

SUPERIOR COURT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
Overview

<u>FY 2009 Enacted</u>		<u>FY 2010 Enacted</u>		<u>FY 2011 Request</u>		<u>Difference</u> <u>FY 2010/2011</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>
937	104,277,000	938	108,524,000	945	113,459,000	7	4,935,000

Introduction

The Superior Court of the District of Columbia is unique among the nation’s trial courts. It accounts for among the highest number of case filings per capita in the United States (as reported by the National Center for State Courts for several years) as it serves all those residing, visiting, and conducting business in the Nation’s Capital 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 2008, 117,965 new cases were filed with the Superior Court. Of the total new filings, 54% were civil cases; 23% were criminal cases; 12% were family cases; 8% were domestic violence cases and the remaining 2% were probate and tax cases. In addition to new case filings, as of October 1, 2008, there were 54,930 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	Total Cases
		Pending 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
2008	117,965	54,930	172,895

Note: Rows may not add because "total cases" includes reactivated and reopened cases.

Table 2
**District of Columbia Superior Court
Efficiency Measures
(Fiscal Year 2008 data)**

	Cases Disposed	Cases Added	Clearance Rate*	Cases Pending		
				01-Oct	30-Sep	Change
Civil	66,775	64,030	104%	21,478	20,397	-5%
Criminal	26,295	27,642	99%	8,486	9,833	-16%
Domestic Violence	9,284	9,224	101%	1,156	1,105	-4%
Family	13,279	13,825	96%	15,705	16,251	3%
Probate	3,683	2,934	125%	7,696	6,947	-10%
Tax	154	310	50%	409	589	44%
Total	119,470	117,965	101%	54,930	55,122	0%

*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.

FY 2011 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 2011 request around four of the six issues—fair and timely case resolution; access to justice, a strong judiciary and workforce, and public trust and confidence.

In FY 2011, the Superior Court requests \$113,459,000 and 945 FTEs, an increase of \$4,935,000 (5%) and 7 FTEs above the FY 2010 Enacted Budget. The request includes increases to support the following Court goals¹:

Strategic Issue 1: Fair and timely case resolution--\$762,000 and 4 FTEs

The Superior Court's FY 2011 request includes \$762,000 and 4 FTEs to address the Courts' strategic issue of fair and timely case resolution, including \$499,000 to provide Special Advocates for abused and neglected children; \$83,000 and 1 FTE to assist in the investigation and stating of accounts; \$75,000 and 1 FTE to meet increased caseloads in civil alternative dispute resolution programs; \$55,000 and 1 FTE to meet the demands of the high volume Landlord Tenant courtroom; and \$50,000 and 1 FTE to enhance timeliness of jury panels.

Strategic Issue 2: Access to justice--\$151,000 and 2 FTEs

The Superior Court's FY 2011 request includes \$151,000 and 2 FTE to address the Courts' strategic issue of access to justice, including \$83,000 and 1 FTE to expand the Guardianship Assistance Program to serve more elderly and disabled wards of the Court and \$68,000 and 1 FTE to increase access to the judge-in-chambers.

Strategic Issue 6: Public Trust and Confidence--\$1,042,000 and 1 FTE

The Superior Court's FY 2011 request includes \$1,042,000 to address the Courts' strategic issue of public trust and confidence, including \$925,000 to expand services for juvenile offenders;

¹ The increases are offset by a decrease of \$1,600,000 for a non-recurring item.

\$117,000 and 1 FTE to strengthen families and parent/child relationships in families with child support orders.

Table 3
SUPERIOR COURT
Budget Authority by Object Class

	FY 2009 Enacted	FY 2010 Enacted	FY 2011 Request	Difference FY 2010/2011
11 – Compensation	71,848,000	74,947,000	78,727,000	3,780,000
12 – Benefits	16,663,000	17,469,000	18,455,000	986,000
<i>Subtotal Personnel Cost</i>	<i>88,511,000</i>	<i>92,416,000</i>	<i>97,182,000</i>	<i>4,766,000</i>
21 - Travel, Transp. of Persons	303,000	449,000	459,000	10,000
22 - Transportation of Things	10,000	11,000	12,000	1,000
23 - Rent, Commun. & Utilities	4,849,000	2,826,000	2,888,000	62,000
24 - Printing & Reproduction	541,000	559,000	576,000	17,000
25 - Other Services	8,520,000	10,665,000	10,690,000	25,000
26 - Supplies & Materials	859,000	889,000	918,000	29,000
31 – Equipment	684,000	709,000	734,000	25,000
<i>Subtotal Non-Personnel Cost</i>	<i>15,766,000</i>	<i>16,108,000</i>	<i>16,277,000</i>	<i>169,000</i>
TOTAL	104,277,000	108,524,000	113,459,000	4,935,000
FTE	937	938	945	7

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

<u>FY 2009 Enacted</u>		<u>FY 2010 Enacted</u>		<u>FY 2011 Request</u>		<u>Difference FY 2010/2011</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	25,239,000	204	26,359,000	204	27,428,000	0	1,069,000

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 2008, Superior Court judges handled nearly 115,500 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 2011 Request

In FY 2011, the Courts request \$27,428,000 for Judges and Chambers Staff, an increase of \$1,069,000 (4%) above the FY 2010 Enacted Budget. The requested increase consists entirely of built-in cost increases.

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

	FY 2009 Enacted	FY 2010 Enacted	FY 2011 Request	Difference FY 2010/2011
11 – Compensation	21,079,000	21,964,000	22,809,000	845,000
12 – Benefits	4,057,000	4,287,000	4,507,000	220,000
Subtotal Personnel Cost	25,136,000	26,251,000	27,316,000	1,065,000
21 - Travel, Transp. of Persons				
22 - Transportation of Things				
23 - Rent, Commun. & Utilities				
24 - Printing & Reproduction	6,000	7,000	8,000	1,000
25 - Other Services				
26 - Supplies & Materials	53,000	55,000	57,000	2,000
31 – Equipment	44,000	46,000	47,000	1,000
Subtotal Non-Personnel Cost	103,000	108,000	112,000	4,000
TOTAL	25,239,000	26,359,000	27,428,000	1,069,000
FTE	204	204	204	0

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

<u>FY 2009 Enacted</u>		<u>FY 2010 Enacted</u>		<u>FY 2011 Request</u>		<u>Difference FY 2010/2011</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>
49	6,722,000	49	7,009,000	49	7,261,000	0	252,000

Organizational Background

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 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 finds 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.

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

FY 2011 Request

In FY 2011, the Courts request \$7,261,000 for Magistrate Judges and Staff, an increase of \$252,000 (4%) above the FY 2010 Enacted Budget. The requested increase consists entirely of built-in cost increases.

Table 1
MAGISTRATE JUDGES AND STAFF
Budget Authority by Object Class

	FY 2009 Enacted	FY 2010 Enacted	FY 2011 Request	Difference FY 2010/2011
11 – Compensation	5,361,000	5,586,000	5,784,000	198,000
12 – Benefits	1,340,000	1,399,000	1,450,000	51,000
<i>Subtotal Personnel Cost</i>	<i>6,701,000</i>	<i>6,985,000</i>	<i>7,234,000</i>	<i>249,000</i>
21 - Travel, Transp. of Persons				
22 - Transportation of Things				
23 - Rent, Commun. & Utilities				
24 - Printing & Reproduction	3,000	4,000	5,000	1,000
25 - Other Services				
26 - Supplies & Materials	10,000	11,000	12,000	1,000
31 – Equipment	8,000	9,000	10,000	1,000
<i>Subtotal Non-Personnel Cost</i>	<i>21,000</i>	<i>24,000</i>	<i>27,000</i>	<i>3,000</i>
TOTAL	6,722,000	7,009,000	7,261,000	252,000
FTE	49	49	49	0

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

<u>FY 2009 Enacted</u>		<u>FY 2010 Enacted</u>		<u>FY 2011 Request</u>		<u>Difference</u> <u>FY 2010/2011</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>
10	686,000	10	717,000	10	753,000	0	36,000

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 eleven divisions and offices with 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 eleven operating divisions, programs, special units 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 Division; Family Court Social Services Division; Multi-Door Dispute Resolution Division; Probate Division; Special Operations Division; the Office of the Auditor Master; and the Identity Consolidation Unit. The Clerk of the Court is responsible for ensuring that each division and program processes all cases in a timely manner and provides 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 staff, budgetary, and operating resources. The Office of the Clerk is staffed by ten FTEs including the Clerk of the Court, two Senior Operations Managers, two administrative support staff, and five Identity Consolidation Deputy Clerks.

FY 2011 Request

For FY 2011, the D.C. Courts request \$753,000 for the Office of the Clerk of the Court, an increase of \$36,000 (5%) above the FY 2010 Enacted Budget. The requested increase consists entirely of built-in increases.

Table 1
CLERK OF THE COURT
Budget Authority by Object Class

	FY 2009 Enacted	FY 2010 Enacted	FY 2011 Request	Difference FY 2010/2011
11 – Compensation	542,000	565,000	592,000	27,000
12 – Benefits	136,000	142,000	149,000	7,000
<i>Subtotal Personnel Cost</i>	<i>678,000</i>	<i>707,000</i>	<i>741,000</i>	<i>34,000</i>
21 - Travel, Transp. of Persons				
22 - Transportation of Things				
23 - Rent, Commun. & Utilities				
24 - Printing & Reproduction				
25 - Other Services				
26 - Supplies & Materials	6,000	7,000	8,000	1,000
31 – Equipment	2,000	3,000	4,000	1,000
<i>Subtotal Non-Personnel Cost</i>	<i>8,000</i>	<i>10,000</i>	<i>12,000</i>	<i>2,000</i>
TOTAL	686,000	717,000	753,000	36,000
FTE	10	10	10	0

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

<u>FY 2009 Enacted</u>		<u>FY 2010 Enacted</u>		<u>FY 2011 Request</u>		<u>Difference FY 2010/2011</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>
101	7,027,000	101	7,325,000	102	7,741,000	1	416,0000

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 five full time equivalent staff, (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 2008 there were just under 8,900 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, reviews and validates reports and manages all Civil courtroom operations. This branch has 28 FTEs.
3. The Landlord and 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 just under 45,000 filings in fiscal year 2008. This branch has 19 FTEs.
4. The Small Claims and Conciliation Branch oversees the processing, scheduling, and adjudication of cases where the amount in controversy is up to \$5,000. In FY 2008, there were just over 10,500 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 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 2008, the Small Claims Branch, building on its Paperless Filing Initiative, established a Consumer Law Resource Center that is an outgrowth of the previously established Small Claims Resource Center; both are staffed by volunteer attorneys. The Civil Actions Branch established a Tax Lien Self Help Center, which is also staffed by volunteer attorneys. The Civil Actions Branch, Small Claims Branch and the Landlord and Tenant Branch all established performance goals related to the time it takes to dispose of a case and the certainty of any case going to trial with two or fewer continuances. 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.

- Be more accountable to the public, especially by maintaining the Division's presence on the Courts' Internet website and routinely incorporating updates to processes and forms.
- Conduct periodic training to ensure judicial officers and court personnel understand the needs of persons who face potential barriers to Court access.
- Conduct cross-training between all Civil Division branches at all staff levels, managers and line-staff.
- 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 nearly 67,000 cases in fiscal year 2008, including more than 10,400 civil actions; 45,100 landlord and tenant cases; and 11,250 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 2008 Data)

	<u>Case Filings</u>	<u>Dispositions</u>	<u>Clearance Rate</u>	<u>Pending Cases</u>		
				<u>1-Oct</u>	<u>30-Sep</u>	<u>Change</u>
Civil Actions	8,898	10,413	117%	6,739	6,027	-11%
Landlord & Tenant	44,618	45,110	101%	11,172	11,091	-1%
Small Claims	<u>10,514</u>	<u>11,252</u>	107%	<u>3,567</u>	<u>3,279</u>	<u>-8%</u>
Total	64,030	66,775	104%	21,478	20,397	-5%

Table 2
CIVIL DIVISION
Performance Indicators

Type of Indicator	Key Performance Indicator	Data Source	FY 2008		FY 2009		FY 2010		FY 2011	
			Goal	Actual*	Goal	Estimate**	Goal	Estimate**	Goal	Estimate**
Time to Disposition	General Civil II Complaints disposed within 24 months	CourtView Report	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Time to Disposition	Landlord & Tenant Non-Jury cases disposed within 150 days	CourtView Report	100%	89%	100%	90%	100%	90%	100%	90%
Time to Disposition	Small Claims Non-Jury cases disposed within 12 months	CourtView Report	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Time to Disposition	Civil I Complaints disposed within 36 months	CourtView Report	100%	92%	100%	95%	100%	95%	100%	95%
Time to Disposition	Collection & Subrogation Cases disposed within 30 months	CourtView Report	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Time to Disposition	Title 47 Tax Lien cases disposed within 36 months	CourtView Report	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

*Time to disposition is for cases filed after March 1, 2008 and resolved prior to June 1, 2009.

** No prior year data on which to base estimates

FY 2011 Request

In FY 2011, the Courts request \$7,741,000 for the Civil Division, an increase of \$416,000 (6%) above the FY 2010 Enacted Budget. The requested increase consists of \$55,000 for 1 FTE to expedite the processing of landlord and tenant cases and \$361,000 for built-in increases.

Landlord and Tenant Courtroom Clerk, JS-7, \$55,000

Problem Statement. To meet the demands of the Landlord and Tenant courtrooms, the highest volume courtrooms in the Superior Court, an additional courtroom clerk is needed. In FY 2008, there were over 45,000 new case filings in the Landlord and Tenant Branch, which represents approximately 39 % of the total Superior Court caseload. Until recently, the Landlord and Tenant Branch had one high volume courtroom with well over 200 scheduled hearings per day and one courtroom clerk. To facilitate the timely processing of the landlord and tenant cases and enhance services to the public, a second landlord and tenant calendar was established. The second calendar handles cases certified from the principal landlord and tenant calendar, which are typically complex cases or a number of less complex cases with the same attorney.

Currently, the Civil Division has 21 courtroom clerk positions and 20 courtrooms that need to be staffed. The current staffing level is inadequate because two of the high volume courtrooms, Landlord and Tenant and Small Claims, require two courtroom clerks due to the large number of cases that are handled on a daily basis.

The courtroom clerk's duties are numerous. Processing landlord and tenant 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, 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 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. The untimely disposition of cases causes delay in execution of the judgment, and could result in the wrongful evictions of persons from their residences. An additional courtroom clerk would facilitate the timely processing of landlord and tenant cases and enhanced 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 enhancing customer service.

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

Relationship to Existing Funding. The Civil Division's base funding is inadequate to fund this position.

Methodology. The position was classified in accordance with the Courts' personnel policies.

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

Performance Measures. The additional courtroom clerk assigned to the second courtroom will enable 100% of cases to be processed within the day the hearing was held.

Table 3
CIVIL DIVISION
New Positions Requested

Position	Grade	Number	Salary	Benefits	Total Personnel Cost
Landlord Tenant Branch Courtroom Clerk	JS-7	1	44,000	11,000	55,000

Table 4
CIVIL DIVISION
Budget Authority by Object Class

	FY 2009 Enacted	FY 2010 Enacted	FY 2011 Request	Difference FY 2010/2011
11 – Compensation	5,572,000	5,806,000	6,134,000	328,000
12 – Benefits	1,393,000	1,454,000	1,539,000	85,000
Subtotal Personnel Cost	6,965,000	7,260,000	7,673,000	413,000
21 - Travel, Transp. of Persons				
22 - Transportation of Things				
23 - Rent, Commun. & Utilities				
24 - Printing & Reproduction	19,000	20,000	21,000	1,000
25 - Other Services				
26 - Supplies & Materials	21,000	22,000	23,000	1,000
31 – Equipment	22,000	23,000	24,000	1,000
Subtotal Non-Personnel Cost	62,000	65,000	68,000	3,000
TOTAL	7,027,000	7,325,000	7,741,000	416,000
FTE	101	101	102	1

Table 5
CIVIL DIVISION
Detail, Difference FY 2010/2011

Object Class	Description of Request	FTE	Cost	Difference FY 2010/2011
11 - Compensation	Current Positions COLA	101	197,000	
	Current Positions WIG		87,000	
	L&T Courtroom Clerk	1	44,000	
	<i>Subtotal</i>			<i>328,000</i>
12 - Personnel Benefits	Current Positions COLA		51,000	
	Current Positions WIG		23,000	
	L&T Courtroom Clerk		11,000	
	<i>Subtotal</i>			<i>85,000</i>
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				416,000

Table 6
CIVIL DIVISION
Detail of Full-Time Equivalent Employment

Grade	FY 2009 Enacted	FY 2010 Enacted	FY 2011 Request
JS-3			
JS-4	6	6	6
JS-5	1	1	1
JS-6	19	19	
JS-7	13	13	11
JS-8	19	19	36
JS-9	21	21	25
JS-10	7	7	8
JS-11	3	3	3
JS-12	4	4	4
JS-13	6	6	6
JS-14			
JS-15	1	1	1
CES	1	1	1
Total Salaries	5,572,000	5,806,000	6,134,000
TOTAL FTEs	101	101	102

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

<u>FY 2009 Enacted</u>		<u>FY 2010 Enacted</u>		<u>FY 2011 Request</u>		<u>Difference FY 2010/2011</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	\$760,000	7	\$806,000	7	\$846,000	0	\$40,000

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, survivors of homicide, and their dependent family members, with certain statutory expenses made necessary as a result of the crime. Eligible expenses include medical costs, mental health counseling, 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. Crime victims are provided with assistance in filing applications; locating other victim service programs; and addressing many of the other quality of life issues that arise after victimization.

Organizational Background

During fiscal year 2008, the Compensation Program was staffed by a Director, Accounting Officer, Administrative Assistant, three Legal Claims Examiners, two Victim Advocates, and three Assistant Legal Claims Examiners. There are a total of seven employees paid from the Superior Courts' budget.

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.

Administrative funds from grants and the Crime Victims Fund support additional staff for the Crime Victims Compensation Program. These funds are used to employ two Legal Claims Examiners and three Assistant Claims Examiners. These positions are in addition to the seven appropriated positions and are necessary to operate the program.

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, 2008.
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 June 30th annually.
4. 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.
5. 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.
6. 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 2008, 152 or 6% 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 2008, 41 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.

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.

Satellite Offices. The Crime Victims Compensation Program staffs two satellite offices in addition to the downtown office. Both of the offices are collaborative efforts with other victim service providers in the District of Columbia. The Crime Victims Compensation Program provides services at the Southeast Domestic Violence Intake Center which is located in the United Medical Center (formerly Greater S.E. Community Hospital). Petitions for domestic violence protection orders may be filed at this center. Representatives from several different domestic violence organizations and law enforcement agencies share office space in this center. The newest location is in the Lighthouse Center for Healing located in Northeast Washington, D.C. Representatives providing services for victims of sexual assault, homicide, and domestic violence are sharing space in this location. In both locations, a victim may come into one building and obtain the services of many different organizations. Not only does this provide a great service for the victim, but it causes the service provider to have a greater understanding of and compassion for the challenges faced by victims.

Workload Data

Table 1
CRIME VICTIMS COMPENSATION PROGRAM
Caseload Overview

	Actual FY 2008	FY 2009 Estimated	% Change
New Cases Filed	2,900	2,950	2%
Determinations Made	2,640	2,930	11%
Number of Cases Pending at End of Fiscal Year	1,068	1,090	2%

Table 2
CRIME VICTIMS COMPENSATION PROGRAM
Performance Measurement Table

Type of Indicator	Performance Indicator	Data Source	FY 2008		FY 2009		FY 2010		FY 2011	
			Goal	Actual	Goal	Estimated	Goal	Projection	Goal	Projection
Input	# Of new claims filed	Case Management Software	2,655	2,900	2,950	2,950	3,010	3,010	3,070	3,070
Output	# Of claims processed	Case Management Software	2,600	2,640	2,950	2,930	2,990	2,990	3,050	3,050
Output	# Of payments	Case Management Software	12,950	13,831	15,000	14,710	15,640	15,640	16,630	16,630
Outcome	Dollar amount of payments	Case Management Software	\$8.2M	\$8.6M	\$9.2M	\$9.1M	\$9.7 M	\$9.7M	\$10.3M	\$10.3M
Outcome	Avg. claim processing time	Case Management Software	10 weeks	11 weeks	11 weeks	12 weeks	12 weeks	12 weeks	12 weeks	12 weeks

FY 2011 Request

In FY 2011, the D.C. Courts request \$846,000 for the Crime Victims Compensation Program, an increase of \$40,000 (5%) above the FY 2010 Enacted Budget. The requested increase consists entirely of built-in cost increases.

Table 3
CRIME VICTIMS COMPENSATION PROGRAM
Budget Authority by Object Class

	FY 2009 Enacted	FY 2010 Enacted	FY 2011 Request	Difference FY 2010/2011
11 - Personnel Compensation	592,000	622,000	652,000	30,000
12 - Personnel Benefits	148,000	161,000	168,000	7,000
<i>Subtotal Personnel Cost</i>	740,000	783,000	820,000	37,000
21 - Travel, Transp. of Persons				
22 - Transportation of Things				
23 - Rent, Commun. & Utilities				
24 - Printing & Reproduction				
25 - Other Services	16,000	17,000	18,000	1,000
26 - Supplies & Materials	2,000	3,000	4,000	1,000
31 - Equipment	2,000	3,000	4,000	1,000
<i>Subtotal Non Personnel Cost</i>	20,000	23,000	26,000	3,000
TOTAL	760,000	806,000	846,000	40,000
FTE	7	7	7	0

Table 4
CRIME VICTIMS COMPENSATION PROGRAM
Detail, Difference FY 2010/2011

Object Class	Description of Request	FTE	Cost	Difference FY 2010/2011
11 - Personnel Compensation	Current Positions COLA	7	21,000	
	Current Positions WIG		9,000	
<i>Subtotal</i>				30,000
12 - Personnel Benefits	Current Positions COLA		5,000	
	Current Positions WIG		2,000	
<i>Subtotal</i>				7,000
21 - Travel, Transp. of Persons				
22 - Transportation of Things				
23 - Rent, Commun. & Utilities				
24 - Printing & Reproduction				
25 - Other Service	Built-in increase			1,000
26 - Supplies & Materials	Built-in increase			1,000
31 - Equipment	Built-in increase			1,000
Total				40,000

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

Grade	2009 Enacted	2010 Enacted	2011 Request
JS-3			
JS-4			
JS-5			
JS-6			
JS-7			
JS-8			
JS-9			
JS-10	1	1	1
JS-11			
JS-12	4	4	4
JS-13			
JS-14	1	1	1
JS-15			
JS-16			
JS-17			
CES	1	1	1
Total Salary	592,000	622,000	652,000
Total FTEs	7	7	7

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

<u>FY 2009 Enacted</u>		<u>FY 2010 Enacted</u>		<u>FY 2011 Request</u>		<u>Difference FY 2010/2011</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>
123	9,097,000	124	9,578,000	124	10,050,000	0	472,000

Mission Statement

The Criminal Division’s mission is 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.

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 support 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 oversees the operation of several specialized courts known as problem solving courts. These include: East of the River Community Court (ERCC), District of Columbia Misdemeanor and Traffic Community Court, Superior Court Drug Court, Prostitution Court, and the Mental Health Diversion Court. The Criminal Division’s Director’s Office has 9 full time equivalent positions (FTEs).

- The Case Management Branch processes motions, appeals and orders for felony, misdemeanor, traffic, and District of Columbia code violations (D.C.). The branch is also

responsible for scanning all court documents related to criminal cases and ensuring the accuracy of those records. This branch has 23 full time equivalent positions.

- The Courtroom Support Branch is responsible for staffing well-trained, professional courtroom clerks who assist judges presiding in the criminal courtrooms by real time updating information in the case management system, receiving and securing evidence, providing direction to the public, docketing cases, preparing all court documents, and ensuring prisoner movement. This branch has 45 FTEs.
- The Special Proceedings Branch has four parts, the Warrant Office, Special Proceedings, Criminal Information, and Criminal Finance. The Warrant and the Special Proceedings offices process and maintain 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. The Criminal Information Office manages all closed files and provides information to the public about case disposition, sealed, and expunged cases. The Criminal Finance Office handles all financial matters regarding criminal cases such as the processing of bond payments/ refunds, VVCA fees, bond and collateral receipts, restitution and disbursement of restitution payments. This branch has 23 FTEs.
- The Quality Assurance Branch performs a comprehensive review of case information updates to the electronic case management system made from the courtroom and from judges' chambers. Quality assurance also reviews for accuracy and correctness all final dispositions of cases, ensures that the judges' orders regarding release and commitment of defendants are followed, and handles matters regarding mental competency. This branch has 21 FTEs.
- The East of the River and D.C. and Traffic Community Courts are responsible for addressing low level and quality-of-life offenses by utilizing a collaborative, problem-solving approach to crime to protect rights and liberties, to hold defendants and offenders accountable, and to increase the public's confidence in the court system. Unlike traditional courts, the Community Courts focus 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. The Community Court has 3 FTEs.

Criminal Division Management Action Plan (MAP) Objectives

The Criminal Division's strategic objectives for FY 2011 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
- Enhance the enforcement of court orders relating to fines, fees, costs, and restitution by developing standard operating procedures to ensure the timely notification to judicial officers

when defendants fail to comply with court orders and notification to defendants of past due obligations.

- Ensure that waiting times and delays are minimized in high-volume courtrooms (Traffic Courts, misdemeanor and Preliminary Hearing calendar) by eliminating “same time” scheduling practices
- 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, and evaluating data gathered to evaluate effectiveness of performance.
- Enhance community relationships by developing outreach activities and by obtaining access to services for defendants who suffer from mental illness.

Divisional Restructuring and/or Work Process Redesign

During FY 2009, the Criminal Division’s goal has been to work towards a paperless system. CourtView, the Court’s database, allows staff to image all documents and to maintain computerized dockets. The Criminal Division has continued to work with prosecutors, defense attorneys, and law enforcement agencies to create an electronic filing system and electronic exchange of vital court information. The division has also developed procedures to reduce storage costs by retrieving archived information to make the information accessible electronically.

Additionally, other goals of the Criminal Division are: providing excellent customer service; ensuring that cases are timely and efficiently managed; enforcing orders; reducing public waiting time; enhancing the availability and accessibility of court information; improving the quality of court data; evaluating the effectiveness of our problem solving courts; promoting civility in the workplace; and developing a highly trained workforce.

Workload Data

Table 1
CRIMINAL DIVISION
Caseload and Efficiency Measures

	<u>Dispositions</u>	<u>New Filings</u>	<u>Clearance Rate</u>
DC Misdemeanor	2,808	2,624	110%
Felony	5,184	5,238	100%
Traffic	7,614	8,067	99%
U.S. Misdemeanors	<u>10,689</u>	<u>11,713</u>	95%
Total	26,295	27,642	99%

Key Performance Indicators

Table 2
CRIMINAL DIVISION
Performance Indicators

Type of Indicator	Key Performance Indicator	Data Source	FY 2008		FY 2009		FY 2010		FY 2011	
			Goal	Actual*	Goal	Estimate	Goal	Estimate	Goal	Estimate
Time to Disposition	Felony I (Murder, Sexual Assault, etc.) cases disposed within 24 months	CourtView	98%	100%	98%	100%	98%	100%	98%	100%
Time to Disposition	Other Felony (Felony II and AFTC) cases disposed within 12 months	CourtView	98%	100%	98%	100%	98%	100%	98%	100%
Time to Disposition	U.S./D.C./Traffic Misdemeanor disposed within 9 months	CourtView	98%	99%	98%	100%	98%	100%	98%	100%
Time to Disposition	U.S./DC Misdemeanor (Diversion)--Community Service/First Time Offenders cases disposed within 9 months	CourtView	98%	99%	98%	100%	98%	100%	98%	100%
Time to Disposition	U.S./DC Misdemeanor (Diversion)--Programs for Behavioral Changes or Avoidance of Re-arrest cases resolved within 12 months	CourtView	98%	98%	98%	100%	98%	100%	98%	100%
Time to Disposition	U.S. Misdemeanor (Drugs) cases disposed within 9 months	CourtView	98%	100%	98%	100%	98%	100%	98%	100%

*Time to disposition is for cases filed after March 1, 2008 and resolved prior to March 1, 2009.

FY 2011 Request

The Criminal Division’s FY 2011 request is \$10,050,000, an increase of \$472,000 (5%) above the FY 2010 Enacted Budget. The increase consists entirely of built-in cost increases

Table 3
CRIMINAL DIVISION
Budget Authority by Object Class

	FY 2009 Enacted	FY 2010 Enacted	FY 2011 Request	Difference FY 2010/2011
11-Personnel Compensation	7,203,000	7,582,000	7,953,000	371,000
12-Personnel Benefits	1,802,000	1,900,000	1,997,000	97,000
<i>Subtotal Personnel Cost</i>	9,005,000	9,482,000	9,950,000	468,000
21-Travel, Transp. of Persons				
22-Transportation of Things				
23-Rent, Commun. & Utilities				
24-Printing & Reproduction	45,000	47,000	49,000	2,000
25-Other Services				
26-Supplies & Materials	21,000	22,000	23,000	1,000
31-Equipment	26,000	27,000	28,000	1,000
<i>Subtotal Non Personnel Cost</i>	92,000	96,000	100,000	4,000
TOTAL	9,097,000	9,578,000	10,050,000	472,000
FTE	123	124	124	0

Table 4
CRIMINAL DIVISION
Detail Difference FY 2010/2011

Object Class	Description of Request	FTE	Cost	Difference FY 2010/2011
11 - Personnel Compensation	Current Positions COLA	124	257,000	
	Current Positions WIG		114,000	
<i>Subtotal</i>				371,000
12 - Personnel Benefits	Current Positions COLA		67,000	
	Current Positions WIG		30,000	
<i>Subtotal</i>				97,000
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				472,000

Table 5
CRIMINAL DIVISION
Detail of Full-Time Equivalent Employment

Grade	2009 Enacted	2010 Enacted	2011 Request
JS-3			
JS-4	1	1	1
JS-5			
JS-6	17	17	18
JS-7	10	10	12
JS-8	27	27	27
JS-9	35	35	32
JS-10	19	19	17
JS-11	1	1	2
JS-12	5	6	7
JS-13	6	6	6
JS-14			
JS-15	1	1	1
JS-16			
JS-17			
CES	1	1	1
Total Salary	7,203,000	7,582,000	7,953,000
Total FTEs	123	124	124

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

<u>FY 2009 Enacted</u>		<u>FY 2010 Enacted</u>		<u>FY 2011 Request</u>		<u>Difference FY 2010/2011</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	2,040,000	25	2,128,000	25	2,234,000	0	106,000

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, and 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.

Management Action Plan (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 to:

1. Provide petitioners immediate relief through the temporary protection order process.
2. Hold perpetrators accountable through a deferred sentencing and judicial review process that requires the perpetrator to appear in court throughout the treatment/counseling period.
3. Reduce waiting time for court participants.
4. Enhance access to justice for Spanish-speaking court users by translating all court forms into Spanish.
5. Ensure that case information is processed, updated completely, correctly and within Unit time standards.
6. Enhance and ensure safety to victims by seeking additional tools for enforcement of protection orders, such as updating the National Register for protection orders.
7. Collaborate with surrounding jurisdictions in Maryland and Virginia regarding enforcement of protection orders and service on their constituents.

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, and 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 2008, the Domestic Violence Unit processed 8,819 new filings and reinstated cases and disposed of 9,249 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 2008 through 2011.

Table 1
DOMESTIC VIOLENCE UNIT
Caseload and Efficiency Measures
(Fiscal Year 2008 Data)

	Cases Filed	Cases Disposed	Clearance Rate*	Cases Pending		
				1-Oct	30-Sep	Change
Contempt Motions	329	318	97%	31	35	13%
Intrafamily (Protection Orders)	4,488	4,512	101%	214	253	18%
Paternity & Child Support	438	694	158%	111	87	-22%
U.S. Misdemeanors	<u>3,969</u>	<u>3,760</u>	95%	<u>800</u>	<u>730</u>	-9%
Total	9,224	9,284	101%	1,156	1,105	-4%

* 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 2008		FY 2009		FY 2010		FY 2011	
			Goal	Actual	Goal	Estimate	Goal	Estimate	Goal	Estimate
Output/Activity	Hearings/events scheduled	Yearly stats/ Random sample	22,200	22,318	24,327	24,549	27,003	27,050	29,433	29,570
Quality	% of cases reviewed & processed within 48 hours	Evaluation, survey, and random sample	94%	94%	95%	95%	95%	95%	95%	95%
End Outcome	Domestic Violence dispositions	Daily/Monthly Statistics	9,150	9,284	9,768	9,860	10,471	10,650	11,121	11,230
Productivity/Efficiency	Case clearance rates	Yearly statistics	100%	101%	100%	101%	100%	100%	100%	100%

FY 2011 Request

The Courts' FY 2011 request for the Domestic Violence Unit is \$2,234,000, an increase of \$106,000 (5%) above the FY 2010 Enacted Budget. The requested increase consists entirely of built-in cost increases.

Table 3
DOMESTIC VIOLENCE UNIT
Budget Authority by Object Class

	FY 2009 Enacted	FY 2010 Enacted	FY 2011 Request	Difference FY 2010/2011
11 - Compensation	1,625,000	1,693,000	1,775,000	82,000
12 - Benefits	406,000	424,000	446,000	22,000
<i>Subtotal Personnel Cost</i>	2,031,000	2,117,000	2,221,000	104,000
21 - Travel, Transp. of Persons				
22 - Transportation of Things				
23 - Rent, Commun. & Utilities				
24 - Printing & Reproduction				
25 - Other Services				
26 - Supplies & Materials	4,000	5,000	6,000	1,000
31 - Equipment	5,000	6,000	7,000	1,000
<i>Subtotal Non Personnel Cost</i>	9,000	11,000	13,000	2,000
TOTAL	2,040,000	2,128,000	2,234,000	106,000
FTE	25	25	25	0

Table 4
DOMESTIC VIOLENCE UNIT
Detail Difference, FY 2010/2011

Object Class	Description of Request	FTE	Cost	Difference FY 2010/2011
11 - Compensation	Current Positions COLA	25	57,000	
	Current Positions WIG		25,000	
<i>Subtotal</i>				<i>82,000</i>
12 - Benefits	Current Positions COLA		15,000	
	Current Positions WIG		7,000	
<i>Subtotal</i>				<i>22,000</i>
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				106,000

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

Grade	FY 2009 Enacted	FY 2010 Enacted	FY 2011 Request
JS-3			
JS-4			
JS-5			
JS-6	1	1	5
JS-7		1	2
JS-8	8	7	6
JS-9	9	9	5
JS-10	3	3	3
JS-11			
JS-12	1	1	1
JS-13	2	2	1
JS-14			
JS-15			1
JS-16			
JS-17			
CES	1	1	1
Total salary	1,625,000	1,693,000	1,775,000
Total FTEs	25	25	25

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

<u>FY 2009 Enacted</u>		<u>FY 2010 Enacted</u>		<u>FY 2011 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>
178	15,507,000	178	16,120,000	179	17,479,000	1	1,359,000

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 of 2001 (“the Act”) was enacted to ensure the safety and well-being of children and families in the District of Columbia. As a result of the Act, specially trained and qualified judges serve on the Family Court at least three or five years, depending on their date of appointment; all family cases remain assigned to judges serving on the Family Court bench; and a one judge/one family case management model is utilized 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. This Branch operates with 20 full time equivalent positions.
2. The Paternity and Child Support Branch processes all actions seeking to establish paternity and to establish and modify child support. This Branch operates with 25 FTEs.
3. The Juvenile and Neglect Branch is responsible for cases involving children alleged to be delinquent, neglected, abused, or otherwise in need of supervision. This Branch operates with 27 FTEs.
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. This Branch operates with 5 FTEs.

5. The Mental Health/Mental Retardation Branch is responsible for matters involving the commitment of individuals who are mentally ill or mentally retarded. This Branch operates with 11 FTEs.
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). This Branch operates with 47 FTEs.
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. This Office operates with 3 FTEs assigned to the Office of the Director.
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 subsequent 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. This Branch operates with 25 FTEs.
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. This Branch operates with 5 FTEs.
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. This specialty court operates with 1 FTE assigned to the Office of the Director.
11. The Office of the Director is responsible for policy making and managing the Division's administrative staff, budgets, supplies, equipment and physical plant in conjunction with the Court Administrative Services Division. The Office of the Director oversees implementation of divisional objectives in support of the Courts' Strategic Plan and court wide performance measures. The office is responsible for preparing all legally mandated reports on divisional operations to the local legislature and the U.S. Congress. This Office operates with 13 FTEs including those in specialized assignments as noted above.

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 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 and proceeding with subsequent filings and finally data and document transfer.

The Family Court Central Intake Center (CIC) utilizes 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 or duplicative orders regarding that family.

While the number of detainees and transfer of detainees in the Family Court are substantially fewer than in the Court’s Criminal Division, the Family Court Operations Division recognizes the need to insure that its procedures support the safe and effective management of those in custody on family related cases. In coordination with the Criminal Justice Coordinating Council (CJCC), the Division has designed and implemented an automated process through the Court’s case management system that will notify detention facilities of Prisoner Transfer Requests (PTR) initiated by the Court. Although the automation is yet to be completed, the Family Court’s Courtroom Support staff has begun to enter information into the system to validate the efficacy and reliability of the technology. The Family Court Operations Division, in conjunction with the IT Division, has also developed a daily courtroom calendar that will automatically display individual “alerts” indicating the existence of, among other things, outstanding bench warrants for parties scheduled to appear before any judicial officer assigned to the Family Court. This initiative furthers the Court’s strategic objective to utilize technology to support operational efficiency.

Workload Data

Table 1
FAMILY COURT OPERATIONS
Caseload and Efficiency Measures
(Fiscal Year 2008 Data)

	Cases Filed	Cases Disposed	Clearance Rate	Cases Pending		
				1-Oct	30-Sep	Change
Abuse & Neglect	796	793	100%	2,614	2,617	0%
Adoption	262	258	98%	304	307	1%
Divorce/Custody/Miscellaneous	3,787	3,463	91%	2,407	2,731	13%
Family Special Proceedings	322	128	40%	374	568	52%
Juvenile Delinquency	3,359	3,695	110%	1,075	740	-31%
Mental Health/	1,340	1,331	99%	533	542	2%
Mental Retardation	11	17	155%	1,257	1,251	0%
Paternity & Child Support	3,948	3,594	91%	7,141	7,495	5%
Total	13,825	13,279	96%	15,705	16,251	3%

Table 2
FAMILY COURT OPERATIONS
Key Performance Indicators

Performance Indicator	Data Source	FY 2008		FY 2009		FY 2010		FY 2011	
		Goal	Actual	Goal	Projection	Goal	Projection	Goal	Projection
Prisoner Transfers Processed	Monthly Statistics	2,239	2,652	2,726	2,726	2,800	2,800	2,800	2,874
Delinquency & Neglect Cases/Orders Reviewed	Monthly Statistics	20,317	20,317	21,703	21,703	23,089	23,089	23,089	24,474
Delinquency & Neglect Cases Corrected	Monthly Statistics	711	711	767	767	823	823	823	878
Applications for Marriage Licenses & Minister Authorizations	Computer Reports	2,616	2,486	2,649	2,277	2,682	2,068	2,682	1,859
Marriage Licenses & Authorizations Issued	Computer Reports	2,279	2,794	2,431	2,665	2,536	2,536	2,536	2,407
Petitions & Complaints Total Intake	Computer Reports	14,100	14,061	14,603	14,603	14,820	14,820		14,972
Domestic & Child Support Hearings Set	Computer Reports	31,898	30,013	29,787	31,403	32,793	32,793	32,793	34,182
Domestic Orders Issued	Computer Reports	8,597	9,074	8,832	9,338	9,603	9,603	9,603	9,867
Child Support Orders Issued	Computer Reports	1,070	2,092	1,875	2,294	2,294	2,497	2,497	2,699
MR Advocate Training Sessions	Computer Log	18	14	60	30	60	35	60	45
New MR Advocates Recruited	Computer Log	25	44	100	200	175	300	175	400
MR Advocates Trained	Computer; Training Log	75	8	150	200	225	200	225	200
MR Cases with MR Advocates	Computer Log	300	275	560	300	820	400	820	550
ASFA case reviews in initial, further initial, pretrial, stipulation, disposition and permanency hearings	Monthly Statistics	3,718	3,718	3,850	3,850	4,017	4,017	4,017	4,235
Data input and other error notifications distributed by Attorney Advisors	Monthly Statistics	770	707	737	737	792	792	792	825
CCAN Attorneys appointed to Adult Parties in Abuse & Neglect cases	Monthly Statistics	2184	1,491	801	1,398	1,305	1,305	1,212	1,212
Guardians <i>ad litem</i> Appointed	Monthly Statistics	1,073	755	394	721	688	688	688	654
Trainings Provided to Attorneys	CCAN Records	16	22	16	22	16	22	16	22
Attorneys Meeting CLE Requirements	CCAN Records	142	155	148	150	145	145	145	141

FY 2011 Request

In FY 2011 the D.C. Courts request \$17,479,000 for Family Court Operations, an increase of \$1,359,000 (8%) above the FY 2010 Enacted Budget. The requested increase includes \$499,000 to provide Special Advocates for abused and neglected children; \$117,000 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 \$743,000 for built-in cost increases.

Special Advocates for Abused and Neglected Children, \$499,000

Introduction. Special Advocates for abused and neglected children are volunteers who closely monitor victimized youth and report to the court. These volunteers are an invaluable resource to Family Court judges and magistrate judges and to families and children in the District. Special Advocates review records, visit the child, and interview family members, teachers, therapists, and others to assess needs of the family and child. They look at the quality and effectiveness of the services the child receives and ensure that court orders for services are met. They look for additional services, such as special skills training or therapeutic treatment for trauma, which the child might need. These volunteers review environmental issues contributing to the child's situation, academic background, and physical/mental health. They present their findings and recommendations on the best interests of the child to the judge through written reports and testimony at hearings. They provide information to promote stability and permanency.

Problem. To continue to receive the services of volunteer Special Advocates to help abused and neglected children get needed services and remain in stable, nurturing homes, the Family Court requests additional funding. Programs that recruit, screen, train, and support the volunteer advocates have significant resource requirements, and the local program that has provided volunteers is no longer able to provide these volunteer advocates without charge.

Relationship to Court Mission, Vision and Strategic Goals. This request supports the Courts' Strategic Goal 1.2 to resolve cases promptly and efficiently, particularly Strategy 1.2.3, to provide accurate and timely information to judicial officers.

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.

Methodology. The requested funds would provide an advocate for 150 children for a year. The selected program is expected to augment funding provided through the Family Court with private, charitable support.

Performance Indicators. The performance of this initiative will be measured in the following areas:

- Building support for abused and or neglected youth in the District by increasing the number of volunteer Special Advocates.
- Providing judges with recommendations based on each volunteer's in-depth knowledge of the youth's needs, resulting in increased number and/or quality of court-ordered services and referrals for each child.
- Improving outcomes for abused and neglected children.

Family Court Fathering Initiative, \$117,000

Family Fathering Court Program Manager (JS-13), \$117,000

Problem Statement. A staggering number of children in the District of Columbia grow up without financial support from and meaningful relationships with their fathers. Too often the financial support of these children must be borne by the City while the nurturing needs of the children remain unmet. In fiscal year 2008 there were more than 63,000 Title IV-D² child support cases in the District. In slightly over 32,000 cases the non-custodial parent was in arrears, representing over \$275.6 million owed in child support.

Adopting a best practice from other jurisdictions, the Court initiated a pilot program, the Fathering Reentry Court to help non-custodial parents who are returning from a period of incarceration and whose child support arrearages indicate an inability to be financially responsible for those children. The services provided by the program are aimed at helping parents find stable and substantive employment and to acquire the tools to become fully participating parents. A goal is to reunite these parents with their children, thereby strengthening families and breaking negative cycles.

The Court's pilot program was a grant-funded venture and limited to fathers reentering the community after a period of incarceration. Approximately 500-550 non-custodial parents return from prison each year in the District of Columbia, approximately two-thirds of who 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. Due to circumstances like prior incarceration, substandard education or vocational skills, poor work histories, alcohol and substance abuse issues, many fathers are unable to fulfill their emotional and financial obligations to their children. The pilot program evolved out of a collaboration between the D.C. Courts, 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 was provided through the Department of Justice Prisoner Reentry Initiative and Byrne Justice Administration grants.

The primary purpose of the Family Court Fathering Initiative is to provide persons who are currently unable to pay court-ordered child support with long-term, substantive employment and services that will enable them to become financially supportive of their children and to become nurturing and participating parents. Its overall objective is to strengthen families in the District of Columbia. Data have consistently demonstrated that fathers play an immeasurable role in the healthy development of minor children. Empowering fathers to become and maintain a financial, physical and emotional presence in the lives of their children will insure that many of those children will grow into successful and well-adjusted adults, thereby breaking many of the negative cycles attendant to single parent households.

² Title IV-D of the Social Security Act (42 U.S. Code 651 *et seq*)

As of March 31, 2009, 35 participants had completed Project Empowerment, a job training program operated by the District DOES, and moved into subsidized employment within various District Government agencies. Twenty-nine participants have transitioned to the second phase of employability support by receiving services from Educational Data Systems Inc. (EDSI), a contracted employment counseling and search organization. Eleven EDSI participants have acquired full-time, non-subsidized employment with benefit packages. The balance are either working toward eligibility for a benefits package or working part-time.

As of June 2009, all 43 participants were paying current, timely child support and engaged in other wrap-around services to improve their parenting skills and their abilities to reconnect with their children as co-parents. None have been re-arrested. At present there are fourteen (14) participants just entering job training and three (3) applicants in institutions awaiting release to begin participation in the Fathering Reentry Court Pilot Program.

This much has been accomplished in little more than one year under grants supporting the pilot project. The FY 2011 budget request would permit the Court to continue the Family Fathering Court Initiative following the expiration of the grant funding. It will also allow the program to begin to engage the broader universe of non-custodial parents in the District of Columbia who are having difficulty sustaining employment, making child support payments, and establishing healthy 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 currently operates with grant funding. Grant funding will be exhausted early in the first quarter of FY 2010.

Methodology. The position was classified in accordance with the Court's classification policies.

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 an independent evaluation. Its performance indicators will be maintained by the program administrators as a base line from which to continue to measure and monitor progress. Outcome measures will include the amount of child support paid, the number of participants who are employed, the number of participants enrolled in job training programs, and the non-custodial 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	94,000	23,000	117,000

Table 4
FAMILY COURT OPERATIONS
Budget Authority by Object Class

	FY 2009 Enacted	FY 2010 Enacted	FY 2011 Request	Difference FY 2010/2011
11 – Compensation	10,850,000	11,306,000	11,954,000	648,000
12 – Benefits	2,713,000	2,827,000	2,994,000	167,000
Subtotal Personnel Cost	13,563,000	14,133,000	14,948,000	815,000
21 - Travel, Transp. of Persons				
22 - Transportation of Things				
23 - Rent, Commun. & Utilities	212,000	217,000	222,000	5,000
24 - Printing & Reproduction	26,000	27,000	28,000	1,000
25 - Other Services	1,351,000	1,380,000	1,909,000	529,000
26 - Supplies & Materials	34,000	35,000	36,000	1,000
31 – Equipment	321,000	328,000	336,000	8,000
Subtotal Non-Personnel Cost	1,944,000	1,987,000	2,531,000	544,000
TOTAL	15,507,000	16,120,000	17,479,000	1,359,000
FTE	178	178	179	1

Table 5
FAMILY COURT OPERATIONS
Detail, Difference FY 2010/2011

Object Class	Description of Request	FTE	Cost	Difference FY 2010/2011
11 - Compensation	Current Positions COLA	178	384,000	
	Current Positions WIG		170,000	
	Fathering Court Initiative	1	94,000	
Subtotal				648,000
12 - Benefits	Current Positions COLA		100,000	
	Current Positions WIG		44,000	
	Fathering Court Initiative		23,000	
Subtotal				167,000
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 Services	Built-in		30,000	
	Special Advocates		499,000	
Subtotal				529,000
26 – Supplies & Materials	Built-in			1,000
31 - Equipment	Built-in			8,000
Total				1,359,000

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

Grade	FY 2009 Enacted	FY 2010 Enacted	FY 2011 Request
JS-3			
JS-4	4	4	4
JS-5			
JS-6	30	30	30
JS-7	9	9	9
JS-8	51	51	51
JS-9	35	35	35
JS-10	14	14	14
JS-11	10	10	10
JS-12	8	8	8
JS-13	14	14	15
JS-14	1	1	1
JS-15	1	1	1
JS-16			
JS-17			
CEs	1	1	1
Total Salaries	10,850,000	11,306,000	11,954,000
Total FTEs	178	178	179

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

<u>FY 2009 Enacted</u>		<u>FY 2010 Enacted</u>		<u>FY 2011 Request</u>		<u>Difference FY 2010/2011</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>
140	16,097,000	140	17,580,000*	140	19,289,000	0	1,709,000

Mission Statement

The mission of the Family Court Social Services Division (CSSD) is to assist the District of Columbia Superior Court’s Family Court and the city’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 CSSD is responsible for all youth involved in the District of Columbia’s juvenile justice system who are not committed to the District of Columbia’s Department of Youth Rehabilitative Services (DYRS). Responsibilities include 1) screening and assessing each youth’s risk to public safety; 2) conducting youth and family assessments; 3) making petition recommendations to the Office of the Attorney General (OAG); 4) advising and making recommendations to the Court throughout all phases of the adjudication process; 5) conducting home, school and community assessments toward the development of comprehensive pre- and post- disposition probation services/supervision plans and alternatives to detention; 6) recommending and facilitating commitment of youth to the DYRS; and 7) coordinating services and monitoring all court-involved youth. The Division is comprised of the director’s office, two units and four branches:

- The Director’s Office is responsible for management and oversight of all goals, objectives, programs, and activities across the division. The office has 7 FTEs
- The Juvenile Information Control Unit processes all cases throughout adjudication and disposition through the use of the court’s Integrated Justice Information (IJIS) CourtView database. The Unit has 5 FTEs
- The Contract Monitoring, Data and Financial Analysis Unit coordinates all court-ordered referrals and oversees the procurement of services and coordination of reimbursement for services provided by contracted service providers. The Unit also coordinates the Division’s staff training. The unit has 5 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, and one dedicated to youth served and supervised under the Status Offender and Juvenile Drug Court Unit. Intake Units I and II are responsible for screening risk to public safety and conducting

* Reflects a shift of \$500,000 from the Management Account to the Family Court Social Services Division.

(youth and family) social assessments on all youth referred by law enforcement entities and the District of Columbia Public Schools (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 the DCPS, Charter Schools 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 26 FTEs.

- The Pre/Post Probation Supervision Branch - Region I provides a seamless set of services, case management, monitoring/supervision, community outreach and global position system (GPS) electronic monitoring. The branch consists of: 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 serve youth residing in the southwest quadrant of the city; 3) the Southeast Satellite Office (SESO) Balanced and Restorative Justice Drop-In Center; and 4) the Delinquency Prevention Unit (DPU), which manages the CSSD's global position system (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 42 FTEs.
- The Pre/Post Probation Supervision Branch - Region II is responsible for a seamless set of services and monitoring/supervision efforts provided by one probation officer of record. The branch consists of: 1) Northwest Satellite Office (NWSO) responsible for serving and supervising the vast majority of youth residing in the Northwest quadrant of the city; 2) the Northeast Satellite Office (NESO) and the new Balanced and Restorative Justice Drop-In Center in Northeast (scheduled to replace the NESO in FY 2010), responsible for serving and supervising all youth residing in the northeast quadrant of the District; 3) the Interstate Probation Supervision Office (IPSO) which manages all youth adjudicated in the District who reside outside the city as well as all youth adjudicated outside the District who reside in the city; 4) Ultimate Transitions Ultimate Responsibilities Now (UTURN), responsible for supervising high-risk pre- and post- adjudicated youth throughout the city. This branch consists of 48 FTEs.
- The Child Guidance Clinic/Branch provides court ordered psychological, psycho-educational, neuro-psychological, competency, and forensic evaluations utilized to determine the needs of 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 Family Court Social Services Division will:

- Use a valid Risk Assessment Instrument and social assessment interviews on all youth within four (4) hours of referral, ensuring sound detention/release and petitioning recommendations (subsequent to consultation), and expeditious case processing initiation by transferring 95% of all cases to appropriate units within three business days of initial hearing in JM-15.

- Provide high quality screenings, assessments, services and supervision to all youth determined eligible for diversion and petitioning including a family group conference within 15 calendar days of petitioning as well as post-adjudication supervision.
- Ensure accurate and timely processing of all services requested by probation officers or ordered by the court by processing all referrals and invoices within three business days of the Probation Officer (PO) of record receiving the case, beginning January 1, 2010.
- Coordinate and facilitate family group conferences (FGC) on all youth within 15 calendar 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, 2010.
- Conduct high-quality, comprehensive home studies for families involved in domestic relations cases by completing 95% of home studies within seven weeks of the court order.
- Develop comprehensive strength-based social studies to guide services and supervision of all juveniles (as ordered by the court) by completing 95% of all social studies due within 15 days or 45 days of the court order.
- Ensure comprehensive service delivery and community supervision for all youth referred via Interstate Compact who reside within a 15 mile radius of the District and ensure all cases adjudicated in the District of Columbia involving youth residing outside of the radius are transferred to the appropriate jurisdiction for services and supervision.
- Provide high-quality psychological, neuro-psychological, psycho-sexual, and psycho-educational evaluations to all youth within 25 business days or less.

Restructuring or Work Process Re-Design

Building on a major re-design effort launched in Fiscal Year 2007, in 2009 CSSD managers continued to sustain the Division's adaptation. The Division continued to conduct strengths-based trainings to enhance utilization of Family Group Conferencing and, in 2010, additional FGC training will be leveraged for existing as well as newly hired staff. Supervision sessions provided by senior and mid-level managers were also increased to provide direct guidance and support to probation officers (PO) and clinical interns. The CSSD also increased the number of interns recruited and trained and deployed them across its units/offices to support POs. Additionally, greater emphasis was placed on the development of sound comprehensive pre-trial services/supervision plans with an eye toward adjusting the plans throughout various phases of adjudication. As a result, many objectives traditionally reserved for post-disposition probation were achieved prior to sentencing.

In 2009, the CSSD in partnership with the Metropolitan Police Department and DYRS, launched District's first-ever co-located Absconder Locator Unit, staffed by three CSSD POs, three DYRS' staff members and four Metropolitan Police Department (MPD) police officers. This unit is located on the D.C. Courts' campus in Building B (the main office for CSSD). Unit staff visit the homes of youth who have failed to appear for a court hearing, absconded

from a local court ordered placement, and/or failed to maintain contact with his or her PO or DYRS Case Manager. Chief among the responsibilities of POs staffing the unit is working with CSSD case-carrying POs and tracking last known whereabouts of CSSD youth through the Integrated Justice Information System (IJIS) and working with the Police to locate the youth and bring him or her before the Court. However, because MPD Officers designated to this unit are routinely called upon to respond to other MPD matters, CSSD POs staffing the unit frequently canvass communities independently in pursuit of youth under custody orders. To date, 60 of the 125 CSSD youth issued custody orders have been retrieved and returned to the Court.

In 2010, the CSSD will utilize the Absconder Locator Unit (ALU) as a law enforcement rotation for POs who have carried cases five or more years. These POs will rotate into the ALU for a six (6) month period. This effort will enable the CSSD to reduce the likelihood of burnout among case-carrying POs and enhance the Division’s public safety efforts. Training will be provided to POs prior to discharging them into the community. The partnership with MPD will continue with a goal of ensuring that youth unwilling to surrender to POs are brought before the Court prior to re-offending. The CSSD will continue leveraging Family Group Conferencing training for existing and all newly hired staff.

Workload Data

Table 1
SOCIAL SERVICES DIVISION
Caseload (Fiscal Year 2008 data)

Case Type	New Cases	Cases Closed	Cases Pending Beginning of Year	Cases Pending End of Year
Juvenile Intake	2,354	2,352	9	11
Pre/ Post Disp. Supervision	3,138	3,287	1,470	1,313
Juvenile Drug Court	46	58	46	34
Domestic Relations	184	146	18	53
Child Guidance Clinic	545	569	2	3

Table 2
SOCIAL SERVICES DIVISION
Key Performance Indicators

Performance Indicators	Data Source	FY 2008		FY 2009		FY 2010		FY 2011	
		Goal	Actual	Goal	Estimate	Goal	Projection	Goal	Projection
Juveniles under supervision and Domestic Relations (DR) monthly cases average of total CSSD cases	D.C. Superior Court Data	1,500	1,485	1,500	1,621	1,600	1,650	1,650	1,700
Juveniles under supervision and drug screening conducted	Pretrial Services Data	5,160	5,165	5,180	5,200	5,195	5,225	5,210	5,250
Juvenile probationers screening positive for drugs during probation	Pretrial Services Data	49%	49.5%	50%	50.5%	51%	51%	51%	51%
Percentage of juveniles successfully completing probation	CSSD Statistical Reports	70%	72%	75%	71%	78%	77%	80%	78%
Juveniles committing new offenses during probation	D.C. Superior Court Data	24%	22%	24%	21%	24%	24%	24%	24%
Average pre and post-disposition supervision caseloads and national standards: 1:25 min, med, max	CSSD Statistical Reports	26.5	27	25	30	25	25	25	25
Average pre and post-disposition intensive supervision caseloads and national standards 1:14	CSSD Statistical Reports	14	12	14	18	14	14	14	14
Increased curfew checks -- face-to-face contact	CSSD Statistical Reports	17,700	17,229	18,000	13,739	17,500	18,000	17,500	18,000
Increased curfew checks -- telephone calls	CSSD Statistical Reports	30,000	34,888	30,000	24,463	31,000	32,000	32,000	30,000
Increased compliance among youth with face-to-face and telephone call curfew checks ³	CSSD Statistical Reports	75%	70%	75%	71%	75%	75%	75%	75%

Division Outcomes and Accomplishments in FY 2009

In FY 2009, with an average daily population of roughly 1,621, of whom 1,246 or 76.8% were males and 375 or 23.2% were females, the CSSD continued to manage the front-end of the

³ Fiscal years 2010 and 2011 projections based on average juvenile arrest and offense rate trends reported by the District of Columbia Metropolitan Police Department (MPD) which show a slight reduction in volume of juvenile arrest overall across 2006, 2007, 2008 and 2009; however, the data also shows a slight increase in the types of serious offenses.

juvenile justice system. As stated, the Division continued to provide timely screenings and assessments of all newly referred youth resulting in more than a 92% completion rate. Curfew calls, face-to-face curfew checks, as well as home and school visits were provided to support sound case management and coordination of court ordered services. Comprehensive forensic evaluations and assessments were also provided as well as signature programs, including Leaders of Today in Solidarity (LOTS), Ultimate Transitions Ultimate Responsibilities Now (UTURN), the S.E. Balanced and Restorative Justice (BARJ) Drop-In Center, as well as the Delinquency Prevention Unit. Outcomes nationally recognized in past years were achieved in FY 2009; however, the significance of the S.E. BARJ Drop-In Center cannot be overstated, particularly as the CSSD nears completion of its new N.E. Drop-In Center.

Table 3
BARJ Center

Month/Year	Oct 08	Nov 08	Dec 08	Jan 09	Feb 09	Mar 09	Apr 09	May 09
Youth in Program	41	31	29	25	25	18	20	21
% not suspended from school	97.4%	94.7%	97.3%	93.8%	96%	92.6%	91.7%	92.6%
% not rearrested	97.5%	95.1%	92.7%	97.2%	96.9%	96.7%	95%	95%

Detailed in Table 3 are outcomes achieved by the S.E. BARJ Drop-In Center in FY 2009. Of major significance is the fact that among the youth participating in the S.E. BARJ Drop-In Center, data reveals recidivism rates remained under 5%, less than 6% of participating youth were suspended from school and more than 97% of participating youth completed the S.E. BARJ Drop-In Center program.

Table 4
Curfew Checks

Month/Year	Oct 08	Nov 08	Dec 08	Jan 09	Feb 09	Mar 09	Apr 09	May 09
Face-to-Face	1,277	1,668	1,521	1,655	1,825	1,922	1,895	1,976
Telephone	2,634	2,706	3,004	3,398	3,272	3,422	2,813	3,214

Data detailed in Table 4 underscores that from October 2008 thru May 2009, a total of 13,739 face-to-face curfew checks and 24,463 telephone curfew checks were conducted. The population of youth receiving face-to-face curfews includes youth residing in the city, District of Columbia youth adjudicated outside the city, as well as youth adjudicated in the District of Columbia who reside within a 15 mile radius of the city. The population of youth receiving telephone curfew checks includes all youth supervised by CSSD who have been court-ordered to adhere to a curfew set by the Court and those whose curfews are set by the parent.

Also in 2009, the Division's Child Guidance Clinic (CGC) completed nearly 550 psychological evaluations. As indicated in the "Organizational Background" portion of this budget submission, the CGC is staffed by five full-time clinical psychologists and three paid interns. The staff of the CGC is augmented by a host of non-paid externs. Because the CGC's doctoral internship is accredited by the American Psychological Association (APA), interns work under the supervision of licensed psychologists. The efforts of the CGC and probation officers, particularly in the aftermath of Speedy Trial legislation passed by the D.C. Council in 2008, have enabled the Family Court to maintain compliance with the legislation. The Clinic continued to operate the only community-based comprehensive program for juveniles adjudicated for sexual assault. In FY 2010 the CGC, in collaboration with Children's Hospital,

will launch a medical and behavioral health screening initiative on the campus of the D.C. Courts.

Also in 2009, the CSSD, in collaboration with one of its contract vendors, sponsored two Civil Rights Tours. The first trip for CSSD girls occurred at the end of March. Thirty-three girls were selected based on compliance with court-ordered conditions of community supervision and parental consent to attend the trip. Upon return to the District of Columbia, each girl was required to complete a 500 word essay on her experience. Additionally, the girls were required to conduct presentations in partial fulfillment of court-ordered community service. The essays and feedback from the presentations were very positive. In July 2009, 40 males were selected (based on compliance with court-ordered conditions) to attend a tour at Andrews Air Force Base. The youth met military officers, enjoyed a lunch on the base, learned a great deal about the history of the men and women serving our nation, and met adults, some of whom volunteered to mentor CSSD youth.

In August 2009, 40 males will participate in a Civil Rights Tour that will include the same destinations visited by the LOTS girls. Essays will be completed and the males will be required to conduct presentations that will count toward their community service. Additionally, in August 2009, the CSSD will sponsor a tour of several Historically Black Colleges and Universities (HBCUs) located on the East Coast. The trips will introduce CSSD youth to college life, permit them to room for one weekend on campus, and enhance their interest in attending a four-year university to earn a college degree. Over the course of the past six years, CSSD has found the HBCU Tours to be invaluable, as many of the youth who attend college frequently return to CSSD (during summer break) as volunteers and interns.

In 2008 the CSSD was recognized by the Annie E. Casey Foundation for many of its initiatives and was selected by the Coalition for Juvenile Justice to present at its 2009 annual conference. Following the conference, representatives from various states toured CSSD’s facilities, and several jurisdictions also invited CSSD to co-present at state assembly meetings to support such jurisdictions’ efforts to replicate CSSD initiatives. Also, the CSSD was selected in FY 2009 to serve as the main plenary for the annual Juvenile Detention Alternatives Initiative (JDAI) conference. The District’s juvenile justice system was designated in September 2005 as a JDAI site by the Annie E. Casey Foundation and, in less than four years, accomplishments achieved by the CSSD will be highlighted for jurisdictions across the country.

Table 5
Parent Participation

Month/Year	Oct 08	Nov 08	Dec 08	Jan 09	Feb 09	Mar 09	Apr 09	May 09
Parent Participation Orders	764	770	875	868	927	845	799	816
Compliance	643	680	787	779	839	769	719	706
% Compliance among parents	89%	89%	92%	90%	91%	92%	92%	90%

From October 2008 through May 2009, the compliance among parents issued parent participation orders achieved a compliance rate of 90.6%. National indicators underscore that parents, guardians and custodians are the best source to supervise and support adolescents involved in juvenile justice systems.

Referral Trends Analyzed

In FY 2009, CSSD's analysis of its Contract Monitoring, Data and Financial Analysis Unit's efforts reveals the need to secure additional funds, due to the continued increase in utilization of contracted services, and due to contract cost escalations. For example in FY 2004, an average of 1,172 supervised youth were provided services in response to court orders for services listed in Table 6. The number of supervised youth provided such services was 1,423 in FY 2005; 1,496 in FY 2006, 1,348 in FY 2007; and 1,575 in FY 2008.

FY 2011 Request

In FY 2011, the Courts request \$19,289,000 for the Family Court Social Services Division, an increase of \$1,709,000 (10%) above the FY 2010 Enacted Budget. The request includes \$925,000 to expand services for youth under supervision and \$784,000 for built-in cost increases.

Expanded Services for Youth Under Supervision, \$925,000

Problem Statement. To expand the CSSD services/supervision, thereby increasing the habilitation and rehabilitation of court-involved youth, the Courts seek additional resources. More than 70% of all youth involved in the District of Columbia's juvenile justice system receive services through CSSD rather than the District's human services agency or departments. Additional services are needed to ensure that these youth benefit from the goal of juvenile justice system: "To stem the tide of youth matriculating to the adult criminal justice system."

In 2008, the District of Columbia Council enacted speedy trial legislation, which placed youth remanded to shelter housing (during the trial) on the same timelines, from petitioning to trial and disposition, as youth remanded to secure detention. The legislation sought to achieve parity among both populations, and the impact to the Family Court and CSSD was felt immediately. CSSD was required to operate at a rapid speed in carrying out its duties and, in so doing, was also required to increase the volume of services provided to youth under its supervision, resulting in an increase in GPS electronic monitoring slots, Third-Party Monitoring slots, educational advocacy, mentoring, tutoring, counseling (individual, group and family), community supervision (supervision of community service completed by youth), and forensic evaluations.

Relationship to Court Vision, Mission and Goals. Additional funds will permit CSSD to enhance services for court-involved youths consistent with the Courts' strategic goal. Specifically, this request supports the Courts' Goal 6.2: to be accountable to the public and Strategy 6.2.6: to provide effective supervision of juvenile probationers to promote public safety and rehabilitation and reduce recidivism.

Relationship to Division Objectives. This request supports the Division MAP Objective to provide high quality screenings, assessments, services and supervision to all youth determined

eligible for diversion and petitioning including a family group conference within 15 calendar days of petitioning as well as post-adjudication supervision.

Relationship to Existing Funding. Following careful reengineering, additional funds are needed to ensure court-involved youth are adequately served and supervised. Existing funds are not sufficient.

Expenditure Plan. Funds will support existing service and supervision contracts listed in Table 6. Contracts will be awarded in accordance with the Courts' Procurement Policies and Guidelines.

Table 6
Expanded Services for Youth

Description	Request Amount
Georgetown After School (ASK) Enrichment Contract	79,598
Wrap Around Services Purchase for CSSD Youth	845,402
Total	925,000

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

- Increase in curfew checks
- Increase in face-to-face community contacts
- Reduction in the loss of contact with youths
- Increase in school checks and conferences with schools
- Reduction in the number of curfew violations reports filed
- Increase in school attendance and academic performance
- Reduction in number of youths testing positive for drugs
- Reduction in number of youths remanded to detention facility
- Increase in the number of POS units for youths referred for service
- Increase in youths successfully completing probation
- Maintain average daily caseload ratio of 1/25 per case carrying probation officer

Table 7
SOCIAL SERVICES DIVISION
Budget Authority by Object Class

	FY 2009 Enacted	FY 2010 Enacted	FY 2011 Request	Difference FY 2010/2011
11 - Personnel Compensation	11,167,000	11,636,000	12,205,000	569,000
12 - Personnel Benefits	2,793,000	2,915,000	3,063,000	148,000
<i>Subtotal Personnel Cost</i>	13,960,000	14,551,000	15,268,000	717,000
21 - Travel, Transp. of Persons				
22 - Transportation of Things				
23 - Rent, Commun. & Utilities				
24 - Printing & Reproduction				
25 - Other Services	2,073,000	2,963,000	3,953,000	990,000
26 - Supplies & Materials	31,000	32,000	33,000	1,000
31 - Equipment	33,000	34,000	35,000	1,000
<i>Subtotal Non Personnel Cost</i>	2,137,000	3,029,000	4,021,000	992,000
TOTAL	16,097,000	17,580,000	19,289,000	1,709,000
FTE	140	140	140	0

Table 8
SOCIAL SERVICES DIVISION
Detail, Difference FY 2010/2011

Object Class	Description of Request	FTE	Cost	Difference FY 2010/2011
11 - Personnel Compensation	Current Positions COLA	140	395,000	569,000
	Current Positions WIG		174,000	
<i>Subtotal</i>				569,000
12 - Personnel Benefits	Current Positions COLA		103,000	148,000
	Current Positions WIG		45,000	
<i>Subtotal</i>				148,000
21 - Travel, Transp. of Persons				
22 - Transportation of Things				
23 - Rent, Commun. & Utilities				
24 - Printing & Reproduction				
25 - Other Services	Expanded Services for Youth		925,000	990,000
	Built-in		65,000	
<i>Subtotal</i>				990,000
26 - Supplies & Materials	Built-in			1,000
31 - Equipment	Built-in			1,000
Total				1,709,000

Table 9
SOCIAL SERVICES DIVISION
Detail of Full-Time & Equivalent Employment

Grade	2009 Enacted	2010 Enacted	2011 Request
JS-2			
JS-3			
JS-4			
JS-5			
JS-6	3	3	4
JS-7	4	4	4
JS-8	17	17	18
JS-9	21	21	29
JS-10	2	2	2
JS-11	3	3	4
JS-12	63	63	50
JS-13	20	20	23
JS-14	5	5	4
JS-15	1	1	1
CES	1	1	1
Total Salary	11,167,000	11,636,000	12,205,000
Total FTEs	140	140	140

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

<u>FY 2009 Enacted</u>		<u>FY 2010 Enacted</u>		<u>FY 2011 Request</u>		<u>Difference FY 2010/2011</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	2,577,000	20	2,677,000	21	2,868,000	1	191,000

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 mediation and binding and non-binding arbitration for most of the Superior Court’s civil cases. Mediation is provided for small claims cases, landlord 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, 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 mediators who are lawyers, social

workers, government employees, retirees, and others providing ADR services to the court. Mediators receive a small stipend for their services.

4. 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	Cases Held	*Cases Settled	Settlement Rate
FY 2008	8,866	4,381	1,886	43%
FY 2009	8,483	4,300	1,831	43%

*settlements include both full and partial settlements of family cases.

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:

- Further the delivery of justice through effective alternative dispute resolution (ADR) in all case types by maintaining settlement and client satisfaction rates.
- Enhance case management by utilizing time standards for processing all cases referred to ADR.
- Enhance data collection and reporting procedures to facilitate report production, and maintain best practices to ensure the integrity of courtwide data.

- Increase understanding of and access to ADR by producing high-quality written materials and videos that better inform and prepare lawyers, clients and the public about the mediation process.
- Improve public access to Alternative Dispute Resolution by increasing services and options for participation.
- Recruit and retain a well-trained neutral roster of mediators in all mediation programs by maintaining an open enrollment application process and providing basic mediation skills training.
- Promote well-trained neutral panels by offering advanced mediation training across programs and instituting a continuing education requirement.
- Enhance current and future delivery of Multi-Door services by initiating a workforce plan that includes position reengineering, organizational and succession planning that aligns all division goals and objectives with individual employee performance plans.
- Promote diversity by outreach efforts to minority groups. Continue to monitor and evaluate diversity of staff and neutral roster.

Division Restructuring or Work Process Design

The Multi-Door Dispute Resolution Division continues to explore innovative and effective approaches to resolving disputes and designing dispute systems that resolve cases early in the court process. The Division supports and collaborates with the Family, Civil, and Probate Divisions by exploring new opportunities to mediate when the case is most amenable to settlement and developing new systems to improve the timing of the mediation process and outcomes. During this fiscal year, the Multi-Door Division, in collaboration with the Probate Division, reviewed the timing of mediation for litigation cases and recognized that mediation was being conducted too early in the process, not allowing for sufficient time to gather information to ensure meaningful negotiations. The new scheduling order allows mediation to be conducted 240 days from the time the complaint is filed, which will bring it closer to pre-trial and trial, when many more cases are ripe for settlement.

The 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 extended services to all *pro se* family cases by expanding the Program for Agreement and Cooperation in Contested Custody Disputes (PAC) to four of five Domestic Relations Calendars. In this innovative program, parents have an opportunity to mediate their dispute following an education seminar on the harmful effects of contested custody disputes on children.

Multi-Door expanded the roster of qualified mediators by adding 40 new mediators through an open enrollment process and new mediation skills training program conducted in the fall of 2009. Multi-Door increased the diversity of its mediator roster during this fiscal year by recruiting minority applicants for the 2009 mediation training class.

The Multi-Door division has worked in conjunction with the Information Technology Division in several areas during this fiscal year to improve the performance of mediators by developing a database system specifically to track mediator performance and settlements. The database system will assist the division in improving the quality of the mediator panel by monitoring patterns and trends that will enhance the matching of mediators to disputes, improve mediator performance and produce specialized training to meet the needs of the programs.

The division worked with the Budget and Finance Division and the Information Technology Division to develop the requirements for a web based voucher system to improve the stipend payment process and reduce the amount of resources expended each month to pay mediators. This web based voucher system is scheduled to be completed at the end of this fiscal year.

Workload Data

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

Type of Indicator	Performance Indicator	Data Source	FY 2008 Actual	FY 2009 Estimated	Projection FY 2010	Projection FY 2011
Input	Cases Referred to Mediation	CourtView	6,980	6,950	6,900	6,850
Output	Mediation Sessions Held	CourtView	3,513	3,550	3,500	3,400
Outcome	Case settlement rate	CourtView	39%	39%	40%	40%
Outcome/Quality	Participant Satisfaction w/ ADR Process	SPSS database	95%	94%	95%	95%
Outcome/Quality	Participant Satisfaction w/ Outcome	SPSS database	86%	85%	85%	85%
Outcome/Quality	Neutral Performance Satisfaction	SPSS database	94%	94%	95%	95%

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

Type of Indicator	Performance Indicator	Data Source	FY 2008 Actual	FY 2009 Estimated	Projection FY 2010	Projection FY 2011
Input	Mediation Sessions Scheduled	Court view	2424	2,133	2,346	2,425
Output	Mediation sessions held	CourtView	1,628	1,420	1,562	1,625
Outcome	*Case settlement rate	CourtView	66%	65%	66%	68%
Outcome/Quality	Participant satisfaction w/ process	SPSS database	97%	96%	97%	98%
Outcome/Quality	Participant satisfaction w/outcome	SPSS database	93%	91%	92%	93%
Outcome/Quality	Neutral performance satisfaction	SPSS database	98%	98%	99%	98%

*Case settlement rate reflects both full and partial settlements of family cases.

The quality performance elements reported in Tables 2 & 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 the number of civil cases filed in the court and the number of

cases referred to mediation. In the civil division there has been a slight decrease in the number of civil complaints filed, while in the family program there has been an increase in the number of cases referred to mediation. Settlement rate projections are based on continuing improvements to the ADR programs and improving mediator performance. Client satisfaction survey rate projections are based on a continuing trend that levels off at 91% 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	FY 2008		FY 2009		FY 2010		FY 2011	
			Goal	Actual	Goal	Estimate	Goal	Estimate	Goal	Estimate
Output	Settlement Rate	IJIS database	50%	43%	50%	43%	50%	45%	50%	45%
Outcome	Overall client satisfaction (ratings of satisfied plus highly satisfied)	SPSS database	80%	93%	80%	94%	80%	95%	80%	96%

FY 2011 Request

In FY 2011, the D.C. Courts request \$2,868,000 for the Multi-Door Dispute Resolution Division, an increase of \$191,000 (7%) above the FY 2010 Enacted Budget. The requested increase consists of \$75,000 for one FTE to meet increased caseloads in civil ADR programs and \$116,000 for built-in increases.

Civil ADR Case Manager (JS-10), \$75,000

Problem Statement. A Civil ADR Case Manager is needed to support the growing caseloads of the Small Claims, Landlord Tenant, Tax and Probate Mediation Programs. Unlike other division programs, these programs are operated entirely by two program officers, with no supporting case manager to provide day-to-day administrative assistance and continuity in the absence of the program officer. One program officer manages three mediation programs operating from different court buildings, creating a situation where the program officer is not on site to accept judicial referrals to mediation or to provide direct supervision of litigants and mediators.

The Small Claims and the Landlord Tenant Programs experience the highest settlement rates in the Civil ADR Branch of the division: 50% of small claims cases and 60% of landlord tenant

cases settle in mediation, significantly reducing the time and cost to litigants and saving judicial resources for cases that need to be tried.

These programs continue to experience exponential increases in caseload, increasing the daily demand for mediation services. The Landlord Tenant Program, begun in 2003, has experienced a steadily climbing caseload - from 445 cases in 2003 to 945 cases in 2008 and the addition of a second venue for mediation of jury demand cases.

The Civil ADR Case Manager is necessary to provide administration, case management and support for the four alternative dispute resolution programs currently operated by two program officers. Current staffing levels are not adequate to provide continuity of services in these programs, which carry combined caseloads of more than 2,000 cases per year and far exceed the individual caseloads of all other case managers and program officers in the division. These two program managers handle more than double the caseload of other programs within the division, leaving them little time to devote to mediator skill development, program improvements, or other pursuits that would increase the quality of the programs and, consequently, increased user satisfaction and settlement rates.

Relationship to Court Mission, Vision and Strategic Goals. The Civil Branch Case Manager 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 and case management to the small claims, landlord and tenant, tax and probate mediation caseloads.

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

Methodology. The position is graded at a grade 10 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. With an additional case manager, we expect the timely processing of cases for mediation and settlement rates that will steadily increase, removing many more cases from the courts' docket.

Table 5
MULTI-DOOR DISPUTE RESOLUTION DIVISION
New Position Requested

Position	Grade	Number	Annual Salary	Benefits	Total Personnel Costs
Case Manager	10	1	\$55,000	\$20,000	\$75,000

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

	FY 2009 Enacted	FY 2010 Enacted	FY 2011 Request	Difference FY 2010/2011
11 - Personnel Compensation	1,542,000	1,607,000	1,741,000	134,000
12 - Personnel Benefits	386,000	403,000	443,000	40,000
<i>Subtotal Personnel Cost</i>	<i>1,928,000</i>	<i>2,010,000</i>	<i>2,184,000</i>	<i>174,000</i>
21 - Travel, Transp. of Persons				
22 - Transportation of Things				
23 - Rent, Commun. & Utilities				
24 - Printing & Reproduction				
25 - Other Services	637,000	653,000	668,000	15,000
26 - Supplies & Materials	7,000	8,000	9,000	1,000
31 - Equipment	5,000	6,000	7,000	1,000
<i>Subtotal Non Personnel Cost</i>	<i>649,000</i>	<i>667,000</i>	<i>684,000</i>	<i>17,000</i>
TOTAL	2,577,000	2,677,000	2,868,000	191,000
FTE	20	20	21	1

Table 7
MULTI-DOOR DISPUTE RESOLUTION DIVISION
Detail, Difference FY 2010/2011

Object Class	Description of Request	FTE	Cost	Difference FY 2010/2011
11 – Personnel Compensation	Current Positions COLA	20	55,000	
	Current Positions WIG		24,000	
	Civil ADR Case Manager	1	55,000	
<i>Subtotal</i>				<i>134,000</i>
12 – Personnel Benefits	Current Positions COLA		14,000	
	Current Positions WIG		6,000	
	Civil ADR Case Manager		20,000	
<i>Subtotal</i>				<i>40,000</i>
21 - Travel, Transp. of Persons				
22 - Transportation of Things				
23 - Rent, Commun. & Utilities				
24 - Printing & Reproduction				
25 - Other Service	Built-in			15,000
26 - Supplies & Materials	Built-in			1,000
31 - Equipment	Built-in			1,000
Total				191,000

Table 8

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

Grade	FY 2009 Enacted	FY 2010 Enacted	FY 2011 Request
JS-3			
JS-4			
JS-5			
JS-6			
JS-7			
JS-8	1	1	1
JS-9	2	2	1
JS-10	7	7	9
JS-11	4	4	5
JS-12	1	1	1
JS-13	4	4	3
JS-14			
JS-15			
JS-16			
JS-17			
CES	1	1	1
Total Salaries	1,542,000	1,607,000	1,741,00
Total FTEs	20	20	21

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

<u>FY 2009 Enacted</u>		<u>FY 2010 Enacted</u>		<u>FY 2011 Request</u>		<u>Difference FY 2010/2011</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	370,000	3	388,000	4	492,000	1	104,000

Mission Statement

The mission of the Office of the Auditor-Master is to assist the Court and parties in actions filed in the D.C. Superior Court by expeditiously stating accounts for persons under the authority of the Court. The Office plays an especially critical role in assisting the Court in its responsibility to safeguard and recover assets of incapacitated adults, minors, and decedent estates which are under Court supervision in the Probate Division. Matters are referred to the Auditor-Master after the Court has determined in a hearing that a fiduciary has failed to properly account to the Court or the parties. The Office also assists the Court by resolving controversies involving complex financial computations and transactions in the Civil, Probate, and Tax Divisions and Family Court. Matters are referred which require that complex financial issues be resolved, or that accountings be conducted in matters involving numerous transactions over a lengthy period of time. It is the primary goal of the Office to perform these tasks in an accelerated manner so as to assist the Court in meeting its Time to Disposition Standards in these complex cases.

The Auditor-Master must also perform such other functions as may be assigned by the Court. Thus, the Auditor-Master is also available to assist the Judiciary in 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 investigates assigned matters by gathering and arranging all available documentation and evidence, issues subpoenas for additional documentation and witnesses to supplement the record, and conducts hearings during which testimony is secured under oath, and the evidence is presented by the Office. Following the hearings, the Auditor-Master states the accounts by determining the value of assets, income and allowable expenses and liabilities, and makes other complex financial calculations in the controversies between parties, and issues proposed findings of fact and conclusions of law, thus conserving judicial time and resources. The report is thereafter considered by the Court in a hearing with the parties.

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 Management Action Plan Objectives

The division’s caseload statistics for FY 2008 and the projected FY 2009 statistics are presented in Table 1A and Table 1B. In accordance with the Time to Disposition Standards effective July 31, 2007, the Office of the Auditor-Master established and met completion standards for FY 2008, as reflected in Table 2.

Workload Data

Table 1A
FY 2008 Caseload Overview

Case Activity Fiscal Year 2008			Cases Pending Fiscal Year 2008		
Dispositions	Cases Referred	Clearance Rate	1 Oct	30 Sep	Change
15	17	88%	17	18	6%

Table 1B
Projected FY 2009 Caseload Overview

Case Activity Fiscal Year 2009			Cases Pending Fiscal Year 2009		
Dispositions	Cases Referred	Clearance Rate	1 Oct	30 Sep	Change
36	23	156%	18	5	-72%

Key Performance Indicators

Table 2
**OFFICE OF THE AUDITOR-MASTER
Key Performance Indicators**

Type of Indicator	Key Performance Indicator	Data Source	FY 2008		FY 2009		FY 2010		FY 2011	
			Goal	Actual	Goal	Projected	Goal	Estimate	Goal	Estimate
Output	Percentage of cases completed within nine months	Monthly Reports	40%	63%	45%	67%	55%	60%	55%	60%
Output	Percentage of cases completed within 12 months	Monthly Reports	65%	75%	70%	69%	70%	75%	70%	75%
Output	Percentage of cases completed within 18 months	Monthly Reports	85%	88%	90%	78%	90%	90%	90%	90%

FY 2011 Request

In FY 2011, the Courts request \$492,000 for the Office of the Auditor-Master, an increase of \$104,000 (27 %) above the FY 2010 Enacted Budget. The requested increase consists of \$83,000 for one FTE to assist in the investigation and stating of accounts and \$21,000 for built-in increases.

Accountant (JS-11), \$83,000

Problem Statement. The Office of the Auditor-Master, which largely engages in accounting functions, operates without an accountant. Many orders of reference involve issues that require an inordinate amount of accounting and staff with effective accounting skill sets, since the accountings involve millions of dollars, and thousands of transactions. The Office has either tasked existing staff with these accounting functions, or sought to supplement staff with college and graduate student interns majoring in business and accounting. This temporary, part-time assistance is helpful, but not effective in addressing the caseload demands. While the current staff has specialized accounting experience, much of their time must be spent investigating, preparing for, and conducting the hearings. They also spend a large percentage of their time preparing subpoenas, drafting orders, researching legal issues, and writing reports, which include findings of fact, conclusions of law and detailed accountings. The Auditor-Master must divide his time between these tasks, and other administrative duties required by the Court.

Relationship to Courtwide Strategic Issues, Goals or Strategies. The Office of the Auditor-Master’s request for additional funding for a new FTE Accountant will assist the Courts in reaching Goal 1.2 of the Courts Strategic Plan: The D.C. Courts will resolve cases promptly and efficiently.

Relationship to Division MAP Objectives. The request supports the division’s FY 2009 Management Action Plan objective – The Office of the Auditor Master will resolve cases promptly and efficiently by resolving 55 percent of the cases within 9 months, 70 percent within 12 months, and 90 percent within 18 months by 2011.

Relationship to Existing Funding. Funding is not available in the division’s budget to support the additional position.

Methodology. The position was classified in accordance with Court's classification policies.

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

Key Performance Indicators. The key performance measure is the percent of cases completed within the established time to disposition standards. The time to disposition standards are reflected in Table 3.

Table 3

New Performance Standards

Days to Completion	120	180	270	360	540
Percent of Cases	40%	60%	80%	95%	100%

Table 4

OFFICE OF THE AUDITOR-MASTER

New Positions Requested

Position	Grade	Number	Salary	Benefits	Total Personnel Cost
Accountant	JS-11	1	\$66,000	\$17,000	\$83,000

Table 5
OFFICE OF THE AUDITOR-MASTER
Budget Authority by Object Class

	FY 2009 Enacted	FY 2010 Enacted	FY 2011 Request	Difference FY 2010/2011
11 – Compensation	283,000	295,000	375,000	80,000
12 – Benefits	71,000	74,000	95,000	21,000
<i>Subtotal Personnel Cost</i>	354,000	369,000	470,000	101,000
21 - Travel, Transp. of Persons				
22 - Transportation of Things				
23 - Rent, Commun. & Utilities				
24 - Printing & Reproduction				
25 - Other Services	3,000	4,000	5,000	1,000
26 - Supplies & Materials	3,000	4,000	5,000	1,000
31 – Equipment	10,000	11,000	12,000	1,000
<i>Subtotal Non Personnel Cost</i>	16,000	19,000	22,000	3,000
TOTAL	370,000	388,000	492,000	104,000
FTE	3	3	4	1

Table 6
OFFICE OF THE AUDITOR-MASTER
Detail Difference, FY 2010/2011

Object Class	Description of Request	FTE	Cost	Difference FY 2010/2011
11- Personnel Compensation	Current Positions COLA	3	10,000	
	Current Positions WIG		4,000	
	Accountant	1	66,000	
<i>Subtotal</i>				80,000
12- Personnel Benefits	Current Positions COLA		3,000	
	Current Positions WIG		1,000	
	Accountant		17,000	
<i>Subtotal</i>				21,000
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				104,000

Table 7

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

Grade	FY 2009 Enacted	FY 2010 Enacted	FY 2011 Request
JS-3			
JS-4			
JS-5			
JS-6			
JS-7			
JS-8			
JS-9	1		
JS-10		1	1
JS-11			1
JS-12	1		
JS-13		1	1
JS-14			
JS-15			
JS-16			
JS-17			
CES	1	1	1
Total Salaries	283,000	295,000	375,000
Total	3	3	4

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

<u>FY 2009 Enacted</u>		<u>FY 2010 Enacted</u>		<u>FY 2011 Request</u>		<u>Difference FY 2010/2011</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>
48	4,732,000	48	4,932,000	49	5,259,000	1	327,000

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 and developmentally disabled 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. The number of new case filings in the Probate Division is at a three year high, up from 2,796 new case filings in fiscal year 2006 and 2,742 in fiscal year 2007, to 2,934 new case filings in fiscal year 2008.

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 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 sometimes 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 went public – providing public access via the Court webpage to docket information concerning all large and small estates and foreign estate proceedings.

Organizational Background

The Probate Division consists of the Office of the Register of Wills, a front-line Probate Clerk's Office, Quality Assurance Office, Legal Branch, Auditing Branch and 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 Probate 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 and seven deputy clerks, most of who serve at the order desk as well as the cashier station, for a total of 8 FTEs.
- The Quality Assurance Office provides courtroom support for the Probate Division judges, tickler processing, 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 Legal Branch is headed by the Deputy Register of Wills together with three attorneys, one legal assistant, two small estate specialists/paralegals and a 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 provide information to 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, informs attorneys and fiduciaries regarding 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 clerks, who are responsible for processing orders and the scheduling of summary hearings.
- 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, the file room, and records maintained off-site, including original wills filed with the Probate Division. This office has 3 FTEs, consisting of the Probate Systems Administrator, one deputy clerk and one records clerk.

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. Enhance access to Probate Division information by implementing remote access to large and small estate docket information.
- Objective 3. Enhance the availability and usefulness of the Probate Division website by reviewing, revising and updating the Probate Division forms available to the public.

Objective 4. Promote a well trained workforce and enhance employee performance following the comprehensive reorganization of the Probate Division.

Objective 5. Facilitate the efficient processing of requests for archival cases by developing a computerized procedure available through the Probate Division website.

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 2009, the Probate Division:

- Introduced the Guardianship Assistance Program, a partnership between the Court and local universities, in which students in social work receive field credit for volunteering their time to provide increased services to incapacitated adults who are under Court supervision. During FY 2009, this program also planned and held the first ever Guardianship Conference for approximately 125 family members and attorney guardians;
- Provided public access, via the web, to the Probate Division docket for all large and small estates and foreign estate proceedings, thus enabling litigants and the public to conduct preliminary genealogical searches online, to check on upcoming court hearings, and to review the docket to ensure that filings have been received and processed;
- Completed a major reorganization of the Probate Division, resulting in a new Quality Assurance Office and heightened efforts to enhance public service;
- Updated and expanded, in cooperation with members of the Bar, the forms available on the Probate Division website;
- Prepared numerous publications for *pro se* litigants, including publications that explain the administration of an estate, provide forms for filing for the opening of a small estate or large estate, provided information concerning the responsibilities of guardians making medical and personal care decisions for a ward and the responsibilities of conservators handling the financial affairs of a ward, and guide the preparation of inventories and accounts for filing with the Court; and
- Created a new Major Litigation case type to improve party maintenance, ensure the proper issuance of defaults and dismissals and promote the continued monitoring of filing of reports and accounts while litigation is underway.

Workload Data

As shown in Table 1, the Probate Division disposed of 3,683 cases during FY 2008 based upon a substantial effort to review all pending older cases and dispose of these cases when appropriate. As a result, the clearance rate during fiscal year 2008 for decedent's estate cases was 121%, for guardianships of minors cases, 229%, for adult guardianships/conservatorships cases, 168%, and for trusts, 300%. This same effort has resulted in a decrease in the number of cases pending in six of the eight case categories, despite the fact that the number of case filings overall in the

Probate Division increased from fiscal year 2007 to fiscal year 2008, including increases in case filings of foreign proceedings, decedent's estates, small estates and trusts.

Table 1
Caseload and Efficiency Measures
(Fiscal Year 2008 Data)

	Cases Filed	Cases Disposed	Clearance Rate*	Cases Pending		
				1-Oct	30-Sept	Change
Old Law Conservatorship	0	30	**	146	116	-20%
Foreign Proceedings	145	118	81%	134	161	+20%
Decedent's Estate	1,610	1,956	121%	4,741	4,395	- 7%
Guardianships of Minors	41	94	229%	428	375	-12%
Adult Guardianships/Conservatorships	403	678	168%	1,978	1,703	-14%
Small Estates	697	693	99%	79	83	+5%
Trusts	<u>38</u>	<u>114</u>	300%	<u>190</u>	<u>114</u>	-40%
Total	2,934	3,683	125%	7,696	6,947	-10%

* 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.

** 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 2008		FY 2009		FY 2010		FY 2011	
		Goal	Actual	Goal	Estimate	Goal	Estimate	Goal	Estimate
Time Standard from Filing to Disposition									
Supervised decedents' estates within 37 months**	Monthly Reports	95%	*	95%	5%	95%	10%	95%	20%
Small estates: within 120 days	Monthly Report	95%	96%	95%	92%	95%	93%	95%	95%
Unsupervised decedents' estates within 37 months	Monthly Reports	95%	*	95%	90%	95%	90%	95%	95%
Requests for compensation from Guardianship Fund: within 30 days	Monthly Reports	95%	98%	95%	98%	95%	98%	95%	98%
Requests for compensation without account: within 30 days	Monthly Reports	95%	97%	95%	98%	95%	98%	95%	98%
Request for compensation with account: within 90 days	Monthly Reports	95%	98%	95%	95%	95%	95%	95%	95%
Uncontested petitions within 30 days	Monthly Report	95%	92%	95%	93%	95%	94%	95%	95%

* Data not ascertainable

**These types of cases are generally more complex, involving will contests, heirship contests, filing for the administration of an estate in connection with the foreclosure of real property, disputes among heirs, changes in fiduciaries and the like.

FY 2011 Request

In FY 2011, the Courts request \$5,259,000 for the Probate Division, an increase of \$327,000 (7%) above the FY 2010 Enacted Budget. The requested increase includes \$83,000 for 1 FTE to expand the Guardianship Assistance Program to serve more elderly and disabled wards of the Court and \$244,000 for built-in cost increases.

Expansion of the Guardianship Assistance Program Deputy Program Manager, JS-11 \$83,000

Problem Statement: To expand the Guardianship Assistance Program through which incapacitated adults served by the Probate Division receive visits and monitoring from volunteer students studying for advanced social work degrees from local universities, the Courts require resources for a deputy program manager. The Court selects and appoints volunteers as student visitors to visit the incapacitated adults, review their medical plans and progress, consult with their families and court-appointed guardians, and report to the Court concerning any unmet needs of the ward. These social work students also work to identify resources available to help these at-risk wards and were instrumental in the design and development of the first ever Guardianship Conference.

Appointment of well-qualified student visitors enhances the Probate Division's ability to ensure the safety and welfare of these vulnerable adults. In this program, implemented in August 2008, the program manager serves as a field instructor to the students. A deputy program manager to serve as a second field instructor would increase the number of elderly, incapacitated wards who could be helped by this program. With over 1,400 open guardianship cases in the Probate Division, there are many incapacitated wards waiting and needing to be served by this program. The need will continue to increase as the District's population ages.

Relationship to Strategic Issues, Goals or Strategies: The expansion of the Guardianship Assistance Program would serve the goals of increased access to justice and promoting public trust and confidence by assisting the Court to ensure that disabled adults receive necessary and appropriate services while under the supervision of the Court. This request is in keeping with Strategic Goal 2.1, to promote access to justice for all persons, and Strategic Issue 6, promoting public trust and confidence.

Relationship to Existing Funding: Currently, the Probate Division has one social worker to serve as Program Manager in the Guardianship Assistance Program. The Division's budget cannot support additional staff to expand this program.

Methodology: The grade level for the Deputy Program Manager of the Guardianship Assistance Program is in accordance with the Court's classification policies.

Expenditure Plan: The Deputy Program Manager of the Guardianship Assistance Program would be recruited and hired in accordance with the Court's personnel policies and practices.

Key Performance Indicators: The Deputy Program Manager will permit the program to increase the number of student volunteer hours to over 4,000 in the provision of monitoring and support services to an increased number of wards; thereby enhancing the Court's ability to ensure the safety and welfare of these vulnerable adults.

Table 3
PROBATE DIVISION
Key Performance Indicators for Request

Type of Indicator	Key Performance Indicator	Data Source	FY 2009		FY 2010		FY 2011	
			Goal	Estimate	Goal	Estimate	Goal	Estimate
Outcome	Number of student hours contributed to the court	Field Instruction timesheets	N/A	2,228	3,200	3,326	4,000	4,102
Outcome	Number of wards served	Monthly reports	N/A	48	104	114	144	162

Table 4
PROBATE DIVISION
New Positions Requested

Position	Grade	Number	Salary	Benefits	Total Personnel Cost
Deputy Program Manager	11	1	\$66,000	\$17,000	\$83,000

Table 5
PROBATE DIVISION
Budget Authority by Object Class

	FY 2009 Enacted	FY 2010 Enacted	FY 2011 Request	Difference FY 2010/2011
11 – Personnel Compensation	3,768,000	3,926,000	4,184,000	258,000
12 – Personnel Benefits	942,000	982,000	1,049,000	67,000
Subtotal Personnel Cost	4,710,000	4,908,000	5,233,000	325,000
21 - Travel, Transp. of Persons				
22 – Transportation of Things				
23 - Rent, Commun. & Utilities				
24 - Printing & Reproduction				
25 - Other Services				
26 - Supplies & Materials	12,000	13,000	14,000	1,000
31 – Equipment	10,000	11,000	12,000	1,000
Subtotal Non Personnel Cost	22,000	24,000	26,000	2,000
TOTAL	4,732,000	4,932,000	5,259,000	327,000
FTE	48	48	49	1

Table 6
PROBATE DIVISION
Detail, Difference FY 2010/2011

Object Class	Description of Request	FTE	Cost	Difference FY 2010/2011
11 - Personnel Compensation	Current Positions COLA	48	133,000	
	Current Positions WIG		59,000	
	Deputy Program Manager	1	66,000	
	<i>Subtotal</i>			<i>258,000</i>
12 - Personnel Benefits	Current Positions COLA		35,000	
	Current Positions WIG		15,000	
	Deputy Program Manager		17,000	
	<i>Subtotal</i>			<i>67,000</i>
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				327,000

Table 7
PROBATE DIVISION
Detail of Full Time Equivalent Employment

Grade	FY 2009 Enacted	FY 2010 Enacted	FY 2011 Request
JS-3			
JS-4			
JS-5	1	1	1
JS-6	6	6	
JS-7	5	5	
JS-8	4	4	13
JS-9	2	2	4
JS-10	2	2	2
JS-11	4	4	4
JS-12	16	16	17
JS-13	5	5	5
JS-14	1	1	1
JS-15	1	1	1
JS-16			
JS-17			
CES	1	1	1
Total Salaries	3,768,000	3,926,000	4,184,000
Total FTEs	48	48	49

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

<u>FY 2009 Enacted</u>		<u>FY 2010 Enacted</u>		<u>FY 2011 Request</u>		<u>Difference FY 2010/2011</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>
29	3,340,000	29	3,467,000	31	3,732,000	2	265,000

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 plus the Director’s Office (2 FTEs), 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 (9 FTEs).
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 (2 FTEs).
3. The Appeals Coordinator’s Office is responsible for the timely processing and service, record gathering, and record certifying of all cases on appeal (7 FTEs).
4. The Superior Court Library houses law books, legal periodicals, and electronic research tools for the use of judges, attorneys, and court staff (2 FTEs)
5. The Juror/Witness Child Care Center cares for children of jurors, witnesses, and other parties required to appear in court (2 FTEs).
6. The Office of Court Interpreting Services provides foreign language and sign language interpreters to defendants and others for court hearings (3 FTEs).
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 (2 FTEs).

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 facilitate the timely certification of appeal records to the Court of Appeals within 60 days of receipt of the transcript lists in 75% or more of the cases. To prepare and forward all

Notices of Appeal filings (preliminary packages) to the Court of Appeals within one week of receipt in the Appeals Coordinators' Office.

- 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. To provide interpreting related training to courtroom clerks, court employees and judges.

Restructuring and Work Process Redesign

Several restructuring efforts are underway in the Special Operations Division. The Jurors' Office will soon be continuing with show cause hearings for jurors who do not report for service on their designated dates. Procedures are also being explored 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 tremendously positive. Efforts are also being explored to include the juror orientation on the website. Effective August 1, 2008, the Jurors' Office migrated from the former legacy mainframe system to an automated personal computer-based Jury Management System. Complete with customized features, this new system will enhance the Courts' ability to report on jury-related statistics such as jury yield and utilization. In addition, to improve juror comfort, new furniture has been installed in the Jurors' Business Center and the Jurors' Lounge.

The Tax Office website was created as a tool to enhance the speed and efficiency of obtaining information from the Tax Division. The Office has also improved its customer service by adding the Tax Rules and a sample petition to the website. In addition, the Tax Office has provided public access to the Tax docket and scheduled hearings for tax cases through the Court's Public Access website. The Tax Office will further enhance service to the public by implementing electronic filing in the near future.

The Office of Court Interpreting Services (OCIS), in order to enhance the timely availability of foreign and sign language interpreters for court proceedings, continues to collaborate 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 implemented a training module for courtroom clerks in connection with the use of interpreters. Training modules for court employees and judges will be implemented shortly.

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. To further enhance service, the Child Care Center complies with the new Department of Health -- Health Regulation Administration guidelines that became effective on April 28, 2008. Staff qualifications have been upgraded, requiring all Center staff to participate in continuing education. Staff is receiving training by attending school, taking distance learning courses and participating in training workshops. An effort is being made to have more staff secure CPR and First Aid certification. New registration forms have been posted on the Internet and the Court Intranet to facilitate completion of forms prior to arrival in the Child Care Center, saving the public time if they download the forms. Also registration is being computerized. This will also save the client time in completing forms. As part of the Court's continuing outreach efforts, the Child Care Center brochure has been edited and reproduced for future distribution. Lastly, the D.C. Courts' Child Care Center has been considered a model by other court systems that have a desire to implement similar services in their jurisdictions.

The Appeals Coordinator's Office has a newly designed Appeals Application computer system to manage the workflow of all appeal cases from time of receipt to final disposition by the D.C. Court of Appeals. This office also developed "A Self-Help Guide for Filing Your Notice of Appeal" to assist parties who are unrepresented by counsel in understanding the appeal process requirements.

Workload Data

In FY 2008, the Special Operations Division's Jurors' Office sent 277,586 summonses to District of Columbia citizens to appear on juries; the Office of Court Interpreting Services received and fulfilled over 7,022 requests for courtroom interpreting services; the Tax Division heard and disposed of 302 tax petitions; and the Appeals Coordinators' Office received 1,030 new appeals that were filed in various division offices. This office also certified 2,836 appeal records and supplemental records that were forwarded to the Court of Appeals. In 2008, 906 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	FY 2008		FY 2009		FY 2010		FY 2011	
			Goal	Actual	Goal	Projection	Goal	Projection	Goal	Projection
Output/Activity	# of summons sent to jurors to serve on jury duty	Courts' Information Technology (IT) Division	260,000	277,586	258,000	272,035	256,000	266,595	254,000	261,264
Output/Activity	Jurors qualified to serve on <i>voir dire</i> panels	IT Division	60,000	63,212	62,000	61,948	64,000	60,710	65,000	59,496
Outcome	Judicial requests for <i>voir dire</i> panels met	Court's R & D Division	80%	86%	82%	84%	84%	86%	86%	88%
Outcome	Jury Yield	IT Division	20%	23.76%	22%	26%	24%	28%	26%	30%

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 2008		FY 2009		FY 2010		FY 2011	
			Goal	Actual	Goal	Projection	Goal	Projection	Goal	Projection
Input	Requests for interpreters	OCIS statistics	7,095	7,095	8,463	8,463	9,309	9,309	10,240	10,240
Output/Activity	Interpreting services provided (cases called within 10 minutes of a "ready call" and within one hour for last minute requests)	OCIS statistics	7,022	7,022	8,463	8,436	9,279	9,279	10,240	10,207
End Outcome	Requests for interpreters met	OCIS statistics	100%	98.8%	100%	99.6%	100%	99.6%	100%	99.6%

Table 3
SPECIAL OPERATIONS DIVISION
Tax Division
Performance Measurement Table

Type of Indicator	Performance Indicator	Data Source	FY 2008		FY 2009		FY 2010		FY 2011	
			Goal	Actual	Goal	Projection	Goal	Projection	Goal	Projection
Input	Number of tax petitions filed	Court data	300	310	325	400	350	450	375	500
Output/Activity	Number of cases prepared for hearing	Court data	350	473	400	450	425	400	450	425
End Outcome	Cases disposed	Court data	80	154	85	100	90	110	95	150
Productivity/Efficiency	Cases disposed/cases filed	Court data	27%	35%	28%	25%	32%	27%	35%	33%

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

Type of Indicator	Key Performance Indicator	Data Source	FY 2008		FY 2009		FY 2010		FY 2011	
			Goal	Actual	Goal	Projection	Goal	Projection	Goal	Projection
Input	Appeals received	Monthly statistical reports	1,020	1,030	1,135	1,150	1,140	1,160	1,145	1,170
Output/Activity	Percentage of appeal documents to the D.C. Court of Appeals within 60 days of date transcript received	Transcript lists, weekly worksheets, and team lists	80%	N/A	85%	85%	87%	87%	90%	90%
End Outcome	Percentage of appeal records and supplemental records available for pick-up by the Court of Appeals	Court of Appeals pick-up log	85%	80%	85%	85%	87%	87%	90%	90%

Table 5
SPECIAL OPERATIONS DIVISION
Library
Performance Measurement Table

Type of Indicator	Performance Indicator	Data Source	FY 2008		FY 2009		FY 2010		FY 2011	
			Goal	Actual	Goal	Projection	Goal	Projection	Goal	Projection
Output	Volumes held	Library Staff Data	23,500	23,400	24,000	23,644	24,500	23,900	25,000	24,100
Outcome	Users	Library Staff Data	10,200	10,198	10,750	10,708	11,250	11,243	11,850	11,805

FY 2011 Request

In FY 2011, the Courts request \$3,732,000 for the Special Operations Division, an increase of \$265,000 (8%) above the FY 2010 Enacted Budget. The requested increase consists of \$118,000 for 2 FTEs to enhance timeliness of jury panels and to increase access to the judge-in-chambers and \$147,000 for built-in increases.

Fair and Timely Case Resolution and Enhancing Timely Jury Panels: Deputy Clerk (JS-6), \$50,000

Problem Statement. The new automated Jury Management System features enhancements that encourage potential jurors to go “paperless”. These include eJuror, the Courts’ online qualification and deferral system, the Juror Automated Deferral IVR Line, the JurorHelp electronic mail box, the JurorServices electronic mail box, the eJuror Survey and the JurorVoice mail box. Before the implementation of the current jury management system, the majority of jurors completed and returned their qualification forms by mail. They requested deferrals by telephone during normal business hours. The prior versions of the Automated Deferral IVR Line and Online jury services were available during regular business hours only. There were no electronic mailboxes to signal for assistance after hours and on weekends.

While the new system has brought much needed automation, an accompanying onslaught of juror inquiries has followed in its wake. These requests flood our mailboxes 24 hours a day/seven days a week and usually require immediate action. A huge number of requests arrive on evenings and weekends; with jurors expecting responses first thing in the morning. Providing a timely response to potential jurors who need assistance via email and voice mail often takes up the better part of a clerk’s day.

The Juror Office also plays a critical role in the delivery of jury panels for *voir dire* to the associate judges of the Superior Court, thereby facilitating the prompt and efficient resolution of cases. Juror Office staff must complete a number of processes before a panel of qualified jurors is assembled and delivered to a courtroom. Once the summons is issued, response forms must be processed far in advance of the summons date to determine juror eligibility. Staff must act quickly on requests for deferrals and excuses. Telephone, e-mail and voice mail inquiries from potential jurors must be addressed within one business day. Special accommodations for jurors with disabilities must be coordinated with the appropriate internal Court divisions and external agencies. Jurors who fail to appear (FTA) in response to the summons must be contacted,

rescheduled or brought in for show cause hearings to justify their absence. To meet these requirements, an additional jury clerk position is needed.

Relationship to the Courts' Strategic Issues, Goals or Strategies. This request supports Strategic Issue 1, Fair and Timely Case Resolution: Courts must resolve cases in a timely manner and avoid undue delay.

Relationship to Division MAP Objectives. The Special Operations Division has set a standard for the Jurors' Office in terms of delivering panels to courtrooms when an adequate number of jurors are available for voir dire. That standard is fifteen minutes from the time a courtroom requests the panel to the time the panel is delivered to the courtroom. The additional staff will support this objective.

Relationship to Existing Funding. Current funding in the division is inadequate to support this position.

Methodology. The position has been graded based on the Court's classification policies.

Expenditure Plan. The new FTE would be recruited and hired in accordance with the Court's personnel policies.

Performance Indicators. Performance indicators include an increase in customer satisfaction, a reduction in the time required to respond to a juror's inquiry, and a reduction in the time required to deliver a panel to the courtroom once a request is made.

Enhance Access to Judge-in-Chambers: Court Clerk (Bilingual) (JS-9), \$68,000

Problem Statement. Judge-In-Chambers (JIC) is an extremely busy and high volume office, processing 11,609 filings in 2008. The Office hears between 120 and 180 cases per month. On a daily basis the JIC is responsible for reviewing various pleadings for filing from every Division within the Superior Court of the District of Columbia, including; scheduling emergency hearings; conducting scheduled hearings; annotating court orders into the computer and providing copies to parties as well as annotating the court's hearing dispositions. Also, the Court must review and sign arrest and search warrants presented by various police agencies. This process is very time consuming, overwhelming, and tedious, and there are only two staff persons in the office to assist the judge.

To meet the growing demands for interpreting services for non-English speaking individuals that frequent the office, JIC must rely heavily upon the Office of Court Interpreting Services (OCIS) to assist with the Hispanic Community. The inability to effectively communicate with non-English speaking individuals has resulted in frustration and confusion for English speaking customers with respect to the review, completion and verification of various pleadings for the court's consideration. The majority of the time, the JIC staff is unaware that an interpreter is required until the individual arrives in the office. Even with the assistance of the OCIS, often the individual is unable to provide a written explanation or complete the form in English, thereby causing further delay in the completion of their paperwork. Most of the time, the filing party is

only able to write a response in their native language. As a consequence, the staff unfortunately is placed in a position of having to complete the paperwork on behalf of the filing individual, thus causing a tremendous delay in providing assistance to other waiting customers.

The addition of a bilingual position enhance service to the public and increase the efficiency of the office by having someone to assist the non-English speaking individuals with translation and the completion of forms.

Relationship to the Court’s Strategic Issues, Goals and Strategies. A bilingual staff person in the JIC Office will help the Courts to implement Goal 2.1 of promoting access to justice for all persons. It is also in line with Strategy 2.1.1 of regularly reviewing court processes and services to identify and eliminate barriers to access.

Relationship to Division MAP Objectives. One of the division MAP objectives is to provide customers with courteous, reasonable, quality and exceptional customer service.

Relationship to Existing Funding. The division’s existing budget will not support the additional position.

Methodology. The position was graded based on the Court’s classification policies.

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

Performance Indicators. Performance indicators include a decrease in the time required to process a case for customers who do not speak English, and the increase in the satisfaction level of those customers.

Table 6
SPECIAL OPERATIONS DIVISION
New Positions Requested

Position	Grade	Number	Salary	Benefits	Total Personnel Cost
Deputy Clerk I (Jurors’ Office)	6	1	\$40,000	\$10,000	\$50,000
Court Clerk (Judge-in-Chambers)	9	1	\$54,000	\$14,000	\$68,000
TOTAL		2	\$94,000	\$24,000	\$118,000

Table 7
SPECIAL OPERATIONS DIVISION
Budget Authority by Object Class

	FY 2009 Enacted	FY 2010 Enacted	FY 2011 Request	Difference FY 2010/2011
11 – Personnel Compensation	1,903,000	1,983,000	2,174,000	191,000
12 – Personnel Benefits	476,000	497,000	546,000	49,000
<i>Subtotal Personnel Cost</i>	<i>2,379,000</i>	<i>2,480,000</i>	<i>2,720,000</i>	<i>240,000</i>
21 - Travel, Transp. of Persons				
22 - Transportation of Things				
23 - Rent, Commun. & Utilities				
24 - Printing & Reproduction	142,000	146,000	150,000	4,000
25 - Other Services	585,000	600,000	614,000	14,000
26 - Supplies & Materials	227,000	233,000	239,000	6,000
31 - Equipment	7,000	8,000	9,000	1,000
<i>Subtotal Non Personnel Cost</i>	<i>961,000</i>	<i>987,000</i>	<i>1,012,000</i>	<i>25,000</i>
TOTAL	3,340,000	3,467,000	3,732,000	265,000
FTE	29	29	31	2

Table 8
SPECIAL OPERATIONS DIVISION
Detail, Difference FY 2010/2011

Object Class	Description of Request	FTE	Cost	Difference FY 2010/2011
11 - Personnel Compensation	Current Positions COLA	29	67,000	
	Current Positions WIG		30,000	
	Deputy Clerk	1	40,000	
	Court Clerk	1	54,000	
<i>Subtotal</i>				<i>191,000</i>
12 - Personnel Benefits	Current Positions COLA		17,000	
	Current Positions WIG		8,000	
	Deputy Clerk		10,000	
	Court Clerk		14,000	
<i>Subtotal</i>				<i>49,000</i>
21 - Travel, Transp. of Persons				
22 - Transportation of Things				
23 - Rent, Commun. & Utilities				
24 - Printing and Reproduction	Built-in			4,000
25 - Other Services	Built-in			14,000
26 - Supplies & Materials	Built-in			6,000
31 - Equipment	Built-in			1,000
Total				265,000

Table 9
SPECIAL OPERATIONS DIVISION
Detail of Full-Time Equivalent Employment

Grade	FY 2009 Enacted	FY 2010 Enacted	FY 2011 Request
JS-4			
JS-5			
JS-6	8	8	7
JS-7	3	3	4
JS-8	3	3	3
JS-9	4	4	5
JS-10	1	1	1
JS-11	2	2	2
JS-12	5	5	6
JS-13	2	2	2
JS-14			
JS-15			
JS-16			
CES	1	1	1
Total Salaries	1,903,000	1,983,000	2,174,000
Total FTEs	29	29	31

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

<u>FY 2009 Enacted</u>		<u>FY 2010 Enacted</u>		<u>FY 2011 Request</u>		<u>Difference FY 2010/2011</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>
--	10,083,000	--	9,438,000*	--	8,027,000	--	(1,411,000)

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 2011 Request

In FY 2011, the Courts request \$8,027,000 for the Management Account that includes an increase of \$189,000 (2%) over the FY 2010 Enacted Budget offset by a decrease of \$1,600,000 for a non-recurring item, for a net decrease of \$1,411,000. The \$189,000 increase consists entirely of built-in cost increases.

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

	FY 2009 Enacted	FY 2010 Enacted	FY 2011 Request	Difference FY 2010/2011
11 - Compensation	361,000	376,000	395,000	19,000
12 - Benefits	0	4,000	9,000	5,000
<i>Subtotal Personnel Cost</i>	<i>361,000</i>	<i>380,000</i>	<i>404,000</i>	<i>24,000</i>
21 - Travel, Transp. of Persons	303,000	449,000	459,000	10,000
22 - Transportation of Things	10,000	11,000	12,000	1,000
23 - Rent, Commun. & Utilities	4,637,000	2,609,000	2,666,000	57,000
24 - Printing & Reproduction	300,000	308,000	315,000	7,000
25 - Other Services	3,855,000	5,048,000	3,523,000	(1,525,000)
26 - Supplies & Materials	428,000	439,000	449,000	10,000
31 - Equipment	189,000	194,000	199,000	5,000
<i>Subtotal Non Personnel Cost</i>	<i>9,722,000</i>	<i>9,058,000</i>	<i>7,623,000</i>	<i>(1,435,000)</i>
TOTAL	10,083,000	9,438,000	8,027,000	(1,411,000)
FTE	0	0	0	0

* Reflects a shift of \$500,000 to the Family Court Social Services Division.

Table 2
MANAGEMENT ACCOUNT
Detail, Difference FY 2010/2011

Object Class	Description of Request	FTE	Cost	Difference FY 2010/2011
11 - Compensation	Built-in			19,000
12 - Benefits	Built-in			5,000
21 - Travel, Transp. of Persons	Built-in			10,000
22 - Transportation of Things	Built-in			1,000
23 - Rent, Commun. & Utilities	Built-in			57,000
24 - Printing & Reproduction	Built-in			7,000
25 - Other Service	Built-in		75,000	
	Non-recurring item		(1,600,000)	
<i>Subtotal</i>				<i>(1,525,000)</i>
26 – Supplies & Materials	Built-in			10,000
31 - Equipment	Built-in			5,000
Total				(1,411,000)