

SUPERIOR COURT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
Overview

<u>FY 2008 Enacted</u>		<u>FY 2009 Enacted</u>		<u>FY 2010 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>
913	98,359,000	928	104,277,000	932	111,036,000	4	6,759,000

*Reflects a transfer of \$2.5 million from Superior Court.

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 as its only trial court. It receives its funding directly from the Federal government and operates in the nation’s most visible arena. With the support of 110 judicial officers, including 62 active judges, 26 senior judges, and 25 magistrate judges, the Superior Court is the court of general jurisdiction over virtually all local legal matters. Supported by approximately 800 non-judicial personnel, the Court operates six major divisions identified below and the Special Operations Division (including the Tax Division), the Domestic Violence Unit, the Crime Victims Compensation Program, and the Office of the Auditor-Master. 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 and is comprised of—
 - **Family Court Operations Division**, which has jurisdiction over the following types of cases: abuse and neglect, juvenile, domestic relations, domestic violence, paternity and support, mental health and retardation, marriage licenses, and adoptions; 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;
- **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; and
- **Multi-Door Dispute Resolution Division**, which provides a variety of alternative dispute resolution services to assist citizens in resolving their problems without litigation.

Caseload and case filings

During FY 2007, 121,130 new cases were filed with the Superior Court. Of the total new filings, 54% were civil cases; 26% were criminal cases; 11% were family cases; 7% were domestic violence cases and the remaining 2% were probate and tax cases. In addition to new case filings, as of October 1, 2007, there were 54,358 cases pending. Tables 1 and 2 provide Superior Court caseload data.

Table 1
District of Columbia Superior Court Caseload

Fiscal Year	New Cases	Start-of-Year Pending Cases	Total Cases
2002	136,045	55,071	205,770
2003	133,425	56,198	204,417
2004	134,767	47,498	200,521
2005	128,468	45,892	191,265
2006	124,003	69,817	196,478
2007	121,130	54,358	177,713

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

Table 2
District of Columbia Superior Court
Efficiency Measures
(Fiscal Year 2007 data)

	Cases Disposed	Cases Added	Clearance	Cases Pending		
			Rate*	01-Oct	30-Sep	Change
Civil	90,672	66,274	**	29,480	22,018	-25%
Criminal	27,205	32,176	**	na	8,486	na
Domestic Violence	8,094	8,271	98%	979	1,156	18%
Family	13,316	13,518	99%	19,100	19,302	1.1%
Probate	3,287	2,742	120%	4,409	3,864	-12%
Tax	84	374	22%	390	409	4.9%
Total	142,658	123,355	**	54,358	55,235	1.6%

*Ratio of cases disposed to cases added (i.e., new filings/reopened/certified in/transferred in) within a given reporting period. A standard efficiency measure is 100%, meaning one case disposed for each case added.

** The caseload figures for the Criminal and Civil Divisions will be subject to adjustment in the future as a result of ongoing data verification activities due to the conversion to the Court's integrated justice information system. Accordingly, the calculation of clearance rates for these caseloads and the Court's total caseload would not be appropriate.

FY 2010 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 D.C. Courts have identified 6 strategic issues, which comprise the center of our strategic goals:

- **Strategic Issue 1:** Fair and timely case resolution;
- **Strategic Issue 2:** Access to justice;
- **Strategic Issue 3:** A strong judiciary and workforce;
- **Strategic Issue 4:** A sound infrastructure;
- **Strategic Issue 5:** Security and disaster preparedness; and
- **Strategic Issue 6:** Public trust and confidence.

The Superior Court has aligned its FY 2010 request around three of the six issues—fair and timely case resolution; access to justice, and public trust and confidence.

In FY 2010, the Superior Court requests \$111,036,000 and 932 FTEs, including a transfer of \$2,500,000 to the Court System and an increase of \$9,259,000 (9%) and 4 FTEs above the FY 2009 Enacted Budget. The request includes increases to support the following Court goals:

Strategic Issue 1: Fair and timely case resolution--\$149,000 and 2 FTEs

The Superior Court's FY 2010 request includes \$149,000 and 2 FTEs to address the Courts' strategic issue of fair and timely case resolution, including \$95,000 and 1 FTE to meet the demands of the high volume Small Claims courtroom; and \$95,000 and 1 FTE to enhance mediation toward settlements in complex civil cases.

Strategic Issue 2: Access to justice--\$95,000 and 1 FTE

The Superior Court's FY 2010 request includes \$95,000 and 1 FTE to address the Courts' strategic issue of access to justice, including \$95,000 and 1 FTE to enhance services for defendants with mental illness.

Strategic Issue 6: Public Trust and Confidence--\$3,900,000 and 1 FTE

The Superior Court's FY 2010 request includes \$3,900,000 and 1 FTE to address the Courts' strategic issue of public trust and confidence, including \$3,650,000 to enhance services and programs for juvenile offenders; \$112,000 and 1 FTE to strengthen families and parent/child relationships in families with child support orders; and \$138,000 to increase the transit subsidy for court personnel.

Table 3
SUPERIOR COURT
Budget Authority by Object Class

	FY 2008 Enacted	FY 2009 Enacted	FY 2010 Request*	Difference FY 2009/2010
11 – Compensation	67,982,000	71,848,000	75,873,000	4,025,000
12 – Benefits	15,697,000	16,663,000	17,705,000	1,042,000
<i>Sub-total Personnel Cost</i>	83,679,000	88,511,000	93,578,000	5,067,000
21 - Travel, Transp. of Persons	296,000	303,000	449,000	146,000
22 – Transportation of Things	9,000	10,000	11,000	1,000
23 - Rent, Commun. & Utilities	4,748,000	4,849,000	3,020,000	(1,828,000)
24 - Printing & Reproduction	526,000	541,000	559,000	18,000
25 - Other Services	7,612,000	8,520,000	11,756,000	3,236,000
26 - Supplies & Materials	828,000	859,000	929,000	70,000
31 – Equipment	661,000	684,000	734,000	50,000
<i>Sub-total Non Personnel Cost</i>	14,680,000	15,766,000	17,458,000	1,692,000
TOTAL	98,359,000	104,277,000	111,036,000	6,759,000
FTE	913	928	932	4

*Reflects a transfer of \$2,500,000 in Object Class 23—Rent Communications and Utilities to the Court System to consolidate funds for leases, facilitating more efficient facilities management.

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

<u>FY 2008 Enacted</u>		<u>FY 2009 Enacted</u>		<u>FY 2010 Request</u>		<u>Difference</u> <u>FY 2009/2010</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>
204	24,149,000	204	25,239,000	204	26,384,000	0	1,145,000

Organizational Background

The Superior Court of the District of Columbia is the court of general jurisdiction over virtually all local legal matters. The Court is comprised of ten divisions and offices, which provide for all local litigation functions including criminal, civil (e.g., landlord tenant, and small claims), family (including abuse and neglect, juvenile, and domestic relations cases), probate, and tax. In FY 2007, Superior Court judges handled nearly 120,000 new case filings. The 62 judges of the Superior Court rotate to each division on a scheduled basis, with judges in the Family Court serving renewable three or five year terms. Each Superior Court judge has an administrative assistant and a law clerk.

FY 2010 Request

In FY 2010, the Courts request \$26,384,000 for Judges and Chambers Staff, an increase of \$1,145,000 (5%) above the FY 2009 Enacted Budget. The requested increase consists entirely of built-in cost increases.

Table 1
JUDGES AND CHAMBERS STAFF
Budget Authority by Object Class

	FY 2008 Enacted	FY 2009 Enacted	FY 2010 Request	Difference FY 2009/2010
11 – Compensation	20,210,000	21,079,000	21,984,000	905,000
12 – Benefits	3,840,000	4,057,000	4,292,000	235,000
Subtotal Personnel Cost	<i>24,050,000</i>	<i>25,136,000</i>	<i>26,276,000</i>	<i>1,140,000</i>
- Travel, Transp. of Persons				
22 - Transportation of Things				
23 - Rent, Commun. & Utilities				
24 - Printing & Reproduction	5,000	6,000	7,000	1,000
25 - Other Services				
26 - Supplies & Materials	51,000	53,000	55,000	2,000
31 – Equipment	43,000	44,000	46,000	2,000
Subtotal Non Personnel Cost	<i>99,000</i>	<i>103,000</i>	<i>108,000</i>	<i>5,000</i>
TOTAL	24,149,000	25,239,000	26,384,000	1,145,000
FTE	204	204	204	0

Table 2
JUDGES AND CHAMBERS STAFF
Detail, Difference FY 2009/2010

Object Class	Description of Request	FTE	Cost	Difference FY 2009/2010
11 - Compensation	Current Positions WIG	204	20,000	
	Current Positions COLA	204	885,000	
Subtotal				905,000
12 - Benefits	Current Positions WIG	204	5,000	
	Current Positions COLA	204	230,000	
Subtotal				235,000
21 - Travel, Transp. of Persons				
22 - Transportation of Things				
23 - Rent, Commun. & Utilities				
24 - Printing & Reproduction	Built-in			1,000
25 - Other Service				
26 - Supplies & Materials	Built-in			2,000
31 - Equipment	Built-In			2,000
Total				1,145,000

Table 3
JUDGES AND CHAMBERS STAFF
Detail of Full-Time Equivalent Employment

	FY 2008 Enacted	FY 2009 Enacted	FY 2010 Request
JS-3			
JS-4			
JS-5			
JS-6			
JS-7			
JS-8			
JS-9			
JS-10	76	76	76
JS-11	64	64	64
JS-12	1	1	1
JS-13			
JS-14	1	1	1
JS-15			
Ungraded	62	62	62
JS Salaries	20,210,000	21,079,000	21,984,000
TOTAL	204	204	204

**SUPERIOR COURT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
MAGISTRATE JUDGES AND STAFF**

<u>FY 2008 Enacted</u>		<u>FY 2009 Enacted</u>		<u>FY 2010 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>
47	6,443,000	47	6,722,000	47	7,015,000	0	293,000

The Superior Court has 25 Magistrate Judges, 16 of whom are assigned to Family Court matters. 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.

The nine 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 jury trials or felony trials.

Eleven judicial law clerks, eight secretaries, and one paralegal support the 25 Magistrate Judges and eight part-time members of the Commission on Mental Health (2 FTEs).

FY 2010 Request

In FY 2010, the Courts request \$7,015,000 for Magistrate Judges and Staff, an increase of \$293,000 (4%) above the FY 2009 Enacted Budget. The requested increase consists entirely of built-in cost increases.

Table 1
MAGISTRATE JUDGES AND STAFF
Budget Authority by Object Class

	FY 2008 Enacted	FY 2009 Enacted	FY 2010 Request	Difference FY 2009/2010
11 - Compensation	5,140,000	5,361,000	5,591,000	230,000
12 - Benefits	1,285,000	1,340,000	1,400,000	60,000
<i>Subtotal Personnel Cost</i>	<i>6,425,000</i>	<i>6,701,000</i>	<i>6,991,000</i>	<i>290,000</i>
21 - Travel, Transp. of Persons				
22 - Transportation of Things				
23 - Rent, Commun. & Utilities				
24 - Printing & Reproduction	2,000	3,000	4,000	1,000
25 - Other Services				
26 - Supplies & Materials	9,000	10,000	11,000	1,000
31 - Equipment	7,000	8,000	9,000	1,000
<i>Subtotal Non Personnel Cost</i>	<i>18,000</i>	<i>21,000</i>	<i>24,000</i>	<i>3,000</i>
TOTAL	6,443,000	6,722,000	7,015,000	293,000
FTE	47	47	47	0

Table 2
MAGISTRATE JUDGES AND STAFF
Detail, Difference FY 2009/2010

Object Class	Description of Request	FTE	Cost	Difference FY 2009/2010
11 - Compensation	Current Positions WIG	47	5,000	
	Current Positions COLA	47	225,000	
Subtotal				230,000
12 - Benefits	Current Positions WIG	47	1,000	
	Current Positions COLA	47	59,000	
Subtotal				60,000
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	Built-in		1,000	
31 - Equipment	Built-in		1,000	
Subtotal				3,000
Total				293,000

Table 3
MAGISTRATE JUDGES AND STAFF
Detail of Full-Time Equivalent Employment

	FY 2008 Enacted	FY 2009 Enacted	FY 2010 Request
JS-3			
JS-4			
JS-5			
JS-6			
JS-7			
JS-8			
JS-9	9	10	10
JS-10	11	10	10
JS-11			
JS-12			
JS-13			
JS-14	2	2	2
JS-15	25	25	25
JS-16			
JS-17			
JS-20			
JS-21			
JS Salaries	5,140,000	5,361,000	5,591,000
TOTAL	47	47	47

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

<u>FY 2008 Enacted</u>		<u>FY 2009 Enacted</u>		<u>FY 2010 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>
5	646,000	5	686,000	5	727,000	0	41,000

Mission Statement

The Office of 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 the 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. The Office of the Clerk of the Court contributes to the Court’s strategic goals of providing managerial assistance and support to the operating divisions so they can provide fair, swift and accessible justice, enhancing public safety, and ensuring public trust and confidence in the justice system.

Organizational Background

The Clerk of the Court has management and supervisory responsibility over all ten operating divisions, programs, and their employees. Court divisions and offices under the administrative authority of the Clerk of the Court include the Civil Division; Crime Victim’s Compensation Office; Criminal Division; Domestic Violence Unit; Family Court Operations; Family Court - Social Services Division; Multi-Door Dispute Resolution Division; Probate Division; Special Operations Division; and the Office of the Auditor Master. The Clerk of the Court is responsible for ensuring that each division and program process all cases in a timely manner and provide the judicial officers, citizens of the District of Columbia and the persons conducting business with the court with timely and accurate customer service. The Clerk of the Court also delegates to each director the responsibility to manage all staff, budgetary and operating resources. The Office of the Clerk is staffed by five FTEs including the Clerk of the Court, two Senior Operations Managers, and two administrative support staff.

FY 2010 Request

For FY 2010, the D.C. Courts request \$727,000 for the Office of the Clerk of the Court, an increase of \$41,000 (6%) above the FY 2009 Enacted Budget. The requested increase consists entirely of built-in increases.

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

	FY 2008 Enacted	FY 2009 Enacted	FY 2010 Request	Difference FY 2009/2010
11 - Personnel Compensation	512,000	542,000	573,000	31,000
12 - Personnel Benefits	128,000	136,000	144,000	8,000
Subtotal Personnel Cost	640,000	678,000	717,000	39,000
21 - Travel, Transp. of Persons				
22 - Transportation of Things				
23 - Rent, Commun. & Utilities				
24 - Printing & Reproduction				
25 - Other Services				
26 - Supplies & Materials	5,000	6,000	7,000	1,000
31 - Equipment	1,000	2,000	3,000	1,000
Subtotal Non Personnel Cost	6,000	8,000	10,000	2,000
TOTAL	646,000	686,000	727,000	41,000
FTE	5	5	5	0

Table 2
OFFICE OF THE CLERK OF THE COURT
 Detail, Difference FY 2009/2010

Object Class	Description of Request	FTE	Cost	Difference FY 2009/ 2010
11 - Personnel Compensation	Current Positions WIGS	5	8,000	
	Current Positions COLA	5	23,000	
Subtotal				31,000
12 - Personnel Benefits	Current Positions WIGS	5	2,000	
	Current Positions COLA	5	6,000	
Subtotal				8,000
21 - Travel, Transp. of Persons				
22 - Transportation of Things				
23 - Rent, Commun. & Utilities				
24 - Printing & Reproduction				
25 - Other Service				
26 - Supplies & Materials	Built-in			1,000
31 - Equipment	Built-in			1,000
Total				41,000

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

	FY 2008 Enacted	FY 2009 Enacted	FY 2010 Request
JS-3			
JS-4			
JS-5			
JS-6			
JS-7			1
JS-8	1	1	
JS-9			
JS-10			
JS-11	1	1	1
JS-12			
JS-13			
JS-14	2	2	2
JS-15			
CES	1	1	1
JS Salaries	512,000	542,000	573,000
TOTAL	5	5	5

**SUPERIOR COURT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
OFFICE OF THE AUDITOR-MASTER**

<u>FY 2008 Enacted</u>		<u>FY 2009 Enacted</u>		<u>FY 2010 Request</u>		<u>Difference FY 2009/2010</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>
3	348,000	3	370,000	3	393,000	0	23,000

Mission Statement

The mission of the Office of the Auditor-Master is to assist the Courts and parties in actions filed in the D.C. Superior Court by expeditiously stating accounts for persons under the authority of the Court who have defaulted in their fiduciary responsibilities. The role of the Office is especially critical in assisting the Courts in its responsibility to safeguard and recover assets of minors and incapacitated adults which are under Court supervision in the Probate Division. The Office of the Auditor-Master also assists the Courts by resolving controversies involving complex financial computations and transactions in the Civil, Probate, and Tax Divisions and Family Court.

The Auditor-Master states accounts and determines the value of assets and liabilities, and makes other complex financial calculations in controversies between parties, thus conserving judicial time and resources. The Auditor-Master is also available to assist the Judiciary by presiding over discovery and settlement negotiations and other pretrial issues, as well as post-trial monitoring of judgments, consent decrees, and settlements in litigation involving complex financial calculations. The Auditor-Master presides over hearings, takes testimony, issues subpoenas to establish the record, and files written reports and recommendations for approval by the Court.

Organizational Background

The position of the Auditor-Master was created in accordance with D.C. Code §11-1724. The Office of the Auditor-Master currently consists of three FTEs: the Auditor-Master, the Attorney Advisor to the Auditor-Master, and an Administrative Assistant.

Divisional MAP Objectives

The objective of the Office of the Auditor-Master is as follows:

- Objective 1. In accordance with the Time to Disposition Standards (TDS) effective July 31, 2007, for all cases filed after April 1, 2007, ensure the prompt and efficient processing by completing at 40% within nine months, 65% within 12 months and 85% within 18 months of the referral, with the goal of having 100% completed within 18 months by FY 2011.

Table 1
OFFICE OF THE AUDITOR-MASTER
Caseload Overview

Case Activity Calendar Year 2007			Cases Pending Fiscal Year 2007		
Dispositions	Cases Referred	Clearance Rate ¹	1 Oct	30 Sep	Change
20	14	143%	18	17	-5%

Table 2
OFFICE OF THE AUDITOR-MASTER
Key Performance Indicators

Key Performance Indicator	Data Source	Projection FY 2008	Projection FY 2009	Projection FY 2010
Percentage of cases completed within nine months	Monthly Reports	40%	45%	50%
Percentage of cases completed within 12 months	Monthly Reports	65%	70%	75%
Percentage of cases completed within 18 months	Monthly Reports	85%	90%	95%

FY 2010 Request

In FY 2010, the D.C. Courts request \$393,000 for the Office of the Auditor-Master, an increase of \$23,000 (6%) above the FY 2009 Enacted Budget. The requested increase consists entirely of built-in increases.

Table 3
OFFICE OF THE AUDITOR-MASTER
Budget Authority by Object Class

	FY 2008 Enacted	FY 2009 Enacted	FY 2010 Request	Difference FY 2009/2010
11 – Compensation	268,000	283,000	299,000	16,000
12 – Benefits	67,000	71,000	75,000	4,000
Subtotal Personnel Cost	335,000	354,000	374,000	20,000
21 - Travel, Transp. of Persons				
22 - Transportation of Things				
23 - Rent, Commun. & Utilities				
24 - Printing & Reproduction				
25 - Other Services	2,000	3,000	4,000	1,000
26 - Supplies & Materials	2,000	3,000	4,000	1,000
31 – Equipment	9,000	10,000	11,000	1,000
Subtotal Non Personnel Cost	13,000	16,000	19,000	3,000
TOTAL	348,000	370,000	393,000	23,000
FTE	3	3	3	0

¹ Ratio of cases disposed to cases added in a given year. A standard efficiency measure is 100% meaning one case disposed for each case filed.

Table 4
OFFICE OF THE AUDITOR-MASTER
Detail Difference, FY 2009/2010

Object Class	Description of Request	Grade	FTE	Cost	Difference FY 2009/2010
11- Personnel Compensation	Current Positions WIGS		3	4,000	
	Current Positions COLA		3	12,000	
Subtotal					16,000
12- Personnel Benefits	Current Positions WIGS		3	1,000	
	Current Positions COLA		3	3,000	
Subtotal					4,000
21 – Travel, Transp. of Persons					
22 – Transportation of Things					
23 – Rent, Commun & Utilities					
24 – Printing & Reproduction					
25 – Other Service	Built-in				1,000
26 – Supplies & Materials	Built-in				1,000
31 - Equipment	Built-in				1,000
Total					23,000

Table 5
OFFICE OF THE AUDITOR-MASTER
Detail of Full-Time Equivalent Employment

	FY 2008 Enacted	FY 2009 Enacted	FY 2010 Request
JS-3			
JS-4			
JS-5			
JS-6			
JS-7			
JS-8			
JS-9	1	1	
JS-10			1
JS-11			
JS-12	1	1	
JS-13			1
JS-14			
JS-15			
JS-16			
JS-17			
CES	1	1	1
Total Salaries	268,000	283,000	299,000
Total	3	3	3

**SUPERIOR COURT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
CIVIL DIVISION**

<u>FY 2008 Enacted</u>		<u>FY 2009 Enacted</u>		<u>FY 2010 Request</u>		<u>Difference</u> <u>FY 2009/2010</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>
98	6,649,000	101	7,027,000	102	7,485,000	1	458,000

Note: Increase of 3 FTEs from FY 2008 to FY 2009 was positions transferred from the Budget & Finance Division.

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. The Division’s mission is to deliver quality services to all users of the civil case processing system, to support the judiciary and to facilitate timely dispositions, thereby increasing the public's trust and confidence in the Court.

Organizational Background

The Division is comprised of a Director’s Office, which has 5 FTEs, and four branches described as follows:

1. The Civil Actions Branch processes all new civil cases where the amount in controversy exceeds \$5,000, including cases requesting equitable relief (such as an injunction or temporary restraining order). In FY 2007 there were more than 8,300 civil actions filed. Responsibilities also include providing procedural information to the public, reviewing electronically filed documents and in-person filings for compliance with Court Rules, processing all post-judgment enforcement requests, scanning documents into the case tracking system, and securely maintaining all civil cases, physically and electronically. This branch has 28 FTEs.
2. The Quality Review Branch monitors compliance with time limits imposed by Court Rules, schedules events, handles identity consolidation matters, issues notices, and manages courtroom operations. This branch has 28 FTEs.
3. The Landlord Tenant Branch processes all actions for the possession of rental property and violations of lease agreements filed by landlords. The branch handled a caseload of nearly 46,000 filings in fiscal year 2007 and has 19 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. In FY 2007, there were over 11,000 small claims cases filed. This branch has 21 FTEs.

Divisional Objectives

- Ensure prompt and efficient case processing and accurately record resulting information;
- Allow easy access to data in a prompt and accurate manner;
- Provide quality customer service promptly, professionally, and courteously;

- Maintain problem-solving links to the community, local agencies, and the Bar;
- Provide ongoing and continuous evaluation and process improvement;
- To ensure a capable, ethical, and productive staff.

Initiatives

During FY 2007 the Civil Actions Branch expanded electronic case filing to all Civil Actions cases. The Division implemented Public Access which allows anyone with an Internet connection to review case information. The Small Claims Branch enacted a paperless initiative whereby all filings are immediately scanned into CourtView. All activities are tied to the Court's Strategic Plan through individual Management Action Plans (MAPs).

Management Action Plan (MAP) Objectives

The following is a brief list of objectives taken from the Civil Division's Management Action Plans, implemented to further the Strategic Plan of the District of Columbia Courts.

- Conduct periodic training to ensure judicial officers and court personnel understand the needs of persons who face potential access barriers.
- Enhance access to the Courts through satellite or community-based service centers, videoconferencing, electronic filing and case information, and other means.
- Promote quality customer service by providing accurate and timely information to judicial officers, court personnel, and other court participants.
- Use time standards, alternative dispute resolution, and best practices to manage cases.
- Foster understanding and respect for all people through diversity training for judicial officers and court personnel.

Workload Data

As shown in Table 1 below, the Civil Division disposed of over 90,000 cases in fiscal year 2007, including more than 11,000 civil actions; 54,000 landlord tenant cases; and 24,000 small claims cases. The Civil Division's current caseload and efficiency measures are reflected in Table 1, and the key performance measures are displayed in Table 2.

Table 1
CIVIL DIVISION
Caseload and Efficiency Measures
(Fiscal Year 2007 Data)

	<u>Dispositions</u>	<u>New Filings</u>	Clearance <u>Rate*</u>	Pending Cases		
				<u>1-Oct</u>	<u>30-Sep</u>	<u>Change</u>
Civil Actions	11,315	8,337	n/a	8,843	6,739	-19%
Landlord & Tenant	54,996	45,985	n/a	10,511	11,712	11%
Small Claims	<u>24,361</u>	<u>11,218</u>	n/a	<u>10,126</u>	<u>3,567</u>	<u>-65%</u>
Total	90,672	65,540	n/a	29,480	22,018	-25%

*In FY 2007, data clean-up efforts associated with the conversion to a new case management system (CourtView) resulted in the dismissal of many cases that were closed in the legacy system but were converted as open cases in the IJIS project. Accordingly it would not be appropriate to calculate a clearance rate. These caseload figures will be subject to adjustment in the future as a result of ongoing data verification activities.

Table 2
CIVIL DIVISION
Key Performance Measures
(Fiscal Year 2007 Data)

Type of Indicator	Performance Indicator	Data Source	Actual FY 2007	Estimate FY 2008	Projection FY 2009	Projection FY 2010
Input	Number of cases filed	Court reports	65,540	64,200	62,900	61,100
Output	Number of cases disposed	Civil Case Processing System	90,672*	67,000	65,700	64,300
Outcome	Cases disposed in < 18 months*	Court's Monthly Statistical Report	82%	83%	85%	90%

* This figure represents Civil Actions and does not include Landlord Tenant and Small Claims cases, which are generally disposed of within 12 months or less of filing.

FY 2010 Request

In FY 2010, the Courts request \$7,485,000 for the Civil Division, an increase of \$458,000 (7%) above the FY 2009 Enacted Budget. The requested increase consists of \$54,000 for 1 FTE to expedite processing of small claims cases and \$404,000 for built-in increases.

Small Claims Courtroom Clerk (JS-7/8/9), \$54,000

Problem Statement. To meet the demands of the Small Claims courtroom, one of the highest volume courtrooms in the Superior Court, an additional courtroom clerk is needed. Of the more than 11,000 new cases filed in fiscal 2007, 58% were resolved in the courtroom, creating an unmanageable workload for a single courtroom clerk.

The courtroom clerk has myriad duties. In addition to administrative functions, the clerk is responsible for customer service. Because of the nature of small claims cases, this is the “People’s Court,” and providing information to the litigants is large part of the courtroom clerk’s job. In addition, the courtroom clerk is expected to provide litigants a written judgment or order at the end of their cases or within 24 hours of the hearing, but currently is not able to meet that standard. The untimely disposition of cases causes delay in execution of the judgment or appeal of the court’s decision.

The clerk’s administrative responsibilities are numerous. Processing small claims cases includes calling each case at roll call using the case management system, CourtView, while simultaneously making annotations in the digital recording system, CourtSmart. The courtroom clerk enters data into CourtView to result the event, create the record of the judgment, and dispose of the case. The courtroom clerk swears each litigant, accepts and processes evidence, scans documents, assists the judge, ensures there is an adequate recording of the hearings, and prepares and distributes orders and judgments. Hearings and trials generally take place throughout the day, leaving the courtroom clerk no time to complete the processing of cases heard earlier in the day nor to prepare for the next day.

A second courtroom clerk would facilitate the timely processing of these cases and enhanced customer service to the litigants.

Relationship to Court Mission and Goals. The additional courtroom clerk would support the Courts' Strategic Goal 1.2 to resolve cases promptly and efficiently by providing additional staffing in this busy courtroom. It would also enhance public trust and confidence in the Courts, Strategic Issue 6, by facilitating improvements in customer service.

Relationship to Divisional Objectives. The requested position would support the Division's objective of ensuring prompt and efficient case processing.

Methodology. The requirement for one additional courtroom clerk is based on the caseload and the number of courtroom clerks currently in the division. There are 17 civil courtrooms and only 19 courtroom clerks. This position will bring the Division closer to the standard of five courtroom clerks per four courtrooms.

Relationship to Existing Funding. Currently, the Division has no funds to hire an additional courtroom clerk.

Performance Measures. The additional courtroom clerk would enable 100% of small claims cases to be processed completely within 24 hours of the hearing.

Table 3
CIVIL DIVISION
New Position Requested

Position	Grade	Number	Salary	Benefits	Total Personnel Cost
Small Claims Courtroom Clerk	JS-7	1	43,000	11,000	54,000

Table 4
CIVIL DIVISION
Budget Authority by Object Class

	FY 2008 Enacted	FY 2009 Enacted	FY 2010 Request	Difference FY 2009/2010
11 – Compensation	5,272,000	5,572,000	5,933,000	361,000
12 – Benefits	1,318,000	1,393,000	1,487,000	94,000
Subtotal Personnel Cost	6,590,000	6,965,000	7,420,000	455,000
21 - Travel, Transp. of Persons				
22 - Transportation of Things				
23 - Rent, Commun. & Utilities				
24 - Printing & Reproduction	18,000	19,000	20,000	1,000
25 - Other Services				
26 - Supplies & Materials	20,000	21,000	22,000	1,000
31 – Equipment	21,000	22,000	23,000	1,000
Subtotal Non Personnel Cost	59,000	62,000	65,000	3,000
TOTAL	6,649,000	7,027,000	7,485,000	458,000
FTE	98	101	102	1

Table 5
CIVIL DIVISION
Detail, Difference FY 2009/2010

Object Class	Description of Request	FTE	Cost	Difference FY 2009/2010
11 - Compensation	Current Positions COLA	101	84,000	
	Current Positions WIGS	101	234,000	
	Small Claims Courtroom Clerk	1	43,000	
Subtotal				361,000
12 - Personnel Benefits	Current Positions WIGS	101	22,000	
	Current Positions COLA	101	61,000	
	Small Claims Courtroom Clerk	1	11,000	
Subtotal				94,000
21 - Travel, Transp. of Persons				
22 - Transportation of Things				
23 - Rent, Commun. & Utilities				
24 - Printing & Reproduction	Built-in			1,000
25 - Other Services				
26 - Supplies & Materials	Built-in			1,000
31 - Equipment	Built-in			1,000
Total				458,000

Table 6
CIVIL DIVISION
Detail of Full-Time Equivalent Employment

	FY 2008 Enacted	FY 2009 Enacted	FY 2010 Request
JS-3			
JS-4	10	10	8
JS-5	1	1	1
JS-6	8	8	17
JS-7	17	17	13
JS-8	25	25	23
JS-9	18	18	18
JS-10	6	6	7
JS-11	3	3	3
JS-12	4	4	3
JS-13	4	4	7
JS-14			1
JS-15	1	1	
CES	1	1	1
Total Salaries	5,272,000	5,572,000	5,933,000
TOTAL	98	101	102

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

<u>FY 2008 Enacted</u>		<u>FY 2009 Enacted</u>		<u>FY 2010 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>
7	\$717,000	7	\$760,000	7	\$830,000	0	\$70,000

Mission Statement

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. Additionally, crime victims are provided with assistance in filing applications; in locating other victim service programs, support groups, mental health counseling; and with many of the other quality of life issues that arise after victimization.

Organizational Background

During fiscal year 2007, the Compensation Program was staffed by a Director, Accounting Officer, Administrative Assistant, two Legal Claims Examiners, and two Victim Advocates. There are a total of seven employees paid from the D.C. Courts' budget. Administrative funds from grants and the Crime Victims Fund also support the Crime Victims Compensation Program. These funds support five additional positions necessary to carry out the functions of the office, two Legal Claims Examiners and three Assistant Claims Examiners. The Crime Victims Compensation Program also relies heavily upon student interns to assist with the growing caseload and continuing supplemental payments. These interns are part of the Court's regular Internship Program and are invaluable. Approximately 4-5 interns are assigned to the Crime Victims Compensation Program each semester and during the summer months. The interns are trained to interview claimants and assist them with filing applications. They also assist in the processing of continuing payments to medical and mental health providers after the claim has been approved. These additional payments may go on for many years in a given case.

Administrative and Grant Funding

In addition to appropriated funds, the Crime Victims Compensation Program receives an annual grant from the U.S. Department of Justice under the Victims of Crime Act (VOCA.) The grant amount is based on the amount of claims paid to victims. The Crime Victims Compensation Program receives 60% of the amount paid in victims' claims in the two years prior to the year of

the grant award. The grant is used to pay victims' claims. In accordance with the administrative guidelines of the VOCA Act, up to 5% of the grant may be used for administrative expenses including staff, training and other items related to the operation of the office. Apart from the grant, the law allows the use of a portion of the Crime Victims Fund for administrative expenses. Pursuant to D.C. Official Code § 4-515(e) no more than 5% of the Crime Victims Fund may be used to pay administrative costs necessary to operate the program. These administrative funds are separate from those of the grant.

Division MAP Objectives

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

1. Provide timely service to crime victims by processing at least 80% of uncomplicated claims for assistance within 10-12 weeks.
2. Collaborate with other agencies to enhance the coordination of services to victims, beginning October 1, 2007.
3. Ensure the effective administration of the CVCP by securing and managing grant awards and examining internal means to ensure the longevity of the Crime Victims Fund to pay crime victim claims and operate the program, by 6/30 annually.
4. Enhance employee performance by requiring all staff to complete at least 10 hours of job-related training, by September annually.
5. Enhance public awareness of the CVCP by making at least 6 presentations at organized community events or staff meeting of agencies and organizations that have contact with victims, by September 30, annually.
6. Explore demographic trends in the domestic violence population seeking temporary emergency housing and develop appropriate responses in the Crime Victims Compensation Program by September 2010.
7. Enhance the professionalism and skills of Crime Victim Compensation Program employees by increasing their knowledge of resources available to victims in the community and the criminal justice system, by inviting at least 10 community organizations to speak at staff meetings, by September 30, annually.
8. Implement the procurement, installation and training on the use of new case management software for the Crime Victims Compensation Program, by September 30, 2010.

Division Restructuring or Work Process Redesign

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.

Claims Processing Redesign. The Crime Victims Compensation Program has developed a classification 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 aggressively reviews and reclassifies claims that have not had any activity in over 90 days. In FY 2007, 155 or 7% 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. In FY 2007, 44 or 2% of cases were classified as “administrative closures.” In both categories, the claim may be reopened once the claimant provides additional information; however, it is no longer regarded as a pending case.

Student Interns. The Crime Victims Compensation Program has utilized the Court’s Student Intern Program to assist with the intake of new applications and the processing of supplemental claims. The student interns have proven to be a tremendous asset to the office and, as an added bonus, have gained a real “hands on” learning experience from the intake process.

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, U.S. Attorney’s Victim Witness Assistance Unit, the Office of the Attorney General for the District of Columbia, the D.C. Medical Examiner’s Office, and the Asian Pacific American Legal Resource Center (APALRC). 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 effort expended in the denial of a claim. Applications as well as informational brochures are provided to victims by these organizations. In addition to the traditional methods of outreach, the Crime Victims Compensation Program has established an “In-Service” Training Schedule which invites community organizations to attend our bi-weekly staff meetings and present information about their organizations and the services that they can offer crime victims, such as food, housing, legal services, and employment referrals to supplement the services provided by the Compensation Program. This has proven to be an invaluable outreach tool because it creates a new point of contact in the organization and leads to many new referrals.

Workload Data

Table 1
CRIME VICTIMS COMPENSATION PROGRAM
Caseload Overview

	Actual FY2007	FY 2008 Estimated ²	% Change
New Cases Filed	2,500	2,655	6%
Determinations Made	2,308	2,610	13%
Number of Cases Pending at End of Fiscal Year	808	853	5%

Table 2
CRIME VICTIMS COMPENSATION PROGRAM
Performance Measurement Table

Type of Indicator	Performance Indicator	Data Source	FY 2007		FY 2008		Projection FY 2009	Projection FY 2010
			Goal	Actual	Goal	Estimated ³		
Input	# Of new claims filed	Case Management Software	2,380	2,500	2,655	2,655	2,800 ⁴	2,970 ⁵
Output	# Of claims processed	Case Management Software	2,500	2,308	2,600	2,610	2,870 ⁶	3,100 ⁷
Output	# Of payments	Case Management Software	9,100	9,874	12,950	12,970	14,250 ⁸	15,600 ⁹
Outcome	Dollar amount of payments	Case Management Software	\$7,900,000	\$8,033,015	\$8,172,000	\$8,172,000	\$8,295,000 ¹⁰	\$8,410,000 ¹¹
Outcome	Avg. claim processing time	Case Management Software	9 weeks	11 weeks	10 weeks	11 weeks	11 weeks	11 weeks

FY 2010 Request

In FY 2010, the Courts request \$830,000 for the Crime Victims Compensation Program, an increase of \$70,000 (9%) above the FY 2009 Enacted Budget. The request consists of built-in cost increases.

² Estimates based on the first seven months of fiscal year 2008.

³ Estimates based on data from the first seven months of fiscal year 2008

⁴ FY 2009 Projection is based upon the increase in claims filed from FY 2007 to FY 2008 (6%).

⁵ Projection for FY 2010 is based on the same rate of increase for FY 2009 (6%).

⁶ FY 2009 Projection is based upon the increase in the number of claims processed from FY 2007 to FY 2008 (10%).

⁷ FY 2010 Projection is based on the same increase used to project FY 2009 (10%).

⁸ Projection for the number of payments to be made in FY 2009 was calculated at 10%. The actual rate of increase was 30%, but that is caused by a change in the hotel practices. Food at the hotel is no longer catered. We no longer receive a single bill for food, but must pass out and account for Safeway food cards for families to purchase their own meals.

⁹ Projection for FY 2010 is based on the same rate of increase as the projection for FY 2009 (10%).

¹⁰ Projection is based on the increase in payments from FY 2007 to the estimates of FY 2008 (1.5%).

¹¹ Projection for amounts paid to victims in FY 2010 is based upon the same rate of increase as FY 2009 (1.5%).

Table 3
CRIME VICTIMS COMPENSATION PROGRAM
Budget Authority by Object Class

	FY 2008 Enacted	FY 2009 Enacted	FY 2010 Request	Difference FY 2009/2010
11 - Compensation	560,000	592,000	641,000	49,000
12 - Benefits	140,000	148,000	166,000	18,000
Subtotal Personnel Cost	<i>700,000</i>	<i>740,000</i>	<i>807,000</i>	<i>67,000</i>
21 - Travel, Transp. of Persons				
22 - Transportation of Things				
23 - Rent, Commun. & Utilities				
24 - Printing & Reproduction				
25 - Other Services	15,000	16,000	17,000	1,000
26 - Supplies & Materials	1,000	2,000	3,000	1,000
31 - Equipment	1,000	2,000	3,000	1,000
Subtotal Non Personnel Cost	<i>17,000</i>	<i>20,000</i>	<i>23,000</i>	<i>3,000</i>
TOTAL	717,000	760,000	830,000	70,000
FTE	7	7	7	0

Table 4
CRIME VICTIMS COMPENSATION PROGRAM
Detail Difference, FY 2009/2010

Object Class	Description of Request	FTE	Cost	Difference FY 2009/2010
11 - Compensation	Current Position WIG	7	19,000	
	Current Position COLA	7	30,000	
	Subtotal			49,000
12 - Benefits	Current Position WIG	7	5,000	
	Current Position COLA	7	13,000	
	Subtotal			18,000
21 - Travel, Transp. of Persons				
22 - Transportation of Things				
23 - Rent, Commun. & Utilities				
24 - Printing & Reproduction				
25 - Other Service	Built-in			1,000
26 - Supplies & Materials	Built-in			1,000
31 - Equipment	Built-in			1,000
Total				70,000

Table 5
CRIME VICTIMS COMPENSATION PROGRAM
Detail of Full-Time Equivalent Employment¹²

	FY 2008 Enacted	FY 2009 Enacted	FY 2010 Request
JS-3			
JS-4			
JS-5			
JS-6			
JS-7			
JS-8			
JS-9			
JS-10	1	1	1
JS-11	2		2
JS-12	2	4	2
JS-13			
JS-14	1	1	1
JS-15			
CES	1	1	1
Total Salary	560,000	592,000	641,000
Total	7	7	7

¹² Only seven FTEs in the Compensation Program are supported by appropriated funds. Two Legal Claims Examiner positions are paid from administrative monies of the Crime Victims Fund as allowed by D.C. Code §4-515(e), and three Assistant Legal Claims Examiner positions are supported by administrative funds from a VOCA Compensation grant.

**SUPERIOR COURT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
CRIMINAL DIVISION**

<u>FY 2008 Enacted</u>		<u>FY 2009 Enacted</u>		<u>FY 2010 Request</u>		<u>Difference FY 2009/2010</u>	
FTE	Obligations	FTE	Obligations	FTE	Obligations	FTE	Obligations
119	8,608,000	122	9,097,000	123	9,714,000	1	617,000

Note: Increase of 3 FTEs from FY 2008 to FY 2009 reflects positions transferred from the Budget & Finance Division.

Mission Statement

The mission of the Criminal Division is to ensure fairness, to provide quality support services to judicial officers, to ensure efficient and timely case processing and resolution, and to provide information to Federal and District of Columbia law enforcement and criminal justice agencies and the public.

The Criminal Division also promotes high standards of professional conduct, and promotes restorative and rehabilitative justice through its community courts: East of the River, District of Columbia Traffic and Misdemeanor and most recent pilot program, the Mental Health Diversion Court.

Introduction

The Criminal Division processes cases prosecuted by the United States Attorney and the District of Columbia Attorney General involving violations of the United States Code, District of Columbia Official Code, and municipal and traffic regulations.

Organizational Background

D.C. Code §11-902 creates the Criminal Division, establishes court divisions, and permits further division into branches by Rule of Court. The Criminal Division’s duties include processing and trial of all criminal cases in the District of Columbia that are not exclusively Federal; 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; and compiling statistical and public information.

The Division provides 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 Criminal Division is comprised of four branches: (1) Case Management Branch; (2) Courtroom Support Branch; (3) Special Proceedings Branch; (4) Quality Assurance Branch. The

division also operates two community courts, the D.C. and Traffic Community Court and the East of the River Community Court (ERCC). During FY 2008, the Criminal Division implemented a pilot Mental Health Diversion Court to provide support to defendants diagnosed with mental illness or with co-occurring substance abuse disorders.

- The Criminal Division's Director's Office has 7 FTEs.
- The Case Management Branch processes and maintains all felony, misdemeanor, traffic, and District of Columbia (D.C.) case files and processes motions and appeals for felony, U.S. misdemeanor, traffic, and D.C. cases and cases to be expunged and sealed. The branch also provides judicial officers, the public, law enforcement officers, and court staff with access to accurate information regarding criminal cases before the Superior Court. This branch has 21 FTEs.
- The Courtroom Support Branch staffs the courtroom clerks for all the courtrooms in the Criminal Division. The branch also is responsible for maintaining the Property Office. This office secures court evidence and maintains the inventory of forms used to process criminal cases. This branch has 42 FTEs.
- The Special Proceedings Branch has two parts, the warrant office and the Criminal Information Center. The warrant office processes and maintains all bench warrants, search warrants, arrest warrants, subpoenas, *habeas corpus* writs, fugitive cases, out-of-state witness cases, grand jury directives, sex offender registration matters, and contempt of court/show cause orders; processes appeals for these cases; and maintains 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 the Washington Area Law Enforcement System (WALEs) and the National Crime Information Center (NCIC); and coordinates the storage and retrieval of archived criminal cases. This branch has 23 FTEs.
- The Quality Assurance Branch is responsible for the proper and accurate commitment or release of persons as ordered by the Judges of the Superior Court and for the accuracy of the final disposition of cases in the court's database. The branch also processes the mental competency cases. This branch has 26 FTEs.
- The East of the River and D.C. and Traffic Community Courts are responsible for addressing quality-of-life offenses (e.g. public drinking, panhandling, prostitution, and some drug offenses) and minor criminal traffic violations, all of which can have significant negative impact on the community's quality of life and can lead to more serious crime. Unlike traditional courts, the Community Courts focuses on therapeutic and restorative justice, with a much broader array of responses (i.e. treatment, community service, etc.) at their disposal. Community Courts seek not only to hold offenders accountable for their actions, but also to repair the harm caused to the community by the offense. Community Courts frequently require offenders to "pay back" the community by performing court-supervised community service. They also seek to reduce the likelihood of future offending by linking offenders to needed services. The Community Court has 3 FTEs.

Criminal Division MAP Objectives

The Criminal Division's strategic objectives for FY 2010 are as follows:

- Ensure that the Criminal Division's caseloads are managed efficiently and resolved timely by implementing trial court performance standards within the statutory requirements that address time standards, staggered schedules, age of pending caseload, trial certainty and accuracy of court records.
- Develop reports using the Court's database, CourtView, to enhance the Criminal Division's ability to manage cases.
- Enhance the enforcement of court orders relating to fines, fees, costs, and restitution by developing standard operating procedures that utilize the CourtView application as a means to ensure the timely notification to Judicial Officers when defendants fail to comply with court orders and notification to defendants of past due obligations.
- To ensure both internal and external customers have timely access to criminal case information by increasing the workstations available for public use.
- To provide on-line access to court data and to allow participants to file documents electronically.
- To increase the speed and accuracy of new case filing by creating an electronic interface between the Prosecutor and the Court for case initiation and associated document filing.
- Enhance the availability of automated court information by ensuring that appropriate criminal forms and informational materials explaining all major criminal court processes and programs are available on the court website.
- Enhance the understanding of court proceedings by providing written documentation to defendants of all dispositions including all types of dismissals.
- Establish a Mental Health Court.
- Enhance the operations, management, program design and effectiveness of the D.C. and Traffic Community Court and the East of the River Community Court by holding Community Court Stakeholder Meetings, conducting at least two community forums annually, establishing an ERCC community advisory board to advise on improved services and outreach to the East of the River community, and gathering and evaluating data and establishing performance measures.
- Ensure that Criminal Division judges, attorneys, and court staff maintain high standards of civility by conducting an annual educational seminar for judges, attorneys, and courtroom clerks and by requiring all employees to complete at least 3 hours of customer service training yearly.

Division Restructuring and/or Work Process Redesign

The Criminal Division is working toward a paperless system. The Court's database, CourtView, allows the Division to image all documents and to maintain computerized dockets. The Criminal Division continues to work with prosecutors, defense attorneys, and law enforcement agencies to create an electronic filing system and electronic exchange of vital court information. In addition, the Criminal Division is developing procedures for the retrieval of vital archived information to make the information accessible electronically and to reduce records storage costs. Work

processes are being restructured and redesigned to facilitate a change from paper records to electronic records.

Workload Data

Table 1
CRIMINAL DIVISION
Caseload and Efficiency Measures

	<u>Dispositions</u>	<u>New Filings</u>	<u>Pending Cases September 30</u>
DC Misdemeanor	3,097	3,216	876
Felony	5,605	5,320	2,118
Traffic	7,627	10,961	2,635
U.S. Misdemeanors	<u>10,876</u>	<u>12,679</u>	<u>2,857</u>
Total	27,205	32,176	8,486

Key Performance Indicators

Table 2
CRIMINAL DIVISION
Performance Indicators*
Time to Disposition

Felony I (Murder, Sexual Assault, etc.)	75 % within 12 mos. 90% within 18 mos. 98% within 24 mos.
Other Felony (Felony II and AFTC)	75% within 6 mos. 90% within 9 mos. 98% within 12 mos.
U.S./D.C./Traffic Misdemeanor	75% within 3 mos. 90% within 6 mos. 98% within 9 mos.
U.S./DC Misdemeanor (Diversion)	<u>Community Service/First time Offenders:</u> 75% within 7 mos. 90% within 8 mos. 98% within 12 mos. <u>Programs for Behavioral Changes or Avoidance of Re-arrest:</u> 75% within 6 mos. 90% within 9 mos. 98% within 12 mos.
U.S. Misdemeanor (Drugs)	75% within 4 mos. 90% within 6 mos. 98% within 9 mos.

* Due to the Court’s conversion to a new database, 2007 statistics on performance are not available.

FY 2010 Request

The D.C. Courts’ FY 2010 request for the Criminal Division is \$9,714,000, an increase of \$617,000 (7%) above the FY 2009 Enacted Budget. This increase includes \$95,000 for one FTE to coordinate provision of community services to mentally ill defendants in the Mental Health Diversion Court and \$522,000 for built in-increases.

Mental Health Court Coordinator, 1 FTE (JS-12), \$95,000

Mental Health Courts focus on addressing the underlying problems that cause a defendant suffering from mental illness to come in contact with the criminal justice system. “What differentiates mental health courts from other approaches are their use of a specialized docket and their regular, judicially supervised, team-based approach to monitoring participant’s treatment and adherence to court conditions,” according to the Bureau of Justice Administration’s Guide to Mental Health Court Design and Implementation.

Problem Statement. To address underlying mental health problems of criminal defendants in the District of Columbia, thereby reducing recidivism, the D.C. Courts seek to institutionalize a pilot Mental Health Diversion Court. The D.C. Jail has become one of the largest providers of mental health services in the District, with an estimated 50% of inmates suffering from some form of mental illness. Many mentally ill defendants also are substance abusers and homeless. Incarcerating them is both more expensive and less effective than ensuring that defendants receive treatment for their mental illnesses and remain connected to community mental health services. The needs of this population include mental health services, substance abuse services, homelessness services, employment services, and other support services to divert them from the criminal justice system into the mental health system and to reduce the rate of recidivism in this population.

Recently, the D.C. criminal justice system has experienced a substantial increase in the number of defendants exhibiting mental illness. From 2002 until 2006, there was a 65% increase in the number of defendants appearing before the Court who had to be examined by psychiatric professionals to determine mental competency before the legal process could begin. During FY 2007, 157 persons were screened for mental competency, and, of those, 41% were found incompetent to participate in court proceedings and required further evaluation and inpatient or outpatient treatment.

In FY 2008, the Criminal Division established a pilot Mental Health Diversion Court to address the needs of criminal defendants suffering from mental illness. A total of 130 defendants were certified to the Mental Health Diversion calendar from the criminal calendar judges. Most of these defendants require mental health services and drug treatment (outpatient and inpatient). The pilot program has proven to be successful; most defendants connected to treatment services show improvement within a short period of time.

The Mental Health Court Coordinator will work with judges, court administrators, mental health professionals, and other criminal justice agencies to ensure that defendants suffering from mental illness receive appropriate mental health services, to enhance the safety of the community and reduce recidivist behavior. The goal is to involve key stakeholders such as mental health, substance abuse, and social service providers, and criminal justice agencies to determine better approaches for dealing with non-violent offenders suffering from mental illness and ways to divert them from the criminal justice system to the mental health system.

Relationship to Strategic Issues, Goals or Strategies. The Mental Health Coordinator will to address the Court’s Strategic Goals 2.1 of promoting access to justice for all persons.

Relationship to Division MAP Objectives. The Mental Health Court Coordinator supports the Criminal Division MAP objective of establishing a mental health court.

Relationship to Existing Funding. The Criminal Division’s base funding is inadequate to fund this position.

Methodology. The grade level for the Mental Health Coordinator is in accordance with the Courts’ classification procedures.

Expenditure Plan. The recruitment and hiring of the Mental Health Coordinator would be in accordance with the Courts’ personnel policies.

Key Performance Indicators. The Performance of the Mental Health Coordinator would be indicated by the provision of needed mental health services and a reduction in recidivism.

Table 3
CRIMINAL DIVISION
New Position Requested

Position	Grade	Number	Salary	Benefits	Total Personnel Cost
Mental Health Court Coordinator	JS-12	1	76,000	19,000	95,000

Table 4
CRIMINAL DIVISION
Budget Authority by Object Class

	FY 2008 Enacted	FY 2009 Enacted	FY 2010 Request	Difference FY 2009/2010
11-Personnel Compensation	6,815,000	7,203,000	7,690,000	487,000
12-Personnel Benefits	1,704,000	1,802,000	1,928,000	126,000
Subtotal Personnel Cost	8,519,000	9,005,000	9,618,000	613,000
21-Travel, Transp. Of Persons	0	0	0	0
22-Transportation of Things	0	0	0	0
23-Rent, Commun. & Utilities	0	0	0	0
24-Printing & Reproduction	44,000	45,000	47,000	2,000
25-Other Services	0	0	0	0
26-Supplies & Materials	20,000	21,000	22,000	1,000
31-Equipment	25,000	26,000	27,000	1,000
Subtotal Non Personnel Cost	89,000	92,000	96,000	4,000
TOTAL	8,608,000	9,097,000	9,714,000	617,000
FTE	119	122	123	1

Table 5
CRIMINAL DIVISION
Detail Difference FY 2009/FY 2010

Object Class	Description of Request	FTE	Cost	Difference FY2009/FY2010
11 - Personnel Compensation	Current Positions WIGS	122	108,000	
	Current Position COLA	122	303,000	
	Mental Health Coordinator	1	76,000	
Subtotal				487,000
12 - Personnel Benefits	Current Positions WIGS	122	28,000	
	Current Positions COLA	122	79,000	
	Mental Health Coordinator	1	19,000	126,000
Subtotal				
21 - Travel, Transp. Of Persons				
22 - Transportation of Things				
23 - Rent, Commun. & Utilities				
24 - Printing & Reproduction	Built-in			2,000
25 - Other Services				
26 - Supplies & Materials	Built-in			1,000
31 - Equipment	Built-in			1,000
Total				617,000

Table 6
CRIMINAL DIVISION
Detail of Full-Time Equivalent Employment

	2008 Enacted	2009 Enacted	2010 Request
JS-3			
JS-4	3	3	1
JS-5			
JS-6	12	12	18
JS-7	9	9	13
JS-8	29	29	25
JS-9	33	33	32
JS-10	19	19	19
JS-11	1	1	1
JS-12	5	5	6
JS-13	5	5	6
JS-14	1	1	
JS-15	1	1	1
CES	1	1	1
Total Salary	6,815,000	7,203,000	7,690,000
Total Full-Time Equivalent (FTE)	119	122	123

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

<u>FY 2008 Enacted</u>		<u>FY 2009 Enacted</u>		<u>FY 2010 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	1,928,000	25	2,040,000	25	2,158,000	0	118,000

The Superior Court’s Domestic Violence Unit processes all court cases in which domestic violence is a significant issue before one designated team of judges. The Unit handles civil protection orders, criminal misdemeanors, family child support, custody, visitation, and divorce actions.

Mission Statement

The mission of the Domestic Violence Unit is to resolve domestic violence disputes, protect domestic violence victims, and hold perpetrators accountable.

The Domestic Violence Unit was established 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” intake centers 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 time for both the court and the victim and involved parties.
- Paternity and child support orders are issued during the same proceeding as the civil protection order.
- Community Intake Center, using technology to bring convenience and services to the public in Anacostia.
- Continued communication to hold batterers accountable for abusive behavior.
- Specialized contempt court hearing for perpetrators to show why they should not be held in contempt for violating a Court order.
- Emergency after-hour access to the judiciary to obtain protection orders after court has closed and on weekends and holidays.

Organizational Background

The Domestic Violence Unit is comprised of 25 administrative employees who support five judicial officers in administering justice and providing services to victims and perpetrators of domestic violence.

MAP Objectives

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.

Other objectives for the Domestic Violence Unit include:

- Develop and implement time standards for differentiated case types, ensuring fairness and efficiency in the process.
- Provide petitioners immediate relief through the temporary protection order process.
- Develop and implement an after-hour access to Emergency Protection Orders for victims of domestic violence.
- Hold perpetrators accountable through a deferred sentencing and judicial review process that requires the perpetrator to appear in court throughout the treatment/counseling period.
- Reduce waiting time for court participants.
- Enhance access to justice for Spanish-speaking court users by translating all court forms into Spanish.
- Report on Court activity regarding domestic violence filings, dispositions, trends, and changes to process or procedures.
- Ensure that case information is processed, updated completely, correctly and within Unit time standards.
- Enhance and ensure safety to victims by seeking additional tools for enforcement of protection orders, such as updating the National Register for protection orders.
- Collaborate with surrounding jurisdictions in Maryland and Virginia regarding enforcement of protection orders and service on their constituents.
- Re-examine workflow, process, and procedural designs to enhance program efficiency and effectiveness.
- Provide orientation and training for new employees, emphasizing the role of the individual to the overall mission of the Unit and the Court.

Restructuring or Work Process Redesign

The Domestic Violence Unit utilizes the Court's new case management system, CourtView, whereby court orders and papers are immediately scanned into a database system and are made available to law enforcement, prosecutors and advocates. This technology enhances enforcement of orders and greatly serves the victims of domestic violence. Cases involving domestic violence are among the most complex and volatile that the Court has to address. Judges and court personnel are tasked with handling cases with the complicated dynamics of abuse in interfamily

relationships. The Unit, as well as the Southeast Center, specializes in addressing these challenging cases in ways that increase victim safety, perpetrator accountability, efficient and effective case adjudication, while assisting families affected by abuse and linking them to services and programs in the community that help victims of abuse and their families rebuild their lives free from violence.

Also, the Unit designs and facilitates a process for access to emergency after-hour protection orders; connecting the victim with police, advocates, prosecutor and judge whenever court is closed.

Workload Data

In FY 2007, the Domestic Violence Unit processed 8,271 new filings and reinstated cases and disposed of 8,094 cases. Table 1 below provides caseload data for the Domestic Violence Unit. Table 2 provides performance data for the Domestic Violence Unit for the Fiscal Years 2007 through 2010.

Table 1
DOMESTIC VIOLENCE UNIT
Caseload and Efficiency Measures
(Fiscal Year 2007 Data)

	Cases Filed	Cases Disposed	Clearance Rate*	Cases Pending		
				1-Oct	30-Sep	Change
Contempt Motions	280	285	102%	36	31	-1%
Intrafamily (Protection Orders)	4,154	4,168	100%	228	214	-6%
Paternity & Child Support	575	529	92%	65	111	70%
U.S. Misdemeanors	3,262	3,112	95%	650	800	23%
Total	8,271	8,094	98%	979	1,156	18%

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

Table 2
DOMESTIC VIOLENCE UNIT
Key Performance Measures

Type of Indicator	Key Performance Indicator	Data Source	FY 2007		FY 2008		Projection FY 2009	Projection FY 2010
			Goal	Actual	Goal	Estimated		
Output/Activity	Hearings/events scheduled	Yearly stats/ Random sample	28,000	28,724	28,200	28,400	28,400	28,500
Quality	% of cases reviewed and processed within 48 hours	Evaluation, survey, and random sample	93%	93%	94%	94%	94%	94%
End Outcome	Domestic Violence dispositions	Daily/Monthly Statistics	8,200	8,094	8,200	8,200	8,350	8,400
Productivity/Efficiency	Case clearance rates	Yearly statistics	100%	98%	102%	101%	100%	100%

FY 2010 Request

The Courts' FY 2010 request for the Domestic Violence Unit is \$2,158,000, an increase of \$118,000 (6%) above the FY 2009 Enacted Budget. The requested increase consists of built-in cost increases.

Table 3
DOMESTIC VIOLENCE UNIT
Budget Authority by Object Class

	FY 2008 Enacted	FY 2009 Enacted	FY 2010 Request	Difference FY 2009/2010
11 - Compensation	1,537,000	1,625,000	1,717,000	92,000
12 - Benefits	384,000	406,000	430,000	24,000
Subtotal Personnel Cost	<i>1,921,000</i>	<i>2,031,000</i>	<i>2,147,000</i>	<i>86,000</i>
21 - Travel, Transp. of Persons				
22 - Transportation of Things				
23 - Rent, Commun. & Utilities				
24 - Printing & Reproduction				
25 - Other Services				
26 - Supplies & Materials	3,000	4,000	5,000	1,000
31 - Equipment	4,000	5,000	6,000	1,000
Subtotal Non Personnel Cost	<i>7,000</i>	<i>9,000</i>	<i>11,000</i>	<i>2,000</i>
TOTAL	1,928,000	2,040,000	2,158,000	118,000
FTE	25	25	25	0

Table 4
DOMESTIC VIOLENCE UNIT
Detail Difference, FY 2009/2010

Object Class	Description of Request	FTE	Cost	Difference FY2009/FY2010
11 - Compensation	Current Position WIG	25	24,000	
	Current Position COLA	25	68,000	
Subtotal				92,000
12 - Benefits	Current Position WIG	25	6,000	
	Current Position COLA	25	18,000	
Subtotal				24,000
21 - Travel, Transp. of Persons				
22 - Transportation of Things				
23 - Rent, Commun. & Utilities				
24 - Printing & Reproduction				
25 - Other Services				
26 - Supplies & Materials	Built-in			1,000
31 - Equipment	Built-in			1,000
Total				118,000

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

	FY 2008 Enacted	FY 2009 Enacted	FY 2010 Request
JS-3			
JS-4			
JS-5			
JS-6	1	1	4
JS-7	1		3
JS-8	7	8	5
JS-9	9	9	6
JS-10	3	3	3
JS-11			
JS-12	1	1	1
JS-13	2	2	2
JS-14			
JS-15			
CES	1	1	1
Total Salary	1,537,000	1,625,000	1,717,000
Total	25	25	25

**SUPERIOR COURT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
FAMILY COURT OPERATIONS DIVISION**

<u>FY 2008 Enacted</u>		<u>FY 2009 Enacted</u>		<u>FY 2010 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>
180	13,883,000	182	15,507,000	183	16,436,000	1	929,000

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

The District of Columbia Family Court Act (“the Act”) resulted 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 at least three or five years, depending on their date of appointment. It requires that all family cases remain assigned to judges serving on the Family Court bench. 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 Family Court retains jurisdiction over all familial actions – child abuse and neglect, custody, adoption, paternity and support, mental health and mental retardation, juvenile delinquency, marriage, and divorce. The Office of the Director, six administrative branches, two support offices, the Family Court Self Help Center, and the Family Treatment Court make up the Family Court Operations Division.

1. The Domestic Relations Branch processes divorce, annulment, custody, and adoption cases. The branch, through its Marriage Section, also issues licenses and authorizations for marriages in the District of Columbia and maintains a list of officiates performing civil weddings in the court.
2. The Paternity and Child Support Branch processes all actions seeking to establish paternity and to establish and modify child support.
3. The Juvenile and Neglect Branch is responsible for cases involving children alleged to be delinquent, neglected, abused, or otherwise in need of supervision.
4. 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.

5. The Mental Health/Mental Retardation Branch is responsible for matters involving the commitment of individuals who are mentally ill or mentally retarded.
6. The Courtroom Support and Quality Control Branch 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).
7. The Attorney Advisor's Office, created within the Office of the Director, in response to the Family Court Act of 2001, assists the Family Court in maintaining compliance with the Federal ASFA, the D.C. ASFA and other child welfare laws applicable to abuse and neglect cases.
8. The Central Intake Center (CIC) is an innovation arising from the Family Court's implementation of the Family Court Act of 2001. The CIC serves as the initial point of contact between the public and the Family Court. Its primary mission is to provide comprehensive, timely, and efficient case processing services to the citizens of the District of Columbia and public agencies from one centralized location. The CIC initiates cases and receives all case filings, as well as the case filing fees. The CIC is the primary location for the dissemination of Family Court case status information to the public.
9. The Family Court Self Help Center (SHC), developed in collaboration with the D.C. Bar, provides legal information and assistance to self-represented parties in Family Court cases.
10. The Family Treatment Court, created as a result of a partnership between the Family Court and the Office of the Deputy Mayor for Children, Youth, Families, and Elders, in cooperation with key District health and human services stakeholders, is a voluntary comprehensive residential substance abuse treatment program for mothers/female caretakers whose children are the subject of a child neglect case.
11. The Office of the Director is responsible for managing the budget, policy making, and overall management of Family Court Operations.

The Family Court Operations Division Management Action Plan Objectives

- Enhance the administration of justice through increased monitoring and compliance with the Federal and D.C. Adoption and Safe Families Acts by reaching and maintaining 95% compliance with all hearing deadlines and content requirements.
- Enhance the timely processing of cases by ensuring that 95% of court information, including exhibits, is complete and available for courtroom proceedings.
- Enhance the administration of justice through the development of interfacing capabilities to electronically initiate abuse and neglect cases, receive subsequent pleadings and exchange documents and data through automation with partnering agencies.
- Enhance understanding of the court process by Spanish speaking persons by translating 100% of existing forms/orders identified suitable for translation.
- Promote a competent and well-trained Family Court CCAN Bar by ensuring compliance with Practice Standards and certification requirements and conducting annual training and monthly training sessions for attorneys.
- Enhance accountability to the public through the continuation of a program developed to increase compliance with court ordered child support payments through provision of services, enhanced supervision, and incentives to non-custodial parents.

Restructuring or Work Process Redesign

The Family Court Operations Division continues to explore innovative and effective methods of improving and streamlining case processing. The Family Court began collaboration with the Child and Family Services Agency to enhance abuse and neglect case processing through the development of electronic interfacing between the Court's case management system and the systems of the child welfare agency and the Office of the Attorney General (OAG), the agency responsible for the prosecution of abuse and neglect matters. Through grant funds received under the Court Improvement Project from the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, the Court is looking to automate the case initiation process, receipt of subsequent filings and to transfer data and documents electronically between the agencies. This initiative will result in improved efficiency for the Family Court and its partnering agencies through the elimination of the manual filing process, improved data quality and the provision of timely access to case information for judicial officers and court staff. The project is to proceed in phases with case initiation being the first phase. The Court expects to begin case initiation and receive abuse and neglect filings from the agency electronically.

The Family Court Central Intake Center (CIC) pilots eFile Lite, a secure web based browser application that supports the electronic filing and receipt of documents. The implementation of eFile Lite in the Family Court allows for the receipt of post case initiation petitions and other filings in juvenile cases from the Office of the Attorney General (OAG), the agency with responsibility for prosecuting delinquency cases in the District of Columbia. The agency transmits pleadings to an electronic queue where they are reviewed for accuracy by CIC staff and either rejected or accepted into the Court's case management system. Upon acceptance, images of the filings immediately appear on the Court's docket and are readily available for viewing by judges and Court personnel. The eFile Lite technology reduces scanning and provides a convenient method of filing for the OAG by reducing their visits to the courthouse to file documents. Plans are underway to expand the eFile Lite technology first to judicial staff to support the filing of signed court orders and later to other filing entities.

In addition to and related to the identity consolidation efforts, the Family Court Operations managers are developing policy and protocols for identifying and linking family members through the Family Identification Number (FID), a functionality of the Court's case management system, CourtView, that identifies members of a particular family through a unique number. The Family Court, in consultation with the Information Technology Division, has developed rules to create an electronic program that will identify members of the same family and assign the appropriate FIDs. This process will be applied to all identities converted from legacy systems into CourtView as well as to identities subsequently entered into CourtView. Going forward, the rules created for the automated assignment of the FIDs will guide the Family Court in identifying and linking family members as their cases are entered into the system. Linking family members through a unique FID is important to effective case processing in that it aids Court staff in ensuring that cases involving the same family are assigned before one judicial officer or judicial team. Moreover, it supports judicial efficiency and informed judicial decision making in that judges are able to hear all cases involving a family at one hearing, thus avoiding the entry of conflicting orders regarding that family.

Workload Data

Table 1
FAMILY COURT OPERATIONS
Caseload and Efficiency Measures
(Fiscal Year 2007 Data)

	Cases Filed	Cases Disposed	Clearance Rate*	Cases Pending		
				1-Oct	30-Sep	Change
Abuse & Neglect	605	857	142%	2,537	2,285	-10%
Adoption	253	295	117%	354	312	-12%
Divorce/Custody/Miscellaneous	3,769	3,454	92%	2,646	2,961	12%
Family Special Proceedings	246	58	24%	186	374	101% **
Juvenile Delinquency	3,044	3,134	103%	2,402	2,312	-4%
Mental Health/Mental Retardation	1,326	1,519	115%	4,403	4,210	-4%
Paternity & Child Support	4,275	3,999	94%	6,572	6,848	4%
Total	13,518	13,316	99%	19,100	19,302	1.06%

*Ratio of cases disposed to cases filed in a given year. Standard efficiency measure is 100%, meaning one case disposed for each case filed.
** Significant pending caseload increase due to the passage of the School Attendance Act

Table 2
FAMILY COURT OPERATIONS
Key Performance Indicators

Performance Indicator	Data Source	FY 2007		FY 2008		Projection FY 2009 *	Projection FY 2010 *
		Goal	Actual	Goal	Actual		
Prisoner Transfers Processed	Monthly Statistics	2481	2247	2239	2239	2726	2800
Delinquency & Neglect Cases/Orders Reviewed	Monthly Statistics	19765	18932	20317	20317	21703	23089
Delinquency & Neglect Cases Corrected	Monthly Statistics	500	656	711	711	767	823
Applications for Marriage Licenses & Minister Authorizations	Computer Reports	2872	2799	2616	2796	2649	2502
Marriage Licenses & Authorizations Issued	Computer Reports	2733	2511	2279	2599	2431	2263
Petitions & Complaints Total Intake	Computer Reports	13000	13520	14100	14,061	14,603	14,820
Domestic & Child Support Hearings Set	Computer Reports	29126	30092	31898	27,864	29,787	30,908
Domestic Orders Issued	Computer Reports	8500	8428	8597	8652	8832	9012
Child Support Orders Issued	Computer Reports	2356	1072	1070	1743	1875	2008
MR Advocate Training Sessions**	Computer Log	275	0	118	24	159	214
New MR Advocates Recruited **	Computer Log	500	8	25	5	100	200
MR Advocates Trained **	Computer; Training Log	740	107	75	4	150	200
MR Cases with MR Advocates **	Computer Log	386	355	300	308	560	756
ASFA case reviews in initial, further initial, pretrial, stipulation, disposition and permanency hearings	Monthly Statistics	5386	3334	3718	3720	3850	4017
Data input and other error notifications distributed by Attorney Advisors	Monthly Statistics	880	616	770	707	737	792
CCAN Attorneys appointed to Adult Parties in Abuse & Neglect cases	Monthly Statistics	3533	2139	2184	2100	801	609
Guardians <i>ad litem</i> Appointed	Monthly Statistics	1393	1043	1073	936	394	305
Trainings Provided to Attorneys**	CCAN Records	33	16	16	16	16	16
Attorneys Meeting CLE Requirements	CCAN Records	159	150	142	153	148	142

*Statistical regression method applied to actual totals

** Projections based upon program goals.

FY 2010 Request

In FY 2010 the Courts request \$ 16,436,000 for Family Court Operations, an increase of \$929,000 (6%) above the FY 2009 Enacted Budget. The requested increase includes \$112,000 for 1 FTE to strengthen families and parent/child relationships in families with child support orders by implementing the D.C. Fathering Court Initiative and \$ 817,000 for built-in cost increases.

Fathering Court Initiative: Fathering Court Program Manager (JS-13), \$112,000

Problem Statement. A staggering number of children in the District of Columbia grow up absent meaningful relationships with and financial support from their fathers. When such failures occur, the District of Columbia is left with the financial responsibility associated with raising these children and mending the effects of broken families. In fiscal 2007 there were nearly 70,000 active Title IV-D¹³ child support cases in Superior Court. In almost half of these cases (32,000), the non-custodial parent, typically the father, was in arrears, representing over \$278 million owed in child support.

Adopting a best practice from other jurisdictions, the Court initiated a pilot Fathering Court to help non-custodial parents who are unable to pay child support find long-term, substantive employment and acquire tools to become fully participating, active parents. The goal is to reunite these parents with their children, thereby strengthening families and breaking negative cycles.

The Court's current pilot program is grant-funded and limited to fathers reentering the community after a period of incarceration. Between 500 and 550 noncustodial parents return from prison each year, approximately two-thirds of whom report unemployment at the time of release. In many cases these fathers are simply ill-equipped to handle the rigors of parenting and, therefore, have no meaningful chance to build a healthy family unit. Many fathers, due to a number of circumstances, including prior incarceration, educational deficiencies, alcohol or substance abuse issues, and inconsistent or poor work histories, are unable to fulfill their child support obligations consistently. The pilot program is a partnership with the Court Services and Offender Supervision Agency (CSOSA), the Office of the Attorney General's Child Support Services Division (CSSD), the Criminal Justice Coordinating Council (CJCC), D.C. Department of Employment Services (DOES), Department of Human Services (DHS), Federal Bureau of Prisons (BOP), Healthy Families/Thriving Communities Collaborative Council (HFTC), and the Urban Institute. Funding is provided through the Department of Justice Prisoner Reentry Initiative and Byrne Justice Administration grants.

The FY 2010 budget request would permit the Court to continue the Fathering Court following the expiration of the grant at the end of FY 2009 and expand the program to include the broader

¹³ Title IV-D of the Social Security Act (42 U.S. Code 651 *et seq*)

universe of non-custodial parents having difficulty sustaining employment, making child support payments, and establishing fulfilling relationships with their children.

Relationship to Court Mission, Vision and Strategic Goals. This request supports the Courts’ Strategic Goal 6.2: The D.C. Courts will be accountable to the public by establishing programs and procedures based on proven practices and research that enhance the administration of justice.

Relationship to Divisional Objectives. The program objective is consistent with the Family Court’s mission to protect and support children brought before it and to strengthen families in trouble. Likewise, the program supports the Division’s goal of encouraging and promoting collaboration with the community and community organizations that provide services to children and families served by the Family Court.

Relationship to Existing Funding. There is currently no appropriated funding for the Fathering Court Pilot Program, which operates with one (1) grant-funded staff member, the program manager, and expects to have one or two grant-funded case monitors in FY 2009. All current grant funding will be exhausted by the end of FY 2009.

Methodology. A position description has been developed for the Fathering Court Program Manager, who is responsible for establishing and maintaining relationships with partner agencies, developing operating procedures with these agencies, performing extensive community outreach, and coordinating social services for the program participants. The position was classified in accordance with the D.C. Courts’ Personnel Policies and Procedures.

Expenditure Plan. The Courts’ Comprehensive Personnel Policies will guide the selection and hiring process.

Performance Indicators. The Fathering Court Initiative program success will be measured through performance indicators designed by an independent program evaluator. Preliminary performance measures include the amount of child support paid, the number of participants who are employed, number of participants enrolled in job training programs, and the noncustodial parents’ increased participation with their children.

Table 3
FAMILY COURT OPERATIONS
New Position Requested

Position	Grade	Number	Salary	Benefits	Total Personnel Cost
Fathering Court Program Manager	13	1	\$90,000	\$22,000	\$112,000

Table 4
FAMILY COURT OPERATIONS
Budget Authority by Object Class

	FY 2008 Enacted	FY 2009 Enacted	FY 2010 Request	Difference FY 2009/2010
11 – Compensation	10,170,000	10,850,000	11,559,000	709,000
12 – Benefits	2,543,000	2,713,000	2,890,000	177,000
<i>Subtotal Personnel Cost</i>	<i>12,713,000</i>	<i>13,563,000</i>	<i>14,449,000</i>	<i>886,000</i>
21 - Travel, Transp. of Persons				
22 - Transportation of Things				
23 - Rent, Commun. & Utilities	207,000	212,000	217,000	5,000
24 - Printing & Reproduction	25,000	26,000	27,000	1,000
25 - Other Services	595,000	1,351,000	1,380,000	29,000
26 - Supplies & Materials	29,000	34,000	35,000	1,000
31 – Equipment	314,000	321,000	328,000	7,000
<i>Subtotal Non Personnel Cost</i>	<i>1,170,000</i>	<i>1,944,000</i>	<i>1,987,000</i>	<i>43,000</i>
TOTAL	13,883,000	15,507,000	16,436,000	929,000
FTE	180	182	183	1

Table 5
FAMILY COURT OPERATIONS
Detail, Difference FY 2009/2010

Object Class	Description of Request	FTE	Cost	Difference FY 2009/2010
11 - Compensation	Fathering Court Initiative	1	90,000	
	Current Position WIGS	182	163,000	
	Current Positions COLA	182	456,000	
Subtotal				709,000
12 – Benefits	Fathering Court Initiative	1	22,000	
	Current Positions WIGS	182	41,000	
	Current Positions COLA	182	114,000	
Subtotal				177,000
21 - Travel, Transp. of Persons				
22 - Transportation of Things				
23 - Rent, Commun. & Utilities	Built-in			5,000
24 - Printing & Reproduction	Built-in			1,000
25 - Other Service	Built-in			29,000
26 – Supplies & Materials	Built-in			1,000
31 – Equipment	Built-in			7,000
Total				929,000

Table 6
FAMILY COURT OPERATIONS
Detail of Full-Time Equivalent Employment

	FY 2008 Enacted	FY 2009 Enacted	FY 2010 Request
JS-3			
JS-4	7	7	5
JS-5			
JS-6	21	22	29
JS-7	31	15	11
JS-8	40	50	51
JS-9	36	38	35
JS-10	9	12	14
JS-11	8	10	10
JS-12	11	11	9
JS-13	14	14	15
JS-14	2	2	1
JS-15			2
JS-16			
JS-17			
CES	1	1	1
Total Salaries	10,170,000	10,850,000	11,559,000
Total	180	182	183

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

<u>FY 2008 Enacted</u>		<u>FY 2009 Enacted</u>		<u>FY 2010 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>
133	15,002,000	138	16,097,000	138	20,602,000	0	4,505,000

Mission Statement

The mission of the Social Services Division (SSD) is to assist the District of Columbia Superior Court’s Family Court and the District’s juvenile justice system in the rehabilitation of youths and, to the maximum extent possible, their families, through the provision of comprehensive services and probation supervision to protect communities, enhance public safety and prevent recidivism.

Organizational Background

The SSD is responsible for all youth involved in the District of Columbia’s juvenile justice system who are not committed to the District’s Department of Youth Rehabilitative Services (DYRS). Responsibilities include 1) screening and assessing each youth’s risk to public safety, conducting youth and family assessments, making petition recommendations to the Office of the Attorney General (OAG) and advising the Court throughout all phases of the adjudication process; 2) conducting home, school, and community assessments toward the development of sound comprehensive pre- and post-disposition probation supervision plans and alternatives to detention; recommending and facilitating the commitment of youth to the custody of the District of Columbia; and 3) coordinating services for youth and families and monitoring all court-involved youth. The Division is comprised of the director’s office, four branches, and two additional units:

- The Director’s Office is responsible for management and oversight of all objectives, programs, and activities across the division. The office has 10 FTEs.
- The Juvenile Information Control Unit processes all cases throughout adjudication using the court’s Integrated Justice Information System (IJIS) CourtView database. The Unit has 5 FTEs.
- The Contract Monitoring and Purchase of Services Unit coordinates all court-ordered referrals, oversees the procurement of services and coordination of reimbursement for services provided by contracted vendors. The Unit also coordinates the Division’s staff trainings. The unit has 3 FTEs.
- The Intake Services Status Offender and Juvenile Drug Court Branch is comprised of three units including two dedicated to day and evening Intake services, one dedicated to youth participating in the Status Offender and Juvenile Drug Court Unit. Intake Units I and II are responsible for screening risk to public safety and conducting (youth and family) social assessments on all youth referred by other law enforcement entities and District of

Columbia Public School (DCPS), presenting all referrals before a judicial officer (the juvenile equivalent of an arraignment), and pre-trial recommendations. The Status Offender and Juvenile Drug Court Unit is responsible for screening, diverting, petitioning, serving, and supervising all youths referred by DCPS and/or a parent alleging the youth to be habitually truant (status offense) or a Person in Need of Supervision (PINS), and all youth participating in the Juvenile Drug Court (JDC) diversion or post-disposition program. The branch consists of 25 FTEs.

- The Pre/Post Probation Supervision Branch Region I culminates the integration of pre-trial and pre-disposition case management, monitoring/supervision, community outreach and global position system (GPS) electronic monitoring. The Branch consists of four units: 1) Leaders of Today in Solidarity (LOTS), the city's first ever female gender-specific seamless probation measure; 2) the Southwest Satellite Office (SWSO), created to address the needs of youth residing in the southwest quadrant of the city; 3) the Southeast Satellite Office (SESO) Balanced and Restorative Justice Drop-In Center, created in FY 2007 to replace the former Southeast Field Unit; and 4) the Delinquency Prevention Unit (DPU), which manages the SSD's GPS electronic monitoring, diversion of low-to-moderate risk youth from secure detention, public safety community education and outreach, and collaboration with the Metropolitan Police Department (MPD) to retrieve youth for whom a custody order has been issued by a Judge. The branch consists of 35 FTEs.
- The Pre/Post Probation Supervision Branch Region II culminates a seamless set of services and monitoring/supervision efforts provided by one probation officer of record. The branch consist of the following four units: 1) the Northwest Satellite Office – NWSO, responsible for serving and supervising the vast majority of youth residing in the Northwest quadrant of the city; 2) the newly created Balanced and Restorative Justice Drop-In Center in Northeast (which replaced the old Northeast Satellite Office), responsible for serving and supervising all youth residing in the northeast quadrant of the District; 3) Ultimate Transitions Ultimate Responsibilities Now (UTURN), responsible for supervising high-risk pre- and post-adjudicated youth throughout the city; and the Interstate Probation Supervision Office. This branch consists of 53 FTEs.
- The Child Guidance Clinic/Branch provides psychological, psycho-educational, neuro-psychological, competency, and public safety evaluations utilized to determine the needs of each youth and family and guide judicial decision-making. The branch also provides individual psychotherapy to youth. The unit has 7 FTEs and 3 paid interns.

Division Management Action Plan (MAP) Objectives

The Social Services Division will—

- Use valid Risk Assessment Instrument (RAI) and social assessment interviews on all youth within four hours of referral, ensuring sound detention/release and petitioning recommendations and expeditious case processing initiation by transferring 90% of all cases to appropriate units within three business days of the initial hearing.

- Provide high quality screenings, assessments, services, and supervision to all referred youth determined appropriate for diversion and petitioning including a family group conference within ten days of petitioning as well as post-adjudication supervision.
- Ensure accurate and timely processing of all services requested by probation officers or ordered by court by processing all referrals and invoices within three business days, beginning January 1, 2009.
- Coordinate and facilitate family group conferences (FGC) for all youth within ten days of receiving the case, to determine the appropriate levels of services and community supervision necessary to achieve the objectives detailed in all pre-trial and post-disposition plans for 90% of all juveniles, beginning January 1, 2009.
- Conduct high-quality, comprehensive home studies for families involved in domestic relations cases by completing 95% of home studies within nine weeks of the court order.
- Develop comprehensive strength-based social studies to guide services and supervision of all juveniles (as ordered by the court) within five weeks of the court order.
- Ensure comprehensive service delivery and community supervision for all youth referred via Interstate Compact who reside within a 20 mile radius of the District and ensure all cases adjudicated in the District involving youth residing outside of the radius are transferred to the appropriate jurisdiction for services and supervision.
- Provide high-quality psychological, psycho-sexual, and psycho-educational evaluations to all youth within 20 business days of the court order, beginning January 1, 2009.

Restructuring or Work Process Re-Design

Consistent with re-design projections detailed in FY 2007, in FY 2008 SSD successfully completed the final phase of its seamless probation supervision and case management logic-model. To ensure adequate management and oversight of each office/unit, the SSD created two branches entitled: Pre & Post-Disposition Supervision Region I and Region II. Each branch consists of four offices or units. Under the new case management and probation supervision model, probation officers (excluding officers designated solely to screen, assess and present cases at the youth's first court appearance), are responsible for pre-trial, pre- and post-disposition case management, coordination of services, and supervision monitoring. These activities include, progress reporting, pre-trial and post-trial service planning, and supervision/monitoring.

To guide probation officers' transition to the new seamless case management model, extensive training was conducted in child development, diversity, strength-based investigative interviews, approaches, and restorative justice principles. In FY 2008 the SSD's senior management team collaborated with supervisors to identify and develop specific training tracks. Also in FY 2008, the SSD expanded its training in the area of Family Group Conferencing (FGC) certification.

FGC training guides probation officers in the use of the FGC model (an internationally recognized method for reducing delinquency, abuse, and neglect). Families are engaged and empowered to help identify solutions and assist the court in serving and supervising the young. Additionally, practicum-oriented supervisory sessions are essential to guide probation officers in the use of the skill and provide sound feedback.

Workload Data

Table 1
SOCIAL SERVICES DIVISION
 Caseload (Fiscal Year 2007 data)

Case Type	New Cases	Cases Closed	Cases Pending Beginning of Year	Cases Pending End of Year	Increase Rate
Juvenile Intake	2,050	2,027	7	30	.9%
Pre/ Post Dispo. Supervision	2318	2373	1430	1375	N/A
Juvenile Drug Court	42	31	37	48	28%
Domestic Relations	74	80	25	19	12%
Child Guidance Clinic	456	457	4	3	7.5%

Table 2
SOCIAL SERVICES DIVISION
 Key Performance Indicators

Performance Indicators	Data Source	FY 2007		FY 2008		Projection	Projection
		Goal	Actual	Goal	Estimate	FY 2009	FY 2010
Juveniles under supervision and Domestic Relations cases	D.C. Superior Court Data	1,695	1,472	1,500	1,525	1,540	1,560
Juveniles under supervision and drug screening conducted	Pretrial Services Data	5,285	5,152	5,160	5,165	5,180	5,190
Juvenile probationers screening positive for drugs during probation	Pretrial Services Data	49%	50%	49%	49%	49%	47%
Percentage of juveniles successfully completing probation	SSD Statistical Reports	35%	36%	36%	35%	37%	37%
Juveniles committing new offenses during probation	D.C. Superior Court Data	25%	24%	24%	25%	24%	24%
Average pre and post-disposition supervision caseloads and national standards: 1:25 med and 1:15 max	SSD Statistical Reports	33	34	27	27	25	25
Average Intensive Supervision caseloads to national standards 1:25 med	SSD Statistical Reports	16	13	15	14	14	14
Curfew checks with face-to-face contact	SSD Statistical Reports	15,600	14,752	17,700	17,400	17,950	17,950
Curfew checks by telephone call	SSD Statistical Reports	24,392	29,916	30,250	30,400	30,500	30,500
Compliance among youth with curfew checks	SSD Statistical Reports	70%	73%	75%	70%	75%	78%

Division Outcomes and Accomplishments in FY 2008

In FY 2007 the SSD opened the nation's first Balance and Restorative Justice (BARJ) Drop-In Center, located in Southeast. The center, which has and continues to receive national acclaim, became fully operational during the fall of FY 2007. This multi-faceted facility includes a satellite probation office and serves as an alternative to detention for medium-to-high risk non-violent youth. It offers an array of services, family education and support, tutoring, recreation and one nutritious meal daily in a structured environment for youth who would otherwise be detained. From October 2007 through April 2008, 318 youth were supervised pre-trial without

the use of detention or shelter housing, of which 96% remained arrest-free and 94% maintained regular school attendance as well as increased performance. The Center has been recognized by local and national media outlets.

Table 3
BARJ Drop-In Center

Month/Year	Oct 07	Nov 07	Dec 07	Jan 08	Feb 08	Mar 08	Apr 08
Youth in Program	41	28	28	23	25	28	39
% not suspended from school	90%	94%	92%	100%	88%	100%	96%
% not rearrested	95%	94%	92%	92%	100%	100%	100%

Among Pre- and Post-Disposition Branches: Region I and Region II, an average of 1,255 adolescent males were under supervision from October 2007 through March 2008. Also, approximately 624 or 50% of youth supervised in community settings (e.g., BARJ, pre- or post-probation or court ordered Consent Decree) were under court ordered curfews and/or other conditions. Additionally, 7,546 face-to-face curfew checks and 16,447 telephone curfew checks were conducted (See Table 4).

Table 4
Curfew Checks

Month/Year	Oct 07	Nov 07	Dec 07	Jan 08	Feb 08	Mar 08
Face-to-Face	1,325	1,218	896	1,252	1,334	1,521
Telephone	2,715	2,775	2,743	2,655	2,791	2,768

From October 2007 thru March 2008, an average of 83.8% of youth were in compliance with court ordered curfews, school attendance, and stay away restrictions as a condition of pre- and post-disposition probation. In addition, 90% of parents complied with court-ordered parent participation.

Table 5
Parent Participation

Month/Year	Oct 07	Nov 07	Dec 07	Jan 08	Feb 08	Mar 08
Parent Participation Orders	872	820	754	765	706	751
Compliance	795	728	666	687	648	646
% Compliance among parents	91%	89%	88%	90%	92%	86%

The Leaders of Today in Solidarity program (LOTS), the District of Columbia's first ever gender-specific seamless set of pre-trial, pre-disposition, and post-disposition adolescent girls' probation initiative continued its cutting edge approach in the supervision of females. During FY 2007, with an average of 227 cases per month, the recidivism rate was less than 5%. In 2008, the SSD sponsored its first Civil Rights Tour, which permitted twenty-five LOTS girls to travel to many landmarks of the Civil Rights Movement, from Birmingham, Alabama to Atlanta, Georgia. LOTS' staff members have presented at local and national conferences and are currently preparing to launch a comprehensive Life Skills Training Program designed to enhance the youths' opportunities for success.

FY 2010 Request

In FY 2010, the Courts request \$20,602,000 for the Social Services Division, an increase of \$4,505,000 (28%) above the FY 2009 Enacted Budget. This increase includes \$3,650,000 to enhance juvenile probation services and \$855,000 for built-in cost increases.

Enhancing Juvenile Probation Services, \$3,650,000

Problem Statement. To enhance the rehabilitation of court-involved juveniles, the Courts seek additional resources—services and facilities—to more closely supervise youth. Increased demand for services and the need to enhance programs mandates increased resources to allow the SSD to maintain its high level of service to the community.

The number of court-ordered referrals for services nearly doubled from 2002 to 2006 and they remain high. Services provided to youth under court supervision include tutoring, third-party monitoring, global positioning systems (GPS) electronic monitoring, parent education and empowerment initiatives, self-esteem, street law related education, crisis counseling services, and individual and family counseling services, as well as tutoring and mentoring associated with Southeast Balance and Restorative Justice Drop-In Center. These services, typically purchased from various vendors, coupled with requirements for leased space in the community, and supplies necessary to support SSD programming, require additional funds.

Additionally, SSD is slated to open a new Northeast Balance and Restorative Justice Drop-In Center, requiring additional funds to support requisite programming (e.g., tutoring, third-party monitoring, GPS electronic monitoring, parent education and empowerment initiatives, self-esteem, street law related education, crisis counseling services, and individual and family counseling services, tutoring and mentoring). The Northeast BARJ Center will join the Southeast BARJ Center, established in 2007 with a grant of federal Violent Offender Truth in Sentencing (VOTIS) funds an alternative to detention for medium-to-high risk non-violent youth.

To reduce reliance on secure detention and shelter home placement while preserving public safety, the Division must maximize its satellite probation offices in each quadrant of the city. With the tremendous success achieved by the Southeast Drop-In Center and with the Northeast Drop-In Center nearing completion, the Courts need resources to lease and build-out spaces to replicate this model in other areas of the city. One BARJ-Drop-In center will be located in the Southwest quadrant of the city to serve the current southwest juvenile population, averaging 150 youth at any given time. Another BARJ Drop-In Center will be centrally located to house our nationally recognized adolescent female LOTS Unit created to serve our female juvenile population, which averages 225 girls from across the city at any given time.

Relationship to Court Vision, Mission and Goals. Additional funds will permit the SSD the ability to enhance services for court-involved youths consistent with the Courts' Strategic Goal 6.2 related to accountability to the public. In particular, it supports Strategy 6.2.6 of providing effective supervision of juvenile probationers to promote public safety and rehabilitation, and reduce recidivism.

Relationship to Division Objectives. This request supports several MAP Objectives, including Objective 7) Ensure comprehensive delivery of services and community supervision.

Relationship to Existing Funding. Following careful reengineering additional funds are needed to ensure court-involved youth are adequately served and supervised. Existing resources do not support the facilities required.

Methodology. The cost of this request is composed of the following:

Table 6
Request Detail

Object Class	Description	Amount
23	Leases	\$179,000
23	CSS Nextel Communications	\$15,000
See below	Creation of BARJ Drop-In Center	\$2,250,000
25	Purchase of Services Program	\$581,000
25	Tutoring and Educational Support Services (NE BARJ Drop-In Center)	\$290,000
25	Drama-Based Social Development and Expressive Arts Program	\$90,000
25	Parenting/Caregiver Training Program (NE BARJ Drop-In Center)	\$78,000
25	Nutrition and Healthy Eating Training Program (NE BARJ Drop-In Center)	\$60,000
25	Saturday Mediation Program (NE BARJ Drop-In Center)	\$21,000
25	Health and Fitness Systems (NE BARJ Drop-In Center)	\$14,000
25	College Tour	\$8,000
26	Child Guidance Clinic Testing Supplies	\$40,000
31	BRAJ Educational Center Laptops	\$25,000
Total		\$3,650,000

Table 7
Drop-In Center Cost Detail

	Annual Lease	One Time Build-Out	Services	Total
Drop-In Center	\$360,000	\$1,600,000	\$290,000	\$2,250,000

Expenditure Plan. Requests for proposals will be released during the second month of FY 2010. Reviews and awards will occur shortly thereafter, permitting the SSD to expand both the array and volume of services. The lease, build-out, and services for the Drop-In Center would be procured according to Court policies.

Key Performance Indicators. Additional funds requested will permit the Division to engage youths and families more effectively, to develop service and supervision plans, to access timely services, to ensure public safety as well as to reduce recidivism. Key performance indicators anticipated are as follows:

- Increased curfew monitoring and face-to-face contacts
- Increase in number of youth successfully completing probation
- Increase in the number of POS units for youths referred for services
- Reduction in the number of youth rearrested during court involvement
- Reduction in the loss of contact with youths
- Decrease in the number of curfew violations and reports filed
- Reduction in the number of youths remanded to detention facilities

- Increased academic performance

Table 8
SOCIAL SERVICES DIVISION
Budget Authority by Object Class

	FY 2008 Enacted	FY 2009 Enacted	FY 2010 Request	Difference FY 2009/FY 2010
11 - Personnel Compensation	10,328,000	11,167,000	11,804,000	637,000
12 - Personnel Benefits	2,582,000	2,793,000	2,959,000	166,000
Subtotal Personnel Cost	12,910,000	13,960,000	14,763,000	803,000
21 - Travel, Transp. of Persons	0	0	0	0
22 - Transportation of Things	0	0	0	0
23 - Rent, Commun. & Utilities	0	0	554,000	554,000
24 - Printing & Reproduction	0	0	0	0
25 - Other Services	2,030,000	2,073,000	5,154,000	3,081,000
26 - Supplies & Materials	30,000	31,000	72,000	41,000
31 - Equipment	32,000	33,000	59,000	26,000
Subtotal Non-Personnel Cost	2,092,000	2,137,000	5,839,000	3,702,000
TOTAL	15,002,000	16,097,000	20,602,000	4,505,000
FTE	133	138	138	0

Table 9
SOCIAL SERVICES DIVISION
Detail, Difference FY 2009/FY 2010

Object Class	Description of Request	FTE	Cost	Difference FY 2009/FY 2010
11 - Personnel Compensation	Current Position WIG	138	168,000	
	Current Position COLA	138	469,000	
Subtotal				637,000
12 - Personnel Benefits	Current Position WIG	138	44,000	
	Current Position COLA	138	122,000	
Subtotal				166,000
21 - Travel, Transp. of Persons				
22 - Transportation of Things				
23 - Rent, Commun. & Utilities	Enhancing Juvenile Probation Services			554,000
24 - Printing & Reproduction				
25 - Other Service	Enhancing Juvenile Probation Services		3,031,000	
	Built-in		50,000	
Subtotal				3,081,000
26 - Supplies & Materials	Enhancing Juvenile Probation Services		40,000	
	Built-in		1,000	
Subtotal				41,000
31 - Equipment	Enhancing Juvenile Probation Services		25,000	
	Built-in		1,000	
Subtotal				26,000
Total				4,505,000

Table 8
SOCIAL SERVICES DIVISION
Detail of Full-Time Equivalent Employment

	2008 Enacted	2009 Enacted	2010 Request
JS-3			
JS-4			
JS-5			
JS-6	3	3	3
JS-7	4	4	4
JS-8	17	17	19
JS-9	16	21	29
JS-10	2	2	2
JS-11	3	3	4
JS-12	61	61	50
JS-13	20	20	21
JS-14	5	5	4
JS-15	1	1	1
JS-16			
JS-17			
CES	1	1	1
Total Salary	10,328,000	11,167,000	11,804,000
Total FTEs	133	138	138

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

<u>FY 2008 Enacted</u>		<u>FY 2009 Enacted</u>		<u>FY 2010 Request</u>		<u>Difference FY 2009/2010</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>
20	2,457,000	20	2,577,000	21	2,801,000	1	224,000

Mission Statement

The mission of the Multi-Door Dispute Resolution Division is to provide appropriate dispute resolution services to litigants and promote 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 between parties or case resolution. The Division is comprised of the Director’s office and three branches, Civil ADR, Family ADR, and Program Assessment.

1. The Civil ADR Branch provides binding and non-binding arbitration and mediation for most of the Superior Court’s civil cases. Mediation is provided for small claims cases, landlord and tenant cases, complex civil matters, and probate and tax assessment cases.
2. The Family ADR Branch includes four programs: Child Protection Mediation, Community Information and Referral, Family Mediation and the Program for Agreement and Cooperation in Contested Custody Disputes (PAC). 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 Family Mediation Program also includes PAC and a Parent Education Seminar for contested custody disputes. The Parent Education Seminar provides parents with valuable information regarding the effects and potential consequences of a custody dispute on children, and allows them to quickly and efficiently mediate a resolution of the dispute in a manner that is in the best interest of the children.
3. The Program Assessment Branch provides quality assurance through the training, evaluation, and support of 300 community-based neutrals who are lawyers, social workers, government employees, retirees, and others providing ADR services to the

community. Multi-Door staff also provides program information and technical assistance to international and domestic judges, lawyers, government officials, and court administrators who seek to establish or improve ADR programs in their own jurisdictions.

Table 1
MULTI-DOOR DISPUTE RESOLUTION DIVISION
Caseload Overview

	Mediation Sessions Scheduled	Mediations Held	Cases Settled	Settlement Rate
FY 2007	9,302	5,274	1,874	36%
FY 2008*	9,449	5,047	1,927	38%

*Projection

Division MAP Objectives

Multi-Door Dispute Resolution Division developed a management action plan (MAP) with the following objectives:

- **Quality** – ADR services will be of the highest possible quality;
- **Responsiveness** – ADR services will be delivered efficiently; and
- **Settlement** – ADR services will facilitate 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 sessions held, cases settled, and settlement rate); the “responsiveness” and “quality” objectives are measured through quality assurance performance indicators that measure satisfaction with the ADR process, outcome, and neutral performance. The quality indicators measure client satisfaction through user surveys.

The Multi-Door Division MAP includes objectives that align with and serve both the three division objectives as well as the D.C. Courts’ Strategic Plan. Multi-Door’s objectives follow:

- Provide prompt and efficient justice by developing and implementing time standards for processing cases in all ADR programs.
- Provide disputants an alternative to litigation by delivering appropriate ADR services that settle, on average, 50% of cases, and maintain an overall client satisfaction rate of 80% or better.
- Provide *pro se* litigants with access to quality agreements by developing family mediation agreement-writing software and agreement language to enable quick and comprehensive agreements.
- Promote a highly qualified and diverse mediator panel through a comprehensive program of recruitment, screening, selection, training, mentoring, evaluation, and support.
- Promote well-trained neutrals by instituting an in-service training plan to strengthen and enhance mediator performance.

Division Restructuring or Work Process Design

The Multi-Door Dispute Resolution Division continues to expand ADR services to litigants by increasing the number and type of cases where ADR services are provided. In the past year, Multi-Door has expanded services on complex civil cases and medical malpractice cases. Early intervention in these cases is an effort to dispense of cases earlier in the litigation process, before resources have been expended on discovery and other legal procedures. ADR services have also been expanded to include mediation of contested custody disputes, where parents have an opportunity to mediate their dispute following an education seminar on the harmful effects of contested custody disputes on children. In FY 2008, the Family Division implemented a unified case management system providing all *pro se* litigants an opportunity to resolve their disputes using mediation.

To support the expanded demand for ADR services in both the family and civil divisions, Multi-Door has implemented an open enrollment process to expedite recruitment of highly qualified mediators. In FY 2008, Multi-Door added 10 trained and experienced mediators to its roster through the open enrollment process.

Workload Data

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

Type of Indicator	Performance Indicator	Data Source	FY 2007 Actual	FY 2008 Estimated	Projection FY 2009	Projection FY 2010
Input	Mediation Sessions Held	CourtView	6,980	6,100	6,000	6,000
Output	Mediation sessions held	CourtView	3,790	3,400	3,400	3,400
Outcome	Case settlement rate	CourtView	37%	39%	40%	40%
Outcome/Quality	Participant Satisfaction w/ ADR Process	SPSS database	92%	96%	96%	96%
Outcome/Quality	Participant Satisfaction w/ Outcome	SPSS database	87%	87%	89%	89%
Outcome/Quality	Neutral Performance Satisfaction	SPSS database	94%	95%	95%	96%

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

Type of Indicator	Performance Indicator	Data Source	FY 2007 Actual	FY 2008 Estimated	Projection FY 2009	Projection FY 2010
Input	Sessions Scheduled	CourtView	2,322	2,449	2,490	2,505
Output	Mediation sessions held	CourtView	1,484	1,547	1,612	1,630
Outcome	Case settlement rate	CourtView	64%	66%	68%	70%
Outcome/Quality	Participant satisfaction w/ process	SPSS database	96%	97%	98%	99%
Outcome/Quality	Participant satisfaction w/outcome	SPSS database	94%	93%	94%	95%
Outcome/Quality	Neutral performance satisfaction	SPSS database	97%	98%	99%	99%

The quality performance elements reported in Tables 2 and 3 above are measured through participant surveys distributed to all ADR participants after the ADR session is held. The

statistics report the “percentage of respondents” who report being either “satisfied” or “highly satisfied” with the overall ADR process, outcome, and neutral performance. Caseload projections are based on gradual increases in response to increased outreach efforts and long-term trend fluctuations. Settlement rate projections are based on a continuing upward trend and long-term trend fluctuations. Client satisfaction survey rate projections are based on a continuing upward trend that levels off at 94% and 99%.

Key Performance Indicators

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” from at least 30% of respondents in each of the three quality performance indicators (ADR process, ADR outcome, and neutral performance) and overall satisfaction rates (a combination of “satisfied” and “highly satisfied” responses) of at least 80%. Key performance indicators drawn from the Multi-Door MAP are as follows:

Table 4
MULTI-DOOR DISPUTE RESOLUTION DIVISION
Key Performance Indicators

Type of Indicator	Key Performance Indicator	Data Source	Actual FY 2007	Estimated FY 2008	Projection FY 2009	Projection FY 2010
Output	Achieve settlement of 50% of cases	IJIS database	36%	38%	40%	40%
Outcome	Achieve overall client satisfaction of 80%*	SPSS database	93%	94%	95%	96%

*The target for combined satisfaction ratings (“satisfied” plus “highly satisfied”) is 80%.

FY 2010 Request

In FY 2010 the D.C. Courts request \$2,801,000 for the Multi-Door Dispute Resolution Division, an increase of \$224,000 (9%) above the FY 2009 Enacted Budget. The requested increase consists of \$95,000 for 1 FTE to mediate complex civil cases and \$129,000 for built-in cost increases.

Special Civil Mediator (JS-12), \$95,000

Problem statement. To institutionalize a temporary position to meet high demand for mediation in complex civil cases, the Courts request a Special Civil Mediator. The temporary Special Civil Mediator performed an essential function for the court by mediating complex, multi-party, civil disputes referred directly by the civil judges of the Superior Court (e.g., Nationals Baseball eminent domain case). The Special Civil Mediator performs duties that require a law degree and a high level of expertise in mediation as applied to a variety of complex civil disputes. In 2006, the Special Civil Mediator mediated 182 civil cases. Of those cases, 66% were settled as a result of mediation. It is essential to the operation of the civil trial calendar to offer the services of a full-time mediator to accept direct referrals from civil court judges and attorneys on complex

civil matters that would otherwise require many hours of judicial time. The resolution of complex civil matters assists the court in removing hundreds of cases annually from the court's docket and provides litigants with a fast and effective alternative to lengthy and costly litigation.

Relationship to Court Mission, Vision and Strategic Goals. The Special Civil Mediator would support the Courts' Strategic Goal 1.2 of resolving cases promptly and efficiently. In particular, it supports Strategy 1.2.1 of using alternative dispute resolution to manage cases.

Relationship to Divisional Objectives. This position directly impacts the success of the Divisions' strategic objective to provide efficient and effective alternative dispute resolution to a wide variety of complex civil disputes.

Relationship to Existing Funding. The division has no excess personnel funding for this position.

Methodology. The position is graded at a grade 12 based on the Courts' classification policies for comparable staff positions.

Expenditure Plan. The requested employee will be recruited and hired according to DC Courts' Personnel Policies.

Performance Indicators. Success of the position will be measured through the employee's performance plan, which will include performance based skills evaluation, dispute resolution knowledge and the ability to facilitate negotiated settlements.

Table 5
MULTI-DOOR DISPUTE RESOLUTION DIVISION
New Position Requested

Position	Grade	Number	Annual Salary	Benefits	Total Personnel Costs
Special Civil Mediator	12	1	\$76,000	\$19,000	\$95,000

Table 6
MULTI-DOOR DISPUTE RESOLUTION DIVISION
Budget Authority by Object Class

	FY 2008 Enacted	FY 2009 Enacted	FY 2010 Request	Difference FY 2009/FY 2010
11 - Personnel Compensation	1,459,000	1,542,000	1,706,000	164,000
12 - Personnel Benefits	365,000	386,000	428,000	42,000
Subtotal Personnel Cost	1,824,000	1,928,000	2,134,000	206,000
21 - Travel, Transp. of Persons			0	0
22 - Transportation of Things			0	0
23 - Rent, Commun. & Utilities			0	0
24 - Printing & Reproduction			0	0
25 - Other Services	623,000	637,000	653,000	16,000
26 - Supplies & Materials	6,000	7,000	8,000	1,000
31 - Equipment	4,000	5,000	6,000	1,000
Subtotal Non Personnel Cost	633,000	649,000	667,000	18,000
TOTAL	2,457,000	2,577,000	2,801,000	224,000
FTE	20	20	21	1

Table 7
MULTI-DOOR DISPUTE RESOLUTION DIVISION
Detail, Difference FY 2009/FY 2010

Object Class	Description of Request	FTE	Cost	Difference FY 2009/FY 2010
11 – Personnel Compensation	Current Position WIGS	20	23,000	
	Current Positions COLA	20	65,000	
	Special Civil Mediator	1	76,000	
	Subtotal			164,000
12 – Personnel Benefits	Current Positions WIGS	20	6,000	
	Current Positions COLA	20	17,000	
	Special Civil Mediator	1	19,000	
	Subtotal			42,000
21 - Travel, Transp. of Persons				
22 - Transportation of Things				
23 - Rent, Commun. & Utilities				
24 - Printing & Reproduction				
25 - Other Service	Built-in		16,000	
26 - Supplies & Materials	Built-in		1,000	
31 - Equipment	Built-in		1,000	
Total				224,000

Table 8
MULTI-DOOR DISPUTE RESOLUTION DIVISION
Detail of Full-Time Equivalent Employment

	FY 2008 Enacted	FY 2009 Enacted	FY 2010 Request
JS-3			
JS-4			
JS-5			
JS-6			
JS-7			1
JS-8	1	1	1
JS-9	2	1	1
JS-10	7	7	7
JS-11	4	5	5
JS-12	1	2	1
JS-13	4	3	3
JS-14			
JS-15			
JS-16			
JS-17			
CES	1	1	1
Total Salaries	1,459,000	1,542,000	1,706,000
Total	20	20	21

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

<u>FY 2008 Enacted</u>		<u>FY 2009 Enacted</u>		<u>FY 2010 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>
45	4,476,000	47	4,732,000	47	5,003,000	0	271,000

Mission Statement

The mission of the Probate Division/Office of the Register of Wills is to deliver quality services to the public fairly, promptly and effectively; to record and maintain wills and case proceedings; to monitor supervised estates of decedents, incapacitated adults, guardianships of mentally challenged adults, minors and certain trusts; to audit fiduciary accounts to ensure that the funds of disabled persons and other persons under court supervision are handled properly; and to make recommendations to judges on all ex parte filings in matters over which the Superior Court has probate jurisdiction.

Introduction

The Probate Division/Office of the Register of Wills has jurisdiction over decedents’ estates, trusts, guardianships of minors, guardianships of mentally challenged adults, and guardianship and conservatorships of adults otherwise incapacitated. Due to the aging of the baby-boomer generation, the work of the Division will only increase over the next decade, as more adults become incapacitated and need court-appointed fiduciaries to handle their personal, medical and financial affairs and as more estates are opened. The duties of the Division include processing requests to open a probate estate; requests to open a small estate when the assets are less than \$40,000; requests to establish a guardianship for a minor, mentally challenged adult or an adult otherwise incapacitated; requests to establish conservatorships to handle the financial affairs of incapacitated adults; requests to establish foreign estates and interventions; and requests to establish trusts. The Division also reviews and processes pleadings and accounts as required throughout the duration of the fiduciary case until the case is closed. Generally, an estate administration is closed upon completion, and a proceeding for a disabled person is terminated upon the death or recovery or when a minor reaches the age of 18. As a result, cases remain under the supervision of the Court and are processed and maintained by the Probate Division for many years and often decades. The Probate Division also provides direct courtroom support and maintains an extensive computerized system, available to provide public information and to ensure notice and timely disposition of any requests. During FY 2008, the Division is expected to go public – providing public access via the Court webpage to docket information concerning all large and small estates.

Organizational Background

The Probate Division consists of the Office of the Register of Wills, a front-line Clerk’s Office, a Quality Assurance Office, a Legal Branch, Auditing Branch and a Probate Systems Office.

- The Office of the Register of Wills consists of the Register of Wills, who is responsible for the management and supervision of the division, one administrative assistant and a Program Manager for the newly created Guardianship Assistance Program, for a total of 3 FTEs.
- The Clerk's Office is the operational center of the Office of the Register of Wills and the primary point of contact for the public. This office has a supervisor, deputy supervisor, two cashiers, one of whom is bilingual, and four deputy clerks, for a total of 8 FTEs.
- The newly created Quality Assurance Office provides courtroom support for the Probate Division judges, tickler processing, identity consolidation and issuance of letters of appointment to fiduciaries. It ensures the accuracy of docket entries available to the public and the proper handling of all court orders. This office consists of a supervisor, one quality assurance specialist, four courtroom clerks and two deputy clerks, for a total of 8 FTEs.
- The newly created Legal Branch combines the three legal advisors with two small estate specialists/paralegals. This branch consists of the Deputy Register of Wills, three assistant deputies, two paralegals, one legal assistant, and one deputy clerk for a total of 8 FTEs. The primary duties of the attorneys are to review pleadings and prepare recommendations to the judges on uncontested matters, represent the office in summary hearings, and advise attorneys and members of the public regarding Probate Division procedures. The small estate specialists/paralegals prepare and process petitions filed, generally by members of the public who do not have legal representation, for estates having assets of \$40,000 or less.
- The Auditing and Appraisals Branch audits accounts of fiduciaries in large estates, conservatorships, guardianships of minors and trusts under court supervision; examines requests for compensation; prepares audit reports; advises attorneys and fiduciaries on accounting procedures; monitors the filing of inventories, accounts and receipts; and conducts appraisals of tangible property. This branch has 18 FTEs, consisting of a branch manager, a supervisory auditor, 13 auditors, one appraiser and two deputy clerk.
- The Probate Systems Office is responsible for all systems of the Probate Division, including CourtView, Remote Public Access to Probate Division dockets for large and small decedents' estates, the Computers in the Courtroom pilot project, and the file room and records maintained off-site, including original wills filed with the Probate Division.

Divisional MAP Objectives

The Probate Division 2010 Management Action Plan (MAP) includes the following objectives:

- Objective 1. Ensure timely case processing by performing 95% of case processing activities within established time standards.
- Objective 2. Render all Probate forms on the Web interactive and printable and expand the forms available to the public to provide greater access to justice.
- Objective 3. Promote a well trained workforce and enhance employee performance.

Divisional Restructuring and/or Work Process Redesign

The Probate Division continues to seek ways to integrate case processing and management as part of the IJIS computerized case management system and to utilize the IJIS system to its fullest.

During FY 2008, the Probate Division:

- implemented Workflow, a paperless test system for court review of the more than 2,000 accounts filed annually (and is next in line to permit e-filing of Court pleadings);
- is scheduled to “go live” on the web with access to the dockets and lists of upcoming court events for all small and large estate cases
- was selected for a pilot project called Computers in the Courtroom, which will provide litigants with much needed access to technology, a project that will be particularly useful in will contests and other Probate Division trials that rely heavily on the review of past documents by the Court;
- completed a massive review of its cases, determining exactly which cases are open and pending before the Court, updating ticklers so that inventories and accounts will be timely filed, identifying all wards under Court supervision and where each ward is located and closing cases that are no longer under Court supervision;
- improved party maintenance substantially in Probate Division cases, which helps to ensure that members of the public receive prompt notice of upcoming Court actions; and
- developed and implemented the Guardianship Assistance Program, a partnership between the Court and social work students in local universities to provide enhanced services to those incapacitated adults who are under Court supervision.

Workload Data

As shown in Table 1, below, the Probate Division disposed of 3,287 cases during FY 2007, a 20% increase over the number of cases filed during that fiscal year.

Table 1
Caseload and Efficiency Measures
(Fiscal Year 2007 Data)

	Cases Filed	Cases Disposed	Clearance Rate*	Cases Pending		
				1-Oct	30-Sept	Change
Old Law Conservatorship	0	53	**	199	146	-27%
Foreign Proceedings	112	106	95%	0	6	n/a
Decedent's Estate	1,505	2,187	145%	1,473	791	-46%
Guardianships of Minors	31	99	319%	139	71	-49%
Adult Guardianships/Conservatorships	432	204	47%	2,203	2,431	10%
Small Estates	627	629	100%	79	77	-2%
Trusts	35	9	26%	316	342	8%
Total	2,742	3,287	120%	4,409	3,864	-12%

* 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.

** Ratio of cases disposed to cases pending as of 9/30/07 for this case type. There are no new cases of this type due to enactment of the Guardianship Protective Proceedings and Durable Power of Attorney Act of 1989. Disabled persons are now included in the Adult Guardianships/Conservatorships category.

Key Performance Indicators

Table 2
PROBATE DIVISION
Key Performance Indicators

Performance Indicator	Data Source	FY 2006		FY 2007	
		Goal	Actual	Goal	Actual
Time Standard from Filing to Disposition					
Supervised decedents' estates within 37 months	Monthly Reports	95%	*	95%	*
Small estates: within 120 days	Monthly Report	95	99%	95%	99%
Unsupervised decedents' estates within 37 months	Monthly Reports	95	*	95%	*
Requests for compensation from Guardianship Fund: within 30 days	Monthly Reports	95%	100%	95%	97%
Requests for compensation without account: within 45 days	Monthly Reports	95%	98%	95%	100%
Request for compensation with account: within 90 days	Monthly Reports	95%	95%	95%	98%
Uncontested petitions within 45 days	Monthly Report	95%	99%	95%	99%

*Data not ascertainable

FY 2010 Request

In FY 2010, the Courts request \$5,003,000 for the Probate Division, an increase of \$271,000 (6%) above the FY 2009 Enacted Budget. The requested increase consists entirely of built-in cost increases.

Table 3
PROBATE DIVISION
Budget Authority by Object Class

	FY 2008 Enacted	FY 2009 Enacted	FY 2010 Request	Difference FY 2009/2010
11 - Personnel Compensation	3,565,000	3,768,000	3,983,000	215,000
12 - Personnel Benefits	891,000	942,000	996,000	54,000
Subtotal Personnel Cost	4,456,000	4,710,000	4,979,000	269,000
21 - Travel, Transp. of Persons	0	0		0
22 - Transportation of Things	0	0		0
23 - Rent, Commun. & Utilities	0	0		0
24 - Printing & Reproduction	0	0		0
25 - Other Services	0	0		0
26 - Supplies & Materials	11,000	12,000	13,000	1,000
31 - Equipment	9,000	10,000	11,000	1,000
Subtotal Non Personnel Cost	20,000	22,000	24,000	2,000
TOTAL	4,476,000	4,732,000	5,003,000	271,000
FTE	45	47	47	0

Table 4
PROBATE DIVISION
Detail, Difference FY 2009/FY2010

Object Class	Description of Request	FTE	Cost	Difference FY 2009/FY2010
11 - Personnel Compensation	Current Positions WIGS	47	57,000	
	Current Positions COLA	47	158,000	
Subtotal				215,000
12 - Personnel Benefits	Current Positions WIGS	47	14,000	
	Current Positions COLA	47	40,000	
Subtotal				54,000
21 - Travel, Transp. of Persons				
22 - Transportation of Things				
23 - Rent, Commun. & Utilities				
24 - Printing & Reproduction				
25 - Other Service				
26 - Supplies & Materials	Built-in			1,000
31 - Equipment	Built-in			1,000
Total				271,000

Table 5
PROBATE DIVISION
Detail of Full Time Equivalent Employment

	FY 2008 Enacted	FY 2009 Enacted	FY 2010 Request
JS-3			
JS-4	2	2	
JS-5	1	1	1
JS-6	5	1	8
JS-7	1	3	5
JS-8	8	8	3
JS-9	2	2	
JS-10	2	2	2
JS-11	3	3	4
JS-12	17	17	16
JS-13	5	5	5
JS-14	1	2	1
JS-15	1	1	1
JS-16			
JS-17			
CES	1	1	1
JS Salaries	3,565,000	3,768,000	3,983,000
TOTAL	45	47	47

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

<u>FY 2008 Enacted</u>		<u>FY 2009 Enacted</u>		<u>FY 2010 Request</u>		<u>Difference FY 2009/2010</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>
27	3,189,000	27	3,340,000	27	3,504,000	0	164,000

The Special Operations Division has administrative oversight for the Tax Division, and 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, processes summons, 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 Division 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 Coordinator's Office is responsible for the timely processing and service, 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 MAP Objectives

- To provide qualified jurors to judges upon request for the purpose of *voir dire* in a timely manner 100% of the time by maintaining a comprehensive, up-to-date website that allows potential jurors to qualify themselves for jury service, defer their service dates and obtain pertinent information regarding their service via the Courts' website.
- To accept, certify and prepare 100% of tax cases on appeal for review by the court according to time standards, quality assurance, and standard operating procedures in compliance with District of Columbia Official Code and Superior Court Tax Rules.
- To develop procedures and guidelines for filing, serving, paying, and processing all appeal cases in the Appeals Coordinator's Office. To prepare and forward all Notices of Appeal filings and to certify and transmit appeal records and record indexes in which a Notice of Appeal has been received to the Court of Appeals timely (within 60 days or less of filing).

- To enhance informed judicial decision-making by maintaining a law library for judges, attorneys and court staff which provides up-to-date materials on a broad range of subjects relevant to the administration of justice.
- To provide high quality child care services for jurors, witnesses, and other persons attending court proceedings by offering age appropriate play opportunities, supportive adult supervision, and a safe stress-free environment.
- To ensure access to court proceedings by non-English speaking and deaf/hearing-impaired persons by providing, upon request, certified foreign language and sign language interpreters for defendants and other parties for court hearings within ten minutes of receipt of a “ready” request from a courtroom at least 95% of the time.

Restructuring and Work Process Redesign

Several restructuring efforts are underway in the Special Operations Division. The Jurors’ Office has continued with show cause hearings for jurors who do not report for service on their designated dates. Procedures are also being developed to bring in citizens who do not respond to the juror summons. These procedures will help to increase the number of jurors reporting for service (i.e. juror yield). The Court, in an ongoing effort to enhance jury service and improve customer satisfaction, now offers WIFI access to jurors in the Juror Business Center. The Jurors’ Office is continually updating the content of its website to include more relevant information on the jury service experience. Also, the interactive section of the website allows jurors to complete the juror qualification form, obtain last date of service, or defer the date of service online. The response to the latter from the public continues to be tremendous. Efforts are also being initiated to include a virtual tour of the Jurors’ Office on the website. Effective August 1, 2008, the Jurors’ Office will migrate from the current Legacy Mainframe system to an automated, personal-computer based Jury Management System. This new system, which is already in use in a number of state courts across the nation, is sanctioned by the National Center for State Courts. Complete with customized features, this new system is expected to enhance the Courts’ ability to report on jury-related statistics such as jury yield and utilization.

The Tax Office is developing a website that will allow parties to research, retrieve, and print tax opinions.

The Office of Court Interpreting Services (OCIS), to enhance the timely availability of foreign and sign language interpreters for court proceedings, is collaborating with the operating divisions to implement procedures that identify cases requiring interpreting services early so that they can prioritize the scheduling of these cases. The Office has also completed the development of its training modules for courtroom clerks and judges in connection with the use of interpreters.

To enhance service to the public, the Child Care Center staff continues to participate in Spanish language training to facilitate communication with Spanish-speaking customers. The staff also has been participating in customer service training. Training has also focused on curriculum development as well as skills to enable the staff better to identify and respond to the needs of the children.

Workload Data

In FY 2007, the Special Operations Division's Jurors' Office sent over 237,209 summonses to District of Columbia citizens to appear on juries; the Office of Court Interpreting Services received and fulfilled over 6,473 requests for courtroom interpreting services; the Tax Division heard and disposed of 302 tax petitions; and the Appeals Coordinators' Office received 1,011 new appeals that were filed in various division offices. This office also certified approximately 2,737 appeal records and supplemental records that were forwarded to the Court of Appeals as detailed in Table 4. In 2007, 708 children used the child care center. Tables 1 through 6 provide performance data for the Jurors' Office, the Office of Court Interpreting Services, the Tax Division, 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	Key Performance Indicator	Data Source	Projection 2008	Projection 2009	Projection 2010
Output/ Activity	# of summons sent to jurors to serve on jury duty	Courts' Information Technology (IT) Division	245,362	240,455	235,646
Output/ Activity	Jurors qualified to serve on voir dire panels	IT Division	47,767	48,722	49,696
End Outcome	Judicial requests for voir dire panels met	Court's R & D Division	82%	84%	86%
End Outcome	Jury Yield	IT Division	21%	23%	25%

Table 2
SPECIAL OPERATIONS DIVISION
Office of Court Interpreting Services
Performance Measurement Table
Requests for Spanish Language Interpretation

Type of Indicator	Performance Indicator	Data Source	FY 2007 Actual	FY 2008 Estimate	Projection FY 2009	Projection FY 2010
Input	Requests for interpreters	OCIS statistics	6,497	6,932	7,396	7,892
Output/ Activity	Interpreting services provided (cases called within 10 minutes of a "ready call" and within one hour for last minute requests)	OCIS statistics	6,473	6,909	7,371	7,865
End Outcome	Requests for interpreters met	OCIS statistics	99.6%	99.7%	99.7%	99.7%

Table 3
SPECIAL OPERATIONS DIVISION
Tax Division
Performance Measurement Table

Type of Indicator	Performance Indicator	Data Source	FY 2007 Actual	FY 2008 Projection	Projection FY 2009	Projection FY 2010
Input	Number of tax petitions filed	Court data	254	275	300	325
Output/ Activity	Number of cases prepared for hearing	Court data	374	380	380	380
End Outcome	Cases disposed	Court data	84	95	100	110
Productivity/ Efficiency	Cases disposed/cases file	Court data	31%	34.5%	33%	34%

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

Type of Indicator	Key Performance Indicator	Data Source	FY 2007 Actual	FY 2008 Estimate	Projection FY 2009	Projection FY 2010
Input	Appeals filed	Office monthly statistical reports & Annual Report	1,011	1,020	1,030	1,040
Output/ Activity	Percentage of appeal records and supplemental records certified by staff weekly	Weekly worksheets from staff, team lists and civil and criminal come-up lists	82%	85%	84%	84%
End Outcome	Percentage of appeal records and supplemental records picked-up by the Court of Appeals	Court of Appeals pick-up log	98%	98%	98%	98%

Table 5
SPECIAL OPERATIONS DIVISION
Library
Performance Measurement Table

Type of Indicator	Performance Indicator	Data Source	FY 2007 Actual	FY 2008 Projection	Projection FY 2009	Projection FY 2010
Output	Volumes held	Library Staff Data	23,200	23,432	23,666	23,903
Outcome	Users	Library Staff Data	9,151	9,609	10,089	10,593

FY 2010 Request

In FY 2010, the Courts request \$3,504,000 for the Special Operations Division, an increase of \$164,000 (5%) above the FY 2009 Enacted Budget. The requested increase consists entirely of built-in increases.

Table 6
SPECIAL OPERATIONS DIVISION
Budget Authority by Object Class

	FY 2008 Enacted	FY 2009 Enacted	FY 2010 Request	Difference FY 2009/2010
11 – Personnel Compensation	1,800,000	1,903,000	2,012,000	109,000
12 – Personnel Benefits	450,000	476,000	505,000	29,000
Subtotal Personnel Cost	2,250,000	2,379,000	2,517,000	138,000
21 - Travel, Transp. of Persons				
22 - Transportation of Things				
23 - Rent, Commun. & Utilities				
24 - Printing & Reproduction	139,000	142,000	0	-142,000
25 - Other Services	572,000	585,000	746,000	161,000
26 - Supplies & Materials	222,000	227,000	233,000	6,000
31 - Equipment	6,000	7,000	8,000	1,000
Subtotal Non Personnel Cost	939,000	961,000	987,000	26,000
TOTAL	3,189,000	3,340,000	3,504,000	164,000
FTE	27	27	27	0

Table 7
SPECIAL OPERATIONS DIVISION
Detail, Difference FY 2009/ 2010

Object Class	Description of Request	FTE	Cost	Difference FY 2009/2010
11 - Personnel Compensation	Current Positions WIGS	27	29,000	
	Current Positions COLA	27	80,000	
Subtotal				109,000
12 - Personnel Benefits	Current Positions WIGS	27	8,000	
	Current Positions COLA	27	21,000	
Subtotal				29,000
21 - Travel, Transp. of Persons				
22 - Transportation of Things				
23 - Rent, Commun. & Utilities				
24 - Printing and Reproduction	Built-in		4,000	
	Redirect to OC 25		-146,000	-142,000
25 - Other Services	Built-in		15,000	
	Redirect from OC 24		146,000	161,000
26 - Supplies & Materials	Built-in		6,000	
31 - Equipment	Built-in		1,000	
Total				164,000

Table 8
SPECIAL OPERATIONS DIVISION
Detail of Full-Time Equivalent Employment

	FY 2008 Enacted	FY 2009 Enacted	FY 2010 Request
JS-3			
JS-4			
JS-5			
JS-6	3	3	4
JS-7	3	3	4
JS-8	6	6	3
JS-9	4	4	4
JS-10			1
JS-11	2	2	2
JS-12	6	6	6
JS-13	2	2	2
JS-14			
JS-15			
JS-16			
CES	1	1	1
JS Salaries	1,800,000	1,903,000	2,012,000
TOTAL	27	27	27

**SUPERIOR COURT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
MANAGEMENT ACCOUNT**

<u>FY 2008 Enacted</u>		<u>FY 2009 Enacted</u>		<u>FY 2010 Request*</u>		<u>Difference FY 2009/2010*</u>	
FTE	Obligations	FTE	Obligations	FTE	Obligations	FTE	Obligations
-	9,864,000	-	10,083,000	-	7,984,000	-	(2,099,000)

*Reflects a transfer of \$2.5 million to the Court System.

To capitalize on centralization of function and economies of scale, a variety of enterprise-wide 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 replacement of equipment.

FY 2010 Request

In FY 2010, the Courts request \$7,984,000 for the Management Account, a net decrease of \$2,099,000 or below the FY 2009 Enacted Budget. The request includes \$138,000 for an increase in the Transit Subsidy for Superior Court employees, described under the Human Resources Division in the Court System section of this request and \$263,000 for built-in cost increases. The request also reflects a transfer of \$2,500,000 to the Court System Management Account to consolidate funds for leases, facilitating more efficient facilities management by the Court System’s Capital Projects and Facilities Management Division.

Table 1
**MANAGEMENT ACCOUNT
Budget Authority by Object Class**

	FY 2008 Enacted	FY 2009 Enacted	FY 2010 Request	Difference FY 2009/2010
11 - Compensation	346,000	361,000	381,000	20,000
12 - Benefits			5,000	5,000
<i>Subtotal Personnel Cost</i>	346,000	361,000	386,000	20,000
21 - Travel, Transp. of Persons	296,000	303,000	449,000	146,000
22 - Transportation of Things	9,000	10,000	11,000	1,000
23 - Rent, Commun. & Utilities	4,541,000	4,637,000	2,249,000	(2,388,000)
24 - Printing & Reproduction	293,000	300,000	308,000	8,000
25 - Other Services	3,775,000	3,855,000	3,948,000	93,000
26 - Supplies & Materials	419,000	428,000	439,000	11,000
31 - Equipment	185,000	189,000	194,000	5,000
<i>Subtotal Non Personnel Cost</i>	9,518,000	9,722,000	7,598,000	(2,124,000)
TOTAL	9,864,000	10,083,000	7,984,000	(2,099,000)
FTE	0	0	0	0

Table 2
MANAGEMENT ACCOUNT
Detail, Difference FY 2009/2010

Object Class	Description of Request	FTE	Cost	Difference FY 2009/2010
11 - Compensation	Built-in			20,000
12 - Benefits	Built-in			5,000
21 - Travel, Transp. of Persons	Built-in		8,000	
	Transportation Subsidy Increase		138,000	
Subtotal				146,000
22 - Transportation of Things	Built-in			1,000
23 - Rent, Commun. & Utilities	Built-in		112,000	
	Transfer to Court System		(2,500,000)	
Subtotal				(2,388,000)
24 - Printing & Reproduction	Built-in			8,000
25 - Other Service	Built-in			93,000
26 - Supplies & Materials	Built-in			11,000
31 - Equipment	Built-in			5,000
Total				(2,099,000)