will be recruited and hired in accordance with the Courts' personnel policies.

Performance Indicators. Performance indicators will include the extent to which the established time standards are achieved. Success will be measured by random sampling of work assignments and compiling statistical reports.

FTE Request: 1 Social Worker, JS 9/11/12, \$53,000

Problem Statement. The Intervention and Trusts Section of the Probate Division is responsible for the oversight and monitoring of nearly 2,000 incapacitated adults under court supervision. Guardians for these incapacitated adults must file reports with the Court twice a year outlining the status of their health and welfare. If any report contains information that the subject ward is being harmed or otherwise negatively impacted, a judge should be advised immediately. Currently, court staff reviews these reports for procedural compliance, but substantive review of

the content of the reports is not possible because existing staff do not have the expertise required to make such assessments. A social worker who is professionally trained in the area of elder care or geriatric care would enable the Probate Division to conduct a more thorough case review and report possible abuse promptly to the appropriate judges. The Social Worker also would communicate with the guardians, conservators, attorneys, and family members and could investigate, on behalf of the Court, in appropriate cases. As a result, the quality of court supervision will be improved and the protection of incapacitated adults will be enhanced.

Relationship to Courts Vision, Mission, and Goals. A Social Worker would provide substantive review of reports affecting the health and welfare of citizens under court supervision. This initiative is in alignment with the Courts' strategic goal of enhancing the administration of justice through the institution of case management plans that utilize best practices and time standards to ensure prompt case processing.

Relationship to Core or Priority Functions. The Probate Division is responsible for reviewing guardianship reports and notifying the assigned judges of procedural irregularities. More in-depth review of the reports would better protect the health and welfare of adult wards and assist court appointees in resolving issues without judicial intervention.

Relationship to Existing Funding. The Division's base funding does not fund this position because high level scrutiny of guardian reports independent of a complaint from an interested person was not previously contemplated in the Courts' planning.

Methodology. The need for substantive review of guardian reports by a person qualified in the subject matter is based upon concern that clerical staff is not sufficiently qualified to recognize problems in the reports. The grade level for the Social Worker is in accordance with the Courts' classification policies.

Expenditure Plan. The Social Worker would be recruited and hired in accordance with the Courts' personnel policies.

Performance Indicators. Performance of the Social Worker will be measured by random supervisory reviews to ensure compliance with performance standards. Currently reports of guardians are not substantively scrutinized.

Table 2
PROBATE DIVISION
New Positions Requested

Position	Grade	Number	Salary	Benefits	Total Personnel Costs
Auditor	JS-06	2	245,000	59,000	304,000
Supervisor Auditor	JS-09	1	73,000	17,000	90,000
Deputy Clerk I	JS-12	4	62,000	15,000	77,000
Social Worker	JS-13	1	43,000	10,000	53,000
TOTAL		8	423,000	101,000	524,000

Table 3
PROBATE DIVISION
Budget Authority by Object Class

	2003 Enacted	2004 Enacted	2005 Request	Difference FY 2004/2005
11 - Personnel Compensation	2,501,000	2,878,000	3,406,000	528,000
12 - Personnel Benefits	485,000	691,000	817,000	126,000
Subtotal Personnel Cost	<i>2,986,000</i>	<i>3,569,000</i>	<i>4,223,000</i>	<i>654,000</i>
21 - Travel, Transportation of Persons				
22 - Transportation of Things				
23 - Rent, Communications & Utilities				
24 - Printing & Reproduction				
25 - Other Services	-	-	1,000,000	1,000,000
26 - Supplies & Materials	10,000	10,000	10,000	-
31 - Equipment	8,000	8,000	8,000	-
Subtotal Non Personnel Cost	<i>18,000</i>	<i>18,000</i>	<i>1,018,000</i>	<i>1,000,000</i>
TOTAL	3,004,000	3,587,000	5,241,000	1,654,000
FTE	46	46	54	8

Table 4
PROBATE DIVISION
Detail, Difference FY 2004-2005

Object Class	Description of Request	FTE	Cost	Difference FY 2004/FY 2005
11 - Personnel Compensation	Auditor	4	245,000	
	Supervisor Auditor	1	73,000	
	Deputy Clerk I	2	62,000	
	Social Worker	1	43,000	
	New Positions Requested	8	423,000	
	Current Positions WIG	46	7,000	
	Current Positions COLA	46	98,000	
Subtotal				528,000
12 - Personnel Benefits	Auditor	4	59,000	
	Supervisor Auditor	1	17,000	
	Deputy Clerk I	2	15,000	
	Social Worker	1	10,000	
	New Positions Requested	8	101,000	
	Current Positions WIG	46	2,000	
	Current Positions COLA	46	23,000	
Subtotal				126,000
21 - Travel, Transportation of Persons				
22 - Transportation of Things				
23 - Rent, Communications & Utilities				
24 - Printing & Reproduction				
25 - Other Services	Reproducing Records			1,000,000
26 - Supplies & Materials				
31 - Equipment				
Total				1,654,000

Table 5
PROBATE DIVISION
Detail of Full-Time Equivalent Employment

	2003 Enacted	2004 Enacted	2005 Request
JS-3			
JS-4	2	2	1
JS-5	1	1	2
JS-6	2	3	5
JS-7	6	5	5
JS-8	4	4	4
JS-9	1	1	2
JS-10	2	2	2
JS-11	3	3	3
JS-12	17	17	21
JS-13	4	4	5
JS-14	2	2	2
JS-15	1	1	1
JS-16	1	1	1
JS-17			
Ungraded			
JS-Salary	\$2,501,000	\$2,878,000	\$3,406,000
Total, End-of-year (EOY)	46	46	54
Total Full-Time Equivalent (FTE)	46	46	54

**DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA SUPERIOR COURT
SOCIAL SERVICES DIVISION**

<u>FY 2003 Enacted</u>		<u>FY 2004 Enacted</u>		<u>FY 2005 Request</u>		<u>Difference</u> <u>FY 2004/2005</u>	
FTE	Obligations	FTE	Obligations	FTE	Obligations	FTE	Obligations
131	13,673,000	132	11,880,000	132	12,345,000	0	465,000

Organizational Background

The mission of the Social Services Division is to assist the Superior Court’s Family Court in the administration of justice and to protect and serve the community by providing probation services for juvenile offenders and their families.

The Social Services Division is the juvenile probation system for the District of Columbia. Responsibilities include providing (1) information and recommendations to assist the Court in decision-making throughout all disposition phases of the adjudication process; (2) court-supervised alternatives to incarcerations; and (3) support services to youth who are within the Court’s purview. The Division is comprised of the director’s office and five branches, which include:

1. **The Operations and Contract Services Unit** is responsible for the administration of and compliance with grants, contracts, and the Juvenile Information Center. The two Units have 12 FTEs.
2. **The Child Guidance/Family Counseling Clinic** provides an array of psycho diagnostic evaluations to include psychological, psycho-educational, and neuro-psychological testing and assessments, which are used during the judicial decision-making process in Family Court cases. The Clinic also provides individual and family counseling services for court-involved youth and their families. Additionally, the Clinic provides Home Studies to assist in custody placements in Domestic Relations cases. Much of the volume of diagnostic and treatment work is accomplished through the comprehensive doctoral training program supported by the Clinic. The Clinic has 16 FTEs.
3. **The Juvenile Intake/Diagnostic Branch** is composed of the Juvenile Intake Teams, Juvenile Diagnostic Teams, and the Central Processing Unit. The Juvenile Intake Services Unit screens and processes delinquency cases. The Juvenile Diagnostic Teams are responsible for providing comprehensive, accurate diagnostic reports. The Branch has 36FTEs.
4. **Juvenile Supervision Branch** is composed of six (6) probation teams located in field units in the Southeast, Northeast, and Northwest areas of the District. Intensive Supervision, Electronic Monitoring, and Interstate Compact teams are located in our central office in the Courts’ Building B. These teams provide supervision and other services to youth and families in cases of delinquency and status offenses. The Branch has 43 FTEs.

5. The Juvenile Drug Court is a 12-month substance abuse treatment program which includes the judge, defense attorneys, prosecuting attorneys, probation officers, treatment case managers, family members, and service providers as members of the treatment team. It is designed to interrupt the use of alcohol and other drugs among court involved youth and promote abstinence and healthy living choices. The Juvenile Drug Court has 18FTEs.

Division Objectives

The Social Services Division serves not only as a major component of the District's Juvenile Justice System, it also serves as a major part of the Family Court. The Division's objective is to provide court ordered services to youth and families. Following are the Division's mandated operational objectives:

- To provide information and recommendations resulting from detailed investigations, to assist the court in its decision making throughout all disposition phases of the adjudication process 99% of the time.
- To provide requested 15-day pre-adjudicated social studies to the court 99% of the time, and to reduce requests for extensions by at least 50%.
- To provide requested psychological evaluations to the court within a 30-day time period 99% of the time, and to reduce the current average 60-day backlog waiting period by 50%.
- To increase the number of juveniles successfully completing probation by 5%.
- To complete divisional re-engineering affecting all branch operations, to provide adequate staffing levels, and to provide properly trained and qualified staff to address our changing population of clients with sexual, mental health, and substance abuse problems within the next eight months.
- To complete division wide training of all staff in the recently developed IGIS case management database.

Division Restructuring or Work Process Re-Design:

As noted in the Booz-Allen- Hamilton staffing study, the Social Services Division will make staffing adjustments and redesign work processes based on changing workload needs in designated units as follows:

Currently, the Division's Child Guidance Clinic continues to experience a 45-day backlog of cases waiting for court ordered evaluations. While this is a significant improvement over the previous sixty-day waiting period this backlog causes delays in court hearings, and violates the Courts' mandate of providing swift, accessible service. The delays are caused by the volume of cases, the logistics of visiting detained youth at Oak Hill Youth Center, and youth who fail to

keep appointments. When hearings are delayed, it can mean extended confinement for some youth and the escalation of problems they are experiencing. To address the evaluation backlog, the Division has instituted the following measures:

- The Division recently shifted and reclassified a vacant probation officer position to a psychologist position. This additional psychologist will have an immediate impact on reducing the waiting time. However, with the addition of the Family Court, the Division has experienced an increase in the number of service requests from the court and in time additional adjustments and resources may be required.
- The Division plans to have neurological evaluations completed within the Clinic as well. Efforts are underway add a psychiatric resident training component to the Clinic. The conduct of psychiatric evaluations by the Clinic will result in significant cost savings.
- The need to respond to court orders for 15-day evaluations is being met by assigning cases across the Division.

The Division is witnessing a growing caseload of status offenders and youthful offenders 13 years and younger. The primary resource to serve this population is a contract with SASHA Bruce, whereby 132 slots are purchased for the Court. Unfortunately, in past years all of these slots are typically filled by the third quarter of each year at which time these cases are forwarded to the juvenile probation supervision teams. These cases tend to be quite complex and time consuming to serve. The Division continues to seek additional community alternatives to serve this population.

The Division is participating in the implementation of the Integrated Justice Information System (IJIS). Staff training is underway.

Performance Measures

Table 1
SOCIAL SERVICES DIVISION
Caseload Measurement
 (Fiscal Year 2002 Data)

Case Type	New Cases	Cases Closed	Cases Pending Start of Year	Cases Pending End of Year	Change in Pending Cases
Juvenile Intake	2,241	2,241	789	825	-8%
Diagnostic	405	399	185	191	3 %
Juvenile Drug Court	72	41	11	42	282%
Juvenile Supervision	862	796	614	680	6%
Child Guidance Clinic (does not include DR cases)	582	599	63	46	-27%
Family Counseling	322	344	154	132	-14%

Table 2
SOCIAL SERVICES DIVISION
Performance Measurement

Type of Indicator	Performance Indicator	Data Source	Actual FY 2002	Estimated FY 2003	Projection FY 2004	Projection FY 2005
Input	Number of juveniles on probation	Court data	1767	1773	1751	1740
Output/ Activity	Number of drug tests conducted for juvenile probationers	Pretrial Services Data	4,637	4,658	4,685	4,675
Output/ Activity	Number of juveniles successfully completing probation	Division Statistical Reports	733	794	877	929
Outcome	Percentage of juvenile probationers testing positive for drugs while on probation	Pretrial Services Data	69%	60%	50%	42%
Outcome	Average gain in educational attainment level while participating in Juvenile Drug Court	Pre-test vs. post-test scores	3.0 points	3.5 points	3.9 points	4.0 points
Outcome	Percentage of juveniles who commit new offenses while on probation	Annual statistics	35%	30%	25%	23%

FY 2005 Request

In FY 2005, the Courts' request for the Social Service Division is \$12,345,000, an increase of \$465,000 or 4% above the FY 2004 Enacted level, for built-in costs.

Table 3
SOCIAL SERVICES DIVISION
Budget Authority by Object Class

	2003 Enacted	2004 Enacted	2005 Request	Difference FY 2004/2005
11 - Personnel Compensation	9,475,000	8,611,000	8,969,000	358,000
12 - Personnel Benefits	2,708,000	2,067,000	2,153,000	86,000
Subtotal Personnel Cost	12,183,000	10,678,000	11,122,000	444,000
21 - Travel, Transportation of Persons				
22 - Transportation of Things				
23 - Rent, Communications & Utilities				
24 - Printing & Reproduction				
25 - Other Services	1,432,000	1,144,000	1,165,000	21,000
26 - Supplies & Materials	28,000	28,000	28,000	-
31 - Equipment	30,000	30,000	30,000	-
Subtotal Non Personnel Cost	1,490,000	1,202,000	1,223,000	21,000
TOTAL	13,673,000	11,880,000	12,345,000	465,000
FTE	131	132	132	-

Table 4
SOCIAL SERVICES DIVISION
Detail Difference FY 2003/FY 2004

Object Class	Description of Request	FTE	Cost	Difference FY 2004/FY 2005
11 - Personnel Compensation	Current Positions WIG	131	63,000	
	Current Positions COLA	131	295,000	
Subtotal				358,000
12 - Personnel Benefits	Current Positions WIG	131	15,000	
	Current Positions COLA	131	71,000	
Subtotal				86,000
21 - Travel, Transportation of Persons				
22 - Transportation of Things				
23 - Rent, Communications & Utilities				
24 - Printing & Reproduction				
25 - Other Services	Built-in			21,000
26 - Supplies & Materials				
31 - Equipment				
Total				465,000

Table 5
SOCIAL SERVICES DIVISION
Detail of Full-Time Equivalent Employment

	2003 Enacted	2004 Enacted	2005 Request
JS-3			
JS-4			
JS-5			
JS-6	4	4	4
JS-7	13	12	5
JS-8	8	11	17
JS-9	4	3	3
JS-10	2	2	2
JS-11	7	6	1
JS-12	64	66	72
JS-13	22	21	21
JS-14	5	5	5
JS-15	1	1	1
JS-16	1	1	1
JS-17			
Ungraded			
JS-Salary	\$9,475,000	\$8,611,000	\$8,969,000
Total, End-of-year (EOY)	131	132	132
Total Full-Time Equivalent (FTE)	131	132	132

**DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA SUPERIOR COURT
SPECIAL OPERATIONS DIVISION**

<u>FY 2003 Enacted</u>		<u>FY 2004 Enacted</u>		<u>FY 2005 Request</u>		<u>Difference FY 2004/2005</u>	
FTE	Obligations	FTE	Obligations	FTE	Obligations	FTE	Obligations
27	2,550,500	27	2,694,000	29	3,088,000	2	394,000

Mission Statement

The Special Operations Division is a unique division among the operating divisions of the Court that provides specialized services within its seven units to litigants, the general public, and court operations.

Organizational Background

The Special Operations Division consists of seven units, as follows:

1. The Jurors' Office maintains a listing of potential jurors, summons and qualifies jurors, obtains information on the size of the juror panel needed, randomly selects and disperses jurors, and selects and swears in grand jurors.
2. The Tax Office is responsible for the daily management of all tax appeals filed in the District of Columbia and for preparing and certifying these records on appeal.
3. The Appeals Coordinators' Office is responsible for the timely processing, record gathering, and record certifying of all cases on appeal.
4. The Superior Court Library houses law books, legal periodicals, and electronic research tools for the use of judges, attorneys, and court staff.
5. The Juror/Witness Child Care Center cares for children of jurors, witnesses, and other parties required to appear in court.
6. The Office of Court Interpreting Services provides foreign language and sign language interpreters to defendants and others for court hearings.
7. The Judge-in-Chambers is responsible for handling matters from every operating division of the Court that may involve the issuing of arrest, bench, and search warrants as well as the enforcement of foreign judgments.

Division Objectives

- To provide qualified jurors to judges upon request for the purpose of voir dire in a timely manner 100% of the time.
- To accept, certify and prepare 100% of tax cases on appeal for review by the court.
- To certify and transmit to the Court of Appeals within 60 days of filing, all appeal cases for which a Notice of Appeal has been received.
- To always provide adequate legal research material for judges, attorneys and court staff.
- To provide child care for jurors, witnesses, and other parties that have business before the Court.

- To provide, upon request, certified foreign language and sign language interpreters for defendants and other parties for court hearings 100% of the time.
- To aid in the operation of the court by processing arrest, bench, search warrants, and other documents needed by the public and court officials.

Workload Data

In FY 2002, the Special Operations Division’s Jurors’ Office sent over 218,000 summonses to District of Columbia citizens to appear on juries; the Office of Court Interpreting Services received and fulfilled over 6,000 requests for courtroom interpreting services; the Tax Office heard and disposed of 375 tax petitions; and the Appeals Coordinators’ Office certified to the Court of Appeals over 1,500 cases within 60 days of filing. Tables 1 through 6 provide performance data for fiscal years 2001 through 2004 for the Jurors’ Office, the Office of Court Interpreting Services, the Tax Office, the Appeals Coordinators Office, the library, and the child care center, respectively.

Table 1
SPECIAL OPERATIONS DIVISION
Jurors’ Office
Performance Measurement Table

Type of Indicator	Performance Indicator	Data Source	Actual FY 2002	Estimated FY 2003	Projection FY 2004	Projection FY 2005
Output/ Activity	# of summons sent to jurors to serve on jury duty	Courts' Information Technology (IT) Division	312,676	218,662	220,000	250,000
Output/ Activity	Jurors qualified to serve on voir dire panels	IT Division	46,229	32,799	33,000	37,500
End Outcome	Judicial requests for voir dire panels met	Court's Research and Development Division	68%	65%	71%	80%

Table 2
SPECIAL OPERATIONS DIVISION
Office of Court Interpreting Services
Performance Measurement Table

Type of Indicator	Performance Indicator	Data Source	Actual FY 2002	Estimated FY 2003	Projection FY 2004	Projection FY 2005
Input	# of requests for interpreters	OCIS statistics	5,737	7,088	8,718	10,810
Output/ Activity	# of interpreting services provided	OCIS statistics	4,850	5,958	7,318	9,074
End Outcome	% of requests for interpreters met	OCIS statistics	84.53%	84.06%	83.94%	83.94%

Table 3
SPECIAL OPERATIONS DIVISION
Tax Office
Performance Measurement Table

Type of Indicator	Performance Indicator	Data Source	Actual FY 2002	Estimated FY 2003	Projection FY 2004	Projection FY 2005
Input	# of tax petitions filed	Court data	150	180	200	225
Output/ Activity	# of cases prepared for hearing	Court data	338	400	425	450
End Outcome	Cases disposed	Court data	78	180	200	250
Productivity/ Efficiency	Cases disposed/cases file	Court data	52%	100%	100%	100%

Table 4
SPECIAL OPERATIONS DIVISION
Appeals Coordinator's Office
Performance Measurement Table

Type of Indicator	Performance Indicator	Data Source	Actual FY 2002	Estimated FY 2003	Projection FY 2004	Projection FY 2005
Input	# of appeals filed	Research and Development	1,082	1,200	1,225	1,250
Intermediate Outcome	# of pages processed	Staff weekly worksheets	850	875	890	900
End Outcome	Records certified to the Court of Appeals within 60 days	Monthly cases status report and staff weekly work sheets	715	700	725	740

Table 5
SPECIAL OPERATIONS DIVISION
Library
Performance Measurement Table

Type of Indicator	Performance Indicator	Data Source	Actual FY 2002	Estimated FY 2003	Projection FY 2004	Projection FY 2005
Output	# of volumes available	Library staff data	23,000	23,100	23,200	23,300
Outcome	# of patrons who used the library	Library staff data	9,450	9,600	9,800	10,000

Table 6
SPECIAL OPERATIONS DIVISION
Child Care Center
Performance Measurement Table

Type of Indicators	Performance Indicator	Data Source	Actual FY 2002	Estimated FY 2003	Projection FY 2004	Projection FY 2005
Input	# of children visiting the center	Staff statistics	744	800	900	950
Output/ Activity	Number of caretakers available	Staff statistics	2	2	2	2
End Outcome	Average # of children cared for daily	Staff statistics	7	10	12	15
Productivity/ Efficiency	% of requests for care met (eligible children*)	Staff statistics	100%	100%	100%	100%

*Children must meet certain health, age, and developmental requirements to be eligible for care.

FY 2005 Request

The Courts' FY 2005 request for the Special Operations Division is \$3,088,000, an increase of \$394,000 (15%) above the FY 2004 Enacted level. The request includes \$153,000 for 2 FTE to help meet the need for foreign language interpreters; \$106,000 to update the library's collection; \$55,000 for an electronic document storage filing system; and \$80,000 for built-in cost increases.

FTE Request – 2 Foreign Language Interpreters, JS-12, \$153,000

Problem Statement. The increasing demand for interpreter services at court proceedings exceeds the resources of the Court's Office of Court Interpreting Services (OCIS), and the ability of the one existing foreign language coordinator to successfully perform the duties required to coordinate interpreters and provide interpreting services. From FY 2000 to FY 2002 the number of requests for interpreter services increased from 3,958 to 5,737, representing a 45 percent increase in service requests. It is projected that the number of requests for interpreter services will increase by 24 percent in FY 2003 compared to the requests in FY 2002. Currently the Court contracts with the Department of State (DOS) for interpreters as well as with independent interpreters.

In addition, it is necessary to have an interpreter available on Saturdays for arraignments and lockups. Because the Court has only one foreign language interpreter on staff, an outside interpreter must be contracted to handle Saturday matters, which increases costs for the Court. Interpreters are also needed to translate documents requested by various divisions of the Court. It is more cost-effective to have salaried staff interpreters providing translation services than to pay outside contract interpreters by the hour or by the translated word to perform these functions.

Relationship to Court Mission and Goals. Providing adequate interpreting services for all who need them is essential to the Court's mission of protecting rights and liberties and resolving disputes peacefully, fairly, and effectively. This is also important in meeting the Court's vision of having the court open to all and trusted by all. Having adequate interpreters is also important to Strategic Issue 2: Broadening access to justice and service to the public.

Relationship to Core or Priority Functions: Additional interpreters are needed for the Division to meet the Court's need for interpreters, which is one of the core functions of the Office of Court Interpreting Services. The Division could provide more cost-effective and better service to the public with 2 additional foreign language interpreters.

Relationship to Existing Funding-There is only one foreign language interpreter on staff who coordinates the contract interpreters and also interprets in the courtroom when necessary. Freelance interpreters are contracted to attempt to meet the needs of the court for interpreters. Two additional interpreters would eliminate the need to contract as many interpreters, thus reducing the expense to the Court while allowing the court to better meet its need for interpreters. If these positions are not funded, the court will continue to have difficulty meeting its interpreting needs and will continue to have the additional expense of contracting with more freelance interpreters.

Methodology. The Division determined that the two positions should be graded at JS-12 based on Court classification policies.

Expenditure Plan. The new FTEs would be recruited and hired in accordance with Court personnel policies.

Performance Indicators. An assessment will be made of the decrease in the number of hearings or cases that have to be rescheduled or continued for lack of an interpreter. An assessment would also be made of whether there is a decrease in the number of free-lance interpreters contracted and whether there is a decrease in the cost of operating the Office of Court Interpreting Services.

Supply Request: Library-Increase Book Budget-\$106,000

Problem Statement. The Court's law library budget has not kept pace with the increasing cost of law books. Although the average increase in the cost of law books is approximately 15% annually, the Court's library budget has only increased once since 1990. As a result, the library has had to discontinue ordering some books and is unable to update many treatises and periodicals, resulting in diminished service to judicial officers and the attorneys and public who use the library.

Relationship to the Court's Vision, Mission, and Goals. Up-to-date and complete information on the law is essential for the Courts to achieve their strategic goal of enhancing the administration of justice by ensuring informed judicial decision-making. This request particularly supports the Courts' Strategy 1.3.5 to provide adequate research and technology resources to judges.

Relationship to Core or Priority Functions: These additional funds are needed to enable the library to fulfill its core function of providing adequate legal research materials for judges, attorneys, law clerks, and other users of the library.

Relationship to Existing Funding. An increase in the book budget would permit the library to update many of the periodicals that have been discontinued due to budget constraints. If these funds are not granted the library will provide inadequate and outdated services to its users.

Methodology. The increase is based on the current cost of books and the fact that the cost increases about 15% annually.

Expenditure Plan. The funds would be used to purchase books and periodicals for the library, in accordance with the Courts' procurement policies.

Performance Indicators. An assessment would be made of the increase in the availability of books based on the increase in requests by users of the library that are met.

Equipment Request: Electronic Document Storage Filing System for Juror Qualification Forms, \$55,000

Problem Statement. The Division lacks an automated filing system to store and retrieve the 200,000 juror qualification forms the Court receives and processes each year. Juror qualification forms are sent to each District resident summoned to serve as a Superior Court juror to determine a potential juror's eligibility to serve. Once Jurors' Office staff enters data from the completed qualification form into the computer system, that form is manually filed according to the original date that the juror was scheduled to serve. If a potential juror raises an issue regarding his/her eligibility during the selection process in the courtroom, a judge may request the juror's original qualification form. Typically, when a judge makes a request for a juror qualification form, the request is made forthwith. This means that staff must be detailed from normal work assignments (i.e. qualifying jurors, sending out voir dire panels and responding to juror telephone calls) to locate the form right away. If a juror is serving on his original summons date, staff has to search all forms with that date (approximately 350-450 forms) to locate the document, by name or bar code number. If a courtroom is waiting for the document, the court proceedings are delayed until the qualification form is located. With an electronic filing system, the forms could be searched by bar code number *or* date of service and could be located in seconds, realizing a significant efficiency enhancement and enhanced service to the litigants.

Relationship to the Court's Vision, Mission, and Goals. An electronic filing system would support the Court's strategic goal of improving court facilities by providing technology that supports efficient and effective case processing, court management, and judicial decision-making.

Relationship to Core or Priority Functions: This request would support one of the division's core functions of providing services to jurors and the Court in a timely manner by eliminating delay due to searches for juror qualification forms.

Relationship to Existing Funding: Currently there are no funds available in the division budget to cover the purchase of this technology. If funds are not provided, the staff in the Jurors' Office will continue to have to neglect jurors at the counter, in the lounge and on the telephone while they manually search for qualification forms.

Methodology. The Division researched available technology and found a system that meets its needs for storing and retrieving juror qualification forms. The requested amount reflects the cost needed to purchase this item.

Expenditure Plan. Funds would be used to purchase the system through the Court's procurement system.

Performance Indicators. An assessment will be made of the decrease in time needed to retrieve qualification forms as well as the increase in staff response time to telephone inquiries and other tasks due to the elimination of the necessity of having two persons to search for qualification forms. Also, with the electronic storage system, instead of having to carry out the time-consuming task of manually storing the qualification forms in a file cabinet, they can be quickly scanned into the system by one person. This will allow the other staff person to assist jurors at the counter or assist with the calling of panels. Having the availability of this additional staff person allows the office to speed up the accomplishment of these tasks.

Table 7
SPECIAL OPERATIONS DIVISION
New Positions Requested

Positions	Grade	Number	Annual Salary	Benefits	Total Personnel Costs
Foreign Language Interpreters	JS-12	2	123,000	30,000	153,000

Table 8
SPECIAL OPERATIONS DIVISION
Budget Authority by Object Class

	2003 Enacted	2004 Enacted	2005 Request	Difference FY 2004/2005
11 - Personnel Compensation	1,385,000	1,470,000	1,648,000	178,000
12 - Personnel Benefits	295,000	353,000	396,000	43,000
Subtotal Personnel Cost	<i>1,680,000</i>	<i>1,823,000</i>	<i>2,044,000</i>	<i>221,000</i>
21 - Travel, Transportation of Persons				
22 - Transportation of Things				
23 - Rent, Communications & Utilities				
24 - Printing & Reproduction	129,000	129,000	131,000	2,000
25 - Other Services	530,500	531,000	539,000	8,000
26 - Supplies & Materials	206,000	206,000	206,000	-
31 - Equipment	5,000	5,000	168,000	163,000
Subtotal Non Personnel Cost	<i>870,500</i>	<i>871,000</i>	<i>1,044,000</i>	<i>173,000</i>
TOTAL	2,550,500	2,694,000	3,088,000	394,000
FTE	27	27	29	2

Table 9

**SPECIAL OPERATIONS DIVISION
Detail, Difference FY 2004/Y 2005**

Object Class	Description of Request	FTE	Cost	Difference FY 2003/FY 2004
11 – Personnel Compensation	Spanish Interpreters	2	123,000	
	Current Positions WIG	27	5,000	
	Current Positions COLA	27	50,000	
	Subtotal			178,000
12 – Personnel Benefits	Spanish Interpreters	2	30,000	
	Current Positions WIG	27	1,000	
	Current Positions COLA	27	12,000	
	Subtotal			43,000
21 - Travel, Transportation Of Persons				
22 - Transportation of Things				
23 - Rent, Communications & Utilities				
24 - Printing & Reproduction	Built-in			2,000
25 - Other Services	Built-in			8,000
26 - Supplies & Materials				
31 – Equipment	Library Books		106,000	
	Electronic Storage System		55,000	
	Built-in		2,000	
	Subtotal			163,000
Total				394,000

Table 10
**SPECIAL OPERATIONS DIVISION
Detail of Full-Time Equivalent Employment**

	2003 Enacted	2004 Enacted	2005 Request
JS-3			
JS-4			
JS-5			
JS-6		1	1
JS-7	1	5	7
JS-8	5	6	4
JS-9	6	5	5
JS-10	5		
JS-11		2	2
JS-12	2	5	7
JS-13	5	2	2
JS-14	2		
JS-15			
JS-16	1	1	1
JS-17			
Ungraded			
JS Salary	\$1,385,000	\$1,470,000	\$1,648,000
Total, End-of-year (EOY)	27	27	29
Total Full-Time Equivalent (FTE)	27	27	29

**DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA SUPERIOR COURT
MANAGEMENT ACCOUNT**

<u>FY 2003 Enacted</u>		<u>FY 2004 Enacted</u>		<u>FY 2005 Request</u>		<u>Difference FY 2004/2005</u>	
FTE	Obligations	FTE	Obligations	FTE	Obligations	FTE	Obligations
-	7,480,000	-	6,250,000	-	6,526,000	-	276,000

To capitalize on centralization of function and economies of scale, a variety of expenses are consolidated in a “management account.” This account provides support for procurement and contract services; safety and health services; and general administrative support in the following areas: space; telecommunications; office supplies; printing and reproduction; mail payments to the U.S. Postal Service; payment for juror and witness services; and publications. The fund also includes depreciation and replacement of equipment.

FY2005 Request

In FY 2005, the Courts request \$6,526,000 for the Management Account, an increase of \$276,000 or 4% above the FY 2004 Enacted level. The requested increase consists of \$178,000 for a courtwide initiative to enhance employee benefits and \$98,000 to cover built-in costs.

Table 2
MANAGEMENT ACCOUNT
Budget Authority by Object Class

	2003 Enacted	2004 Enacted	2005 Request	Difference FY 2004/2005
11 - Personnel Compensation	270,000	275,000	284,000	9,000
12 - Personnel Benefits	0	0	178,000	178,000
Subtotal Personnel Cost	<i>270,000</i>	<i>275,000</i>	<i>462,000</i>	<i>187,000</i>
21 - Travel, Transportation of Persons	272,000	276,000	280,000	4,000
22 - Transportation of Things	9,000	9,000	9,000	0
23 - Rent, Communications & Utilities	1,835,000	1,863,000	1,891,000	28,000
24 - Printing & Reproduction	269,000	273,000	277,000	4,000
25 - Other Services	4,232,000	2,952,000	2,996,000	44,000
26 - Supplies & Materials	399,000	405,000	411,000	6,000
31 - Equipment	194,000	197,000	200,000	3,000
Subtotal Non Personnel Cost	<i>7,210,000</i>	<i>5,975,000</i>	<i>6,064,000</i>	<i>89,000</i>
TOTAL	7,480,000	6,250,000	6,526,000	276,000
FTE	0	0	0	0

Table 3
MANAGEMENT ACCOUNT
Detail Difference Between FY 2003 Base and FY 2004 Request

Object Class	Description of Request	FTE	Cost	Difference FY 2004/FY 2005
11 - Personnel Compensation	Built-in			9,000
12 - Personnel Benefits	Enhanced Employee Benefits			178,000
21 - Travel, Transportation of Persons	Built-in			4,000
22 - Transportation of Things				
23 - Rent, Communications & Utilities	Built-in			28,000
24 - Printing & Reproduction	Built-in			4,000
25 - Other Services	Built-in			44,000
26 - Supplies & Materials	Built-in			6,000
31 - Equipment				3,000
Subtotal NPS				89,000
Total				276,000