

SUPERIOR COURT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Overview

<u>FY 2010 Enacted</u>		<u>FY 2011 Annualized CR</u>		<u>FY 2012 Request</u>		<u>Difference FY 2010/2012</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>
936	108,524,000	936	108,524,000	948	115,353,000	12	6,829,000

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 113 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, 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 2009, 115,045 new cases were filed with the Superior Court. Of the total new filings, 55% were civil cases; 23% were criminal cases; 11% 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, 2009, there were 53,876 cases pending. Tables 1 and 2 provide Superior Court caseload data.

Table 1
District of Columbia Superior Court Caseload

Fiscal Year	New Cases	Start-of-Year Pending Cases	Total Cases
2002	136,045	55,071	205,770
2003	133,425	56,198	204,417
2004	134,767	47,498	200,521
2005	128,468	45,892	191,265
2006	124,003	69,817	196,478
2007	121,130	54,358	177,713
2008	117,965	54,930	172,895
2009	115,045	53,876	171,972

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

Table 2
District of Columbia Superior Court Efficiency Measures (Fiscal Year 2009 data)

	Cases Disposed	Cases Added	Clearance Rate*	Cases Pending		
				01-Oct	30-Sep	Change
Civil	67,240	64,623	104%	21,478	18,861	-12%
Criminal	28,838	26,964	107%	8,060	7,261	-10%
Domestic Violence	9,662	9,695	100%	1,105	1,138	3%
Family	14,057	13,549	104%	15,762	15,254	-3%
Probate	2,929	2,827	104%	6,947	6,845	-1%
Tax	157	438	36%	524	805	54%
Total	122,883	118,096	104%	53,876	50,164	-7%

*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 2012 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 2012 request around three of the six issues—fair and timely case resolution, access to justice, and public trust and confidence.

In FY 2012, the Superior Court requests \$115,353,000 and 948 FTEs, an increase of \$6,829,000 (6%) and 12 FTEs above the FY 2010 Enacted Budget. The request includes increases to support the following Court goals:

Strategic Issue 1: Fair and Timely Case Resolution--\$1,032,000 and 4 FTEs

The Superior Court's FY 2012 request includes \$1,032,000 and 4 FTEs to address the Courts' strategic issue of fair and timely case resolution, including \$595,000 to provide special advocates for abused and neglected children; \$173,000 and 3 FTEs to keep pace with higher domestic violence caseloads; \$161,000 and 1 FTE to provide additional leadership in alternative dispute resolution programs; and \$103,000 to update reference materials maintained by the Superior Court Library in judges' chambers.

Strategic Issue 2: Access to Justice--\$500,000

The Superior Court's FY 2012 request includes \$500,000 to enhance access to justice by meeting increased demand for foreign language and sign language interpreters who permit full participation in court proceedings.

Strategic Issue 6: Public Trust and Confidence--\$2,596,000 and 1 FTE

The Superior Court's FY 2012 request includes \$2,596,000 and 1 FTE to address the Courts' strategic issue of public trust and confidence, including \$2,522,000 to enhance public safety and reduce recidivism among juvenile girls under court supervision by creating a drop-in center for supervision and services and \$74,000 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 2010 Enacted	FY 2011 Annualized CR	FY 2012 Request	Difference FY 2010/2012
11 - Compensation	74,931,000	74,931,000	77,337,000	2,406,000
12 - Benefits	17,485,000	17,485,000	18,176,000	691,000
<i>Subtotal Personnel Cost</i>	<i>92,416,000</i>	<i>92,416,000</i>	<i>95,513,000</i>	<i>3,097,000</i>
21 - Travel, Transp. of Persons	449,000	449,000	467,000	18,000
22 - Transportation of Things	11,000	11,000	13,000	2,000
23 - Rent, Commun. & Utilities	2,826,000	2,826,000	3,301,000	475,000
24 - Printing & Reproduction	559,000	559,000	592,000	33,000
25 - Other Services	10,665,000	10,665,000	13,658,000	2,993,000
26 - Supplies & Materials	889,000	889,000	1,051,000	162,000
31 - Equipment	709,000	709,000	758,000	49,000
<i>Subtotal Non-Personnel Cost</i>	<i>16,108,000</i>	<i>16,108,000</i>	<i>19,840,000</i>	<i>3,732,000</i>
TOTAL	108,524,000	108,524,000	115,353,000	6,829,000
FTE	936	936	948	12

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

<u>FY 2010 Enacted</u>		FY 2011		<u>FY 2012 Request</u>		Difference	
<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	26,359,000	204	26,359,000	204	26,619,000	0	260,000

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 2009, Superior Court judges handled more than 115,000 new case filings. The 62 judges of the Superior Court rotate to each division on a scheduled basis, with judges in the Family Court serving renewable three or five year terms. Each Superior Court judge has an administrative assistant and a law clerk.

FY 2012 Request

In FY 2012, the Courts request \$26,619,000 for Judges and Chambers Staff, an increase of \$260,000 (1%) 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 2010 Enacted	FY 2011 Annualized CR	FY 2012 Request	Difference FY 2010/2012
11 – Compensation	21,964,000	21,964,000	22,162,000	198,000
12 – Benefits	4,287,000	4,287,000	4,340,000	53,000
<i>Subtotal Personnel Cost</i>	<i>26,251,000</i>	<i>26,251,000</i>	<i>26,502,000</i>	<i>251,000</i>
21 - Travel, Transp. of Persons	0	0	0	0
22 - Transportation of Things	0	0	0	0
23 - Rent, Commun. & Utilities	0	0	0	0
24 - Printing & Reproduction	7,000	7,000	9,000	2,000
25 - Other Services	0	0	0	0
26 - Supplies & Materials	55,000	55,000	59,000	4,000
31 – Equipment	46,000	46,000	49,000	3,000
<i>Subtotal Non-Personnel Cost</i>	<i>108,000</i>	<i>108,000</i>	<i>117,000</i>	<i>9,000</i>
TOTAL	26,359,000	26,359,000	26,619,000	260,000
FTE	204	204	204	0

Table 2
JUDGES AND CHAMBERS STAFF
Detail Difference, FY 2010/2012

Object Class	Description of Request	FTE	Cost	Difference FY 2010/2012
11 - Compensation	Current Positions WIG		198,000	
12 - Personnel Benefits	Current Positions WIG		53,000	
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		4,000	
31 - Equipment	Built-in		3,000	
TOTAL				260,000

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

Grade	FY 2010 Enacted	FY 2011 Annualized CR	FY 2012 Request
JS-3			
JS-4			
JS-5			
JS-6			
JS-7			
JS-8			
JS-9			
JS-10	80	80	80
JS-11	60	60	60
JS-12	1	1	1
JS-13			
JS-14	1	1	1
JS-15			
JS-20	61	61	61
JS-21	1	1	1
Total Salaries	21,964,000	21,964,000	22,162,000
Total FTEs	204	204	204

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

<u>FY 2010 Enacted</u>		<u>FY 2011</u>		<u>FY 2012 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>
49	7,009,000	49	7,009,000	49	7,042,000	0	33,000

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 2012 Request

In FY 2012, the Courts request \$7,042,000 for Magistrate Judges and Staff, an increase of \$33,000 (0%) above the FY 2010 Enacted Budget. The requested difference consists entirely of built-in cost increases.

Table 1
MAGISTRATE JUDGES AND STAFF
Budget Authority by Object Class

	FY 2010 Enacted	FY 2011 Annualized CR	FY 2012 Request	Difference FY 2010/2012
11 – Compensation	5,586,000	5,586,000	5,604,000	18,000
12 – Benefits	1,399,000	1,399,000	1,408,000	9,000
Subtotal Personnel Cost	6,985,000	6,985,000	7,012,000	27,000
21 - Travel, Transp. of Persons	0	0	0	0
22 - Transportation of Things	0	0	0	0
23 - Rent, Commun. & Utilities	0	0	0	0
24 - Printing & Reproduction	4,000	4,000	6,000	2,000
25 - Other Services	0	0	0	0
26 - Supplies & Materials	11,000	11,000	13,000	2,000
31 – Equipment	9,000	9,000	11,000	2,000
Subtotal Non-Personnel Cost	24,000	24,000	30,000	6,000
TOTAL	7,009,000	7,009,000	7,042,000	33,000
FTE	49	49	49	0

Table 2
MAGISTRATE JUDGES AND STAFF
Detail Difference, FY 2010/2012

Object Class	Description of Request	FTE	Cost	Difference FY 2010/2012
11 - Compensation	Current Positions WIG		18,000	
12 – Personnel Benefits	Current Positions WIG		9,000	
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		2,000	
31 – Equipment	Built-in		2,000	
TOTAL				33,000

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

Grade	FY 2010 Enacted	FY 2011 Annualized CR	FY 2012 Request
JS-8			
JS-9	9	9	9
JS-10	13	13	13
JS-11			
JS-12			
JS-13			
JS-14	2	2	2
JS-15	25	25	25
Total Salaries	5,586,000	5,586,000	5,604,000
Total FTEs	49	49	49

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

<u>FY 2010 Enacted</u>		FY 2011		<u>FY 2012 Request</u>		Difference	
<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	951,000	10	951,000	10	1,033,000	0	82,000

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 2012 Request

For FY 2012, the D.C. Courts request \$1,033,000 for the Office of the Clerk of the Court, an increase of \$82,000 (9%) 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 2010 Enacted	FY 2011 Annualized CR	FY 2012 Request	Difference FY 2010/2012
11 – Compensation	783,000	783,000	820,000	37,000
12 – Benefits	158,000	158,000	199,000	41,000
Subtotal Personnel Cost	941,000	941,000	1,019,000	78,000
21 - Travel, Transp. of Persons	0	0	0	0
22 - Transportation of Things	0	0	0	0
23 - Rent, Commun. & Utilities	0	0	0	0
24 - Printing & Reproduction	0	0	0	0
25 - Other Services	0	0	0	0
26 - Supplies & Materials	7,000	7,000	9,000	2,000
31 – Equipment	3,000	3,000	5,000	2,000
Subtotal Non-Personnel Cost	10,000	10,000	14,000	4,000
TOTAL	951,000	951,000	1,033,000	82,000
FTE	10	10	10	0

Table 2
CLERK OF THE COURT
Detail Difference, FY 2010/2012

Object Class	Description of Request	FTE	Cost	Difference FY 2010/2012
11 - Compensation	Current Positions WIG		37,000	
12 – Personnel Benefits	Current Positions WIG		41,000	
21 - Travel, Transp. of Persons				
22 - Transportation of Things				
23 - Rent, Commun. & Utilities				
24 - Printing & Reproduction				
25 - Other Services				
26 - Supplies & Materials	Built-in		2,000	
31 – Equipment	Built-in		2,000	
TOTAL				82,000

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

Grade	FY 2010 Enacted	FY 2011 Annualized CR	FY 2012 Request
JS-8	6	6	6
JS-9			
JS-10			
JS-11	1	1	1
JS-12			
JS-13			
JS-14	2	2	2
CES	1	1	1
Total Salaries	783,000	783,000	820,000
Total FTEs	10	10	10

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

<u>FY 2010 Enacted</u>		<u>FY 2011 Annualized CR</u>		<u>FY 2012 Request</u>		<u>Difference FY 2010/2012</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	7,325,000	101	7,325,000	102	7,623,000	1	298,000

The Civil Division has jurisdiction over any civil action at law or in equity (excluding family matters) brought in the District of Columbia, except where jurisdiction is exclusively vested in the Federal court. The Division is comprised of four branches. 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 2009 there were more than 9,300 civil actions filed. Branch 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 in excess of 43,200 filings in fiscal year 2009. 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 2009, there were over 10,100 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 2009 the Landlord and Tenant Branch expanded to two courtrooms in Building B; the Division implemented intra- and inter-branch cross-training among all grade levels; and the Small Claims Branch's paperless initiative, whereby all filings are immediately scanned into CourtView and then returned to the filer, became a permanent feature of the Branch. The Landlord and Tenant Resource Center, Consumer Law Resource Center, the Small Claims Resource Center and the Tax Sale Resource Help Center, all continue to be highly effective methods to assist the public. 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 among 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.
- Enhance access to the Courts through satellite or community-based service centers, videoconferencing, electronic filing and case information, and other means.

Workload Data

As shown in Table 1 below, the Civil Division disposed of more than 67,000 cases in fiscal year 2009, including more than 9,400 civil actions; 46,700 landlord and tenant cases; and 11,100 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 2009 Data)

	<u>Case Filings</u>	<u>Dispositions</u>	Clearance <u>Rate</u>	Pending Cases		
				<u>1-Oct</u>	<u>30-Sep</u>	<u>Change</u>
Civil Actions	9,318	9,433	101%	6,027	6,560	9%
Landlord & Tenant	43,281	46,723	108%	11,091	7,357	-34%
Small Claims	<u>10,148</u>	<u>11,084</u>	109%	<u>3,279</u>	<u>2,732</u>	<u>-17%</u>
Total	62,747	67,240	107%	21,478	16,649*	-18%

*In FY 2009, data clean-up efforts in the Small Claims Branch and the Landlord & Tenant Branch resulted in an unusually high number of case dismissals.

Table 2
CIVIL DIVISION
Performance Indicators

Type of Indicator	Key Performance Indicator	Data Source	FY 2009		FY 2010		FY 2011		FY 2012	
			Goal	Actual*	Goal	Estimate	Goal	Estimate	Goal	Estimate
Time to Disposition	General Civil II Complaints disposed within 24 months	CourtView Report	100%	100%	100%	99%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Time to Disposition	Landlord & Tenant Non-Jury cases disposed within 150 days	CourtView Report	100%	97%	100%	98%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Time to Disposition	Small Claims Non-Jury cases disposed within 12 months	CourtView Report	100%	100%	100%	99%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Time to Disposition	Civil I Complaints disposed within 36 months	CourtView Report	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
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 May 1, 2010.

FY 2012 Request

In FY 2012, the Courts request \$7,623,000 for the Civil Division, an increase of \$298,000 (4%) above the FY 2010 Enacted Budget. New FY 2012 request consists entirely of built-in increases (see Table 5).

Table 3
CIVIL DIVISION
Budget Authority by Object Class

	FY 2010 Enacted	FY 2011 Annualized CR	FY 2012 Request	Difference FY 2010/2012
11 – Compensation	5,806,000	5,806,000	6,024,000	218,000
12 – Benefits	1,454,000	1,454,000	1,528,000	74,000
Subtotal Personnel Cost	7,260,000	7,260,000	7,552,000	292,000
21 - Travel, Transp. of Persons	0	0	0	0
22 - Transportation of Things	0	0	0	0
23 - Rent, Commun. & Utilities	0	0	0	0
24 - Printing & Reproduction	20,000	20,000	22,000	2,000
25 - Other Services	0	0	0	0
26 - Supplies & Materials	22,000	22,000	24,000	2,000
31 – Equipment	23,000	23,000	25,000	2,000
Subtotal Non-Personnel Cost	65,000	65,000	71,000	6,000
TOTAL	7,325,000	7,325,000	7,623,000	298,000
FTE	101	101	102	1

Table 4
CIVIL DIVISION
Detail Difference, FY 2010/2012

Object Class	Description of Request	FTE	Cost	Difference FY 2010/2012
11 - Compensation	Current Positions WIG		174,000	
	Courtroom Clerk (FY11 Pres. Recom.)	1	44,000	
<i>Subtotal 11</i>				<i>218,000</i>
12 – Personnel Benefits	Current Positions WIG		63,000	
	Courtroom Clerk (FY11 Pres. Recom.)	1	11,000	
<i>Subtotal 12</i>				<i>74,000</i>
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		2,000	
31 – Equipment	Built-in		2,000	
TOTAL				298,000

Table 5

CIVIL DIVISION
Detail of Full-Time Equivalent Employment

Grade	FY 2010 Enacted	FY 2011 Annualized CR	FY 2012 Request
JS-3			
JS-4	6	6	
JS-5	1	1	
JS-6	19	19	26
JS-7	13	13	13
JS-8	19	19	20
JS-9	21	21	20
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	5,806,000	5,806,000	6,024,000
Total FTEs	101	101	102

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

<u>FY 2010 Enacted</u>		<u>FY 2011 Annualized CR</u>		<u>FY 2012 Request</u>		<u>Difference FY 2010/2012</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	806,000	7	806,000	7	829,000	0	23,000

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 2009, 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. Continue to collaborate with other agencies to enhance the coordination of services to victims, beginning October 1, 2010.
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 2011.
6. Implement the installation and training and establish any new business practices that must be put in place due to the use of new case management software for the Crime Victims Compensation Program, by September 30, 2011.

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 2009, 524 or 16% 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 2009, 88 or 3% 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 2009	FY 2010 Estimated	% Change
New Cases Filed	3,224	2,900	-10%
Determinations Made	3,226	3,000	-7%
Number of Cases Pending at End of Fiscal Year	1,085	985	-9%

Table 2
CRIME VICTIMS COMPENSATION PROGRAM
Performance Measurement Table

Type of Indicator	Performance Indicator	Data Source	FY 2009		FY 2010		FY 2011		FY 2012	
			Goal	Actual	Goal	Estimated ¹	Goal	Projection	Goal	Projection
Input	# Of new claims filed	Case Management Software	2,655	3,224	2,950	2,900	2,900	2,900	2,900	2,900
Output	# Of claims processed	Case Management Software	2,600	3,226	2,950	3,000	3,000	3,000	3,000	3,000
Output	# Of payments	Case Management Software	12,950	16,312	15,000	14,100	14,100	14,100	14,100	14,100
Outcome	Dollar amount of payments	Case Management Software	\$8.2M	\$10.0M	\$9.2M	\$8.7M	\$8.7 M	\$8.7M	\$8.7M	\$8.7M
Outcome	Avg. claim processing time	Case Management Software	10 weeks	12 weeks	11 weeks	12 weeks	12 weeks	12 weeks	12 weeks	12 weeks

FY 2012 Request

In FY 2012, the D.C. Courts request \$829,000 for the Crime Victims Compensation Program, an increase of \$23,000 (3%) 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 2010 Enacted	2011 Annualized CR	FY 2012 Request	Difference FY 2010/2012
11 - Personnel Compensation	622,000	622,000	636,000	14,000
12 - Personnel Benefits	161,000	161,000	164,000	3,000
<i>Subtotal Personnel Cost</i>	783,000	783,000	800,000	17,000
21 - Travel, Transp. of Persons	0	0	0	0
22 - Transportation of Things	0	0	0	0
23 - Rent, Commun. & Utilities	0	0	0	0
24 - Printing & Reproduction	0	0	0	0
25 - Other Services	17,000	17,000	19,000	2,000
26 - Supplies & Materials	3,000	3,000	5,000	2,000
31 - Equipment	3,000	3,000	5,000	2,000
<i>Subtotal Non-Personnel Cost</i>	23,000	23,000	29,000	6,000
TOTAL	806,000	806,000	829,000	23,000
FTE	7	7	7	0

¹ Estimates based on calculation from the first 8 months of FY10 data. For the first time in many years, our estimates do not reflect an increase in the number of claims filed and amounts paid to victims. All projections for FY11 and FY12 are flat to account for this downward trend.

Table 4
CRIME VICTIMS COMPENSATION PROGRAM
Detail Difference, FY 2010/2012

Object Class	Description of Request	FTE	Cost	Difference FY 2010/2012
11 - Personnel Compensation	Current Positions WIG		14,000	
12 - Personnel Benefits	Current Positions WIG		3,000	
21 - Travel, Transp. of Persons				
22 - Transportation of Things				
23 - Rent, Commun. & Utilities				
24 - Printing & Reproduction				
25 - Other Service	Built-in increase		2,000	
26 - Supplies & Materials	Built-in increase		2,000	
31 - Equipment	Built-in increase		2,000	
Total				23,000

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

Grade	FY 2010 Enacted	FY 2011 Annualized CR	FY 2012 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 Salaries	622,000	622,000	636,000
Total FTEs	7	7	7

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

<u>FY 2010 Enacted</u>		<u>FY 2011 Annualized CR</u>		<u>FY 2012 Request</u>		<u>Difference FY 2010/2012</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	9,578,000	123	9,578,000	123	9,873,000	0	295,000

Mission Statement

The Criminal Division’s mission is to provide quality administrative and support services for the Superior Court of the District of Columbia, 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.

Introduction

The Criminal Division processes criminal 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.

The Criminal Division also promotes high standards of professional conduct, and promotes restorative and rehabilitative justice through its community courts: East of the River Community Court (ERCC), District of Columbia Misdemeanor and Traffic Community Court, Drug Court, Prostitution Court, and Mental Health Diversion Court.

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 Criminal Division is comprised of four branches and oversees several specialized courts known as problem solving courts. The four branches of the Criminal Division are: (1) Case Management Branch; (2) Courtroom Support Branch; (3) Special Proceedings Branch; (4) Quality Assurance Branch. The several specialized courts overseen by the Criminal Division are: East of the River Community Court (ERCC), District of Columbia Misdemeanor and Traffic Community Court, Drug Court, Prostitution Court, and the Mental Health Diversion Court.

- The Director’s Office ensures that the Criminal Division’s duties and responsibilities are met based on the Court Rules. The Director’s Office has 6 FTEs.

- The Case Management Branch processes and maintains all felony, misdemeanor, traffic, and District of Columbia case files and processes motions and appeals for felony, U.S. misdemeanor, traffic, and D.C. cases and cases to be expunged and sealed. The branch also provides judicial officers, the public, law enforcement officers, and court staff with access to accurate information regarding criminal cases before the Superior Court. This branch has 20 FTEs.
- The Courtroom Support Branch staffs the courtroom clerks for all the courtrooms in the Criminal Division. The branch also is responsible for maintaining the Property Office. This office secures court evidence and maintains the inventory of forms used to process criminal cases. This branch has 41 FTEs.
- The Special Proceedings Branch manages two sections: the Warrant Office and the Criminal Information Center/Finance Office. The Warrant Office processes and maintains all bench warrants, search warrants, arrest warrants, subpoenas, habeas corpus writs, fugitive cases, out-of-state witness cases, grand jury directives, sex offender registration matters, and contempt of court/show cause orders.

The Criminal Information /Finance Office provide criminal case information to the Court's internal and external customers. Motions, appeals, and other filings are accepted by the Criminal Information Center/Finance Office. The Finance Office receipts Court ordered fines, fees, bonds, and restitution payments and processes bond refunds. The Special Proceedings branch has 26 FTEs.

- The Quality Assurance Branch performs quality review of updates to the electronic case management system and the final disposition of cases, ensures that the judges' orders regarding release and commitment of defendants are followed, and handles matters regarding mental competency and federal designation of prisoners. The Quality Assurance Branch has 25 FTEs.
- Problem Solving Courts: East of the River Community Court (ERCC), District of Columbia Misdemeanor and Traffic Community Court, Drug Court, Prostitution Court, and the Mental Health Diversion Court are responsible for addressing quality-of-life offenses (e.g. public drinking, panhandling, prostitution, and some drug offenses) and minor criminal traffic violations, all of which can have significant negative impact on the community's quality of life and can lead to more serious crime. Unlike traditional courts, the Community Courts focuses on therapeutic and restorative justice, with a much broader array of responses (i.e. treatment, community service, etc.) at their disposal. Community Courts seek not only to hold offenders accountable for their actions, but also to repair the harm caused to the community by the offense. Community Courts frequently require offenders to "pay back" the community by performing court-supervised community service. They also seek to reduce the likelihood of future offending by linking offenders to needed services. The Community Court has 5 FTEs.

Criminal Division MAP Objectives

The Criminal Division's strategic objectives for FY 2012 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, trial certainty, staggered schedules, age of pending caseload, and accuracy of court records.
- Enhance the enforcement of court orders relating to fines, fees, costs, and restitution by developing standard operating procedures that utilize the CourtView application as a means to ensure the timely notification to Judicial Officers when defendants fail to comply with court orders and notification to defendants of past due obligations.
- To increase the speed and accuracy of new case filing by creating an electronic interface between the Prosecutor and the Court for case initiation and associated document filing.
- Enhance the understanding of court proceedings by providing written documentation to defendants of all dispositions including all types of dismissals.
- Enhance the operations, management, program design and effectiveness of Community Courts by holding Stakeholder Meetings, and conducting community forums annually, and gathering and evaluating data and establishing performance measures
- Ensure that Criminal Division judges, attorneys, and court staff maintain high standards of civility by conducting an annual conference for judges, courtroom clerks, and Criminal Justice Stakeholders to engage in a dialogue about new ideas, and what could change or be done better.
- To build a supportive management team to enhance employee performance and satisfaction, and to increase efficiency.

Division Restructuring and/or Work Process Redesign

The Criminal Division's goal is to enhance efficiency by establishing a paper on demand system. CourtView, the Court's database allows the Division to maintain computerized dockets and images of all documents. The Criminal Division continues to work with prosecutors, defense attorneys, and law enforcement agencies to create an electronic filing system and electronic exchange of vital court information. In addition, the Criminal Division has developed procedures for the retrieval of vital archived information to make the information accessible electronically and to reduce records storage costs. Work processes are being restructured and redesigned to facilitate a change from paper records to electronic records, and only creating paper copies when demanded by the public or internal customers.

Workload Data

Table 1
CRIMINAL DIVISION
Caseload and Efficiency Measures

	New Filings	Pending Cases 31-Dec	Dispositions	Clearance Rate
D.C. Misdemeanor	1,929	413	2,043	107%
Felony	4,937	2,071	5,511	105%
Traffic	6,604	2,516	7,374	117%
U.S. Misdemeanors	<u>11,666</u>	<u>3,320</u>	<u>13,220</u>	104%
Total	25,136	8,320	28,148	108%

Key Performance Indicators

Table 2
CRIMINAL DIVISION
Time to Disposition

	Goal	Achieved
Felony I (Murder, Sexual Assault, etc.)	75 % within 12 mos.	90% within 12 mos.
	90% within 18 mos.	99% within 12 mos.
	98% within 24 mos.	100% with 24 mos.
Other Felony (Felony II and AFTC)	75% within 6 mos.	79% within 6 mos.
	90% within 9 mos.	89% within 9 mos.
	98% within 12 mos.	95% within 12 mos.
U.S. Misdemeanor D.C. Misdemeanor Traffic	75% within 3 mos.	66% within 3 mos.
	90% within 6 mos.	92% within 6 mos.
	98% within 9 mos.	93% within 9 mos.
U.S./DC/Traffic Misdemeanor (Diversion)	75% within 6 mos.	96% within 6 mos.
	90% within 9 mos.	98% within 9 mos.
	98% within 12 mos.	99% within 12 mos.
U.S. Misdemeanor (Drugs)	75% within 4 mos.	74% within 4 mos.
	90% within 6 mos.	88% within 6 mos.
	98% within 9 mos.	95% within 9 mos.

Table 3
CRIMINAL DIVISION
Trial Certainty: Jury Trials

	Goal	Achieved
Felony I (Murder, Sexual Assault, etc.)	70% within 2 nd trial date	68% within 2 nd trial date
Felony II	70% within 2 nd trial date	65% within 2 nd trial date
AFTC	70% within 2 nd trial date	76% within 2 nd trial date
U.S. Misdemeanor	70% within 2 nd trial date	63% within 2 nd trial date
D.C.	70% within 2 nd trial date	75% within 2 nd trial date
Traffic	70% within 2 nd trial date	76% within 2 nd trial date

Table 4
CRIMINAL DIVISION
Trial Certainty: Non Jury Trials

	Goal	Achieved
Felony	80% within 2 nd trial date	86% within 2 nd trial date
U.S. Misdemeanor	80% within 2 nd trial date	87% within 2 nd trial date
D.C.	80% within 2 nd trial date	88% within 2 nd trial date
Traffic	80% within 2 nd trial date	81% within 2 nd trial date

FY 2012 Request

The D.C. Courts' FY 2012 request for the Criminal Division is \$9,873,000, an increase of \$295,000 (3%) above the FY 2010 Enacted Budget. The requested increase consists entirely of built-in cost increases.

Table 5
CRIMINAL DIVISION
Budget Authority by Object Class

	FY 2010 Enacted	FY 2011 Annualized CR	FY 2012 Request	Difference FY 2010/2012
11-Personnel Compensation	7,582,000	7,582,000	7,810,000	228,000
12-Personnel Benefits	1,900,000	1,900,000	1,960,000	60,000
<i>Subtotal Personnel Cost</i>	<i>9,482,000</i>	<i>9,482,000</i>	<i>9,770,000</i>	<i>288,000</i>
21-Travel, Transp. of Persons	0	0	0	0
22-Transportation of Things	0	0	0	0
23-Rent, Commun. & Utilities	0	0	0	0
24-Printing & Reproduction	47,000	47,000	50,000	3,000
25-Other Services	0	0	0	0
26-Supplies & Materials	22,000	22,000	24,000	2,000
31-Equipment	27,000	27,000	29,000	2,000
<i>Subtotal Non-Personnel Cost</i>	<i>96,000</i>	<i>96,000</i>	<i>103,000</i>	<i>7,000</i>
TOTAL	9,578,000	9,578,000	9,873,000	295,000
FTE	123	123	123	0

Table 6
CRIMINAL DIVISION
Detail Difference, FY 2010/2012

Object Class	Description of Request	FTE	Cost	Difference FY 2010/2012
11 - Personnel Compensation	Current Positions WIG		228,000	
12 - Personnel Benefits	Current Positions WIG		60,000	
21 - Travel, Transp. Of Persons				
22 - Transportation of Things				
23 - Rent, Commun. & Utilities				
24 - Printing & Reproduction	Built-in		3,000	
25 - Other Services				
26 - Supplies & Materials	Built-in		2,000	
31 - Equipment	Built-in		2,000	
Total				295,000

Table 7

CRIMINAL DIVISION
Detail of Full-Time Equivalent Employment

Grade	2010 Enacted	2011 Annualized CR	2012 Request
JS-3			
JS-4			
JS-5			
JS-6	17	17	13
JS-7	10	10	16
JS-8	27	27	28
JS-9	35	35	32
JS-10	19	19	18
JS-11	1	1	2
JS-12	6	6	6
JS-13	6	6	6
JS-14			
JS-15	1	1	1
CES	1	1	1
Total Salaries	7,582,000	7,582,000	7,810,000
Total FTEs	123	123	123

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

<u>FY 2010 Enacted</u>		<u>FY 2011 Annualized CR</u>		<u>FY 2012 Request</u>		<u>Difference FY 2010/2012</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	2,128,000	25	2,128,000	28	2,370,000	3	242,000

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

Mission Statement

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

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

- “One-stop” intake centers for victims. Victims seeking protection, child support, visitation, custody or criminal sanctions enter through one door and file the case(s) they need, without traveling from one agency to another.
- A three-track differentiated case processing system in which specially trained judicial officers hear cases involving each family and possess detailed knowledge of other cases and decisions concerning this same family.
- Integration of the adjudication of criminal and civil domestic violence cases so that parties obtain results for separate cases at one judicial hearing, thereby saving time for both the court and the victim and involved parties.
- Paternity and child support orders are issued during the same proceeding as the civil protection order.
- Community Intake Center, using technology to bring convenience and services to the public in Anacostia.
- Continued communication to hold batterers accountable for abusive behavior.
- Specialized contempt court hearing for perpetrators to show why they should not be held in contempt for violating a court order.
- Emergency after-hour access to the judiciary to obtain protection orders after court has closed and on weekends and holidays.

Organizational Background

The Domestic Violence Unit is comprised of 25 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 D.C. Court's 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 D.C. Courts 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 2009, the Domestic Violence Unit processed 9,695 new filings and reinstated cases and disposed of 9,662 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 2009 through 2012.

Table 1
DOMESTIC VIOLENCE UNIT
Caseload and Efficiency Measures
(Fiscal Year 2009 Data)

	Cases Filed	Cases Disposed	Clearance Rate*	Cases Pending		
				1-Oct	30-Sep	Change
Contempt Motions ²	334	238	71%	35	131	274%
Intrafamily (Protection Orders)	4,761	4,720	99%	253	294	16%
Paternity & Child Support ³	731	771	105%	87	47	-46%
U.S. Misdemeanors	<u>3,869</u>	<u>3,933</u>	102%	<u>730</u>	<u>666</u>	-9%
Total	9,695	9,662	100%	1,105	1,138	3%

* 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 2009		FY 2010		FY 2011		FY 2012	
			Goal	Actual	Goal	Estimate	Goal	Estimate	Goal	Estimate
Output/Activity	Hearings/events scheduled	Yearly stats/ Random sample	24,327	32,520	27,003	29,433	35,200	35,200	36,600	36,600
Quality	% of cases reviewed & processed within 48 hours in Court's database	Evaluation, survey, and random sample	95%	95%	95%	95%	95%	95%	95%	95%
Quality	% of cases reviewed & processed within 48 hours in MPD's database	Evaluation, survey, and random sample	100%	85%	100%	85%	100%	85%	100%	85%
End Outcome	Domestic Violence dispositions	Daily/Monthly Statistics	9,768	9,662	10,471	11,121	10,500	10,500	10,900	10,900
Productivity/Efficiency	Case clearance rates	Yearly statistics	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

*Projections for 2011 and 2012 have been adjusted based on 2009 actual figures.

FY 2012 Request

The D.C. Courts' FY 2012 request for the Domestic Violence Unit is \$2,370,000, an increase of \$242,000 (11%) above the FY 2010 Enacted Budget. The requested increase consists of \$173,000 for three FTEs to enhance the safety of domestic violence victims and \$69,000 for built-in cost increases.

² There was a significant increase in the number of pending contempt cases as a result of a significant increase in the number of contempt filings and case processing changes.

³ There has been a significant reduction in the number of pending cases as a result of case processing changes.

Enhance the Safety of Domestic Violence Victims, \$173,000

2 Deputy Clerks (JS-6), \$99,000

1 Calendar Coordinator (JS-10), \$74,000

Introduction Statement. The Domestic Violence Unit (D.V. Unit) needs three additional FTEs to enhance the safety of domestic violence victims by assisting the additional individuals that will seek services in the D.V. Unit as a result of statutory changes that have expanded the jurisdiction of the D.V. Unit, and to ensure the timeliness and accuracy of the data. The additional staff will enhance the safety of some of the most vulnerable persons in the District, domestic violence victims.

Problem Statement. The Intrafamily Offenses Act of 2008 (enacted in March 2009) expanded the jurisdiction of the D.V. Unit by delineating the way in which minors can file for Civil Protection Orders (CPOs). According to the Health and Human Services Centers for Disease Control & Prevention, the District of Columbia has one of the highest rates of teen dating violence in the country.⁴ During the past school year the domestic violence advocacy organizations conducted outreach in schools explaining how to file for CPOs, and the Courts expect a significant increase in case filings as a result. Additionally, the statute now allows individuals who work or go to school in the District, rather than just residents, to file in the D.V. Unit. According to the U.S. Census Bureau, the District of Columbia has the highest percentage increase in daytime population as a result of commuters streaming into the city.⁵ Therefore it is expected that a significant number of individuals who live in surrounding jurisdictions will come to the D.V. Unit to file for CPOs. Filings are already increasing, with a 10% increase in CPO cases during the six-month period after these statutory changes took effect (April – September 2009) compared to the same period in 2008.

Victims are most vulnerable during the first 24 hours after the court issues a CPO. The Metropolitan Police Department (MPD) relies on timely data to enforce these orders and protect victims of domestic violence. Currently, the D.V. clerks are able to enter only 85% of protection orders into the MPD database system within two days of a judge issuing an order. In addition, the Unit has only two calendar coordinators to conduct quality control review in approximately 32,500 events annually and to handle the movement of approximately 25 prisoners each day. The two coordinators must review court orders, computer entries for case notes, scheduling of future events, resolution of past events and eventual disposition of the case. Due to the volume of cases and the need for immediate processing, data quality sometimes suffers. Victim safety and due process rights are at risk for wrongful detention, improper release of a detained defendant or delay in the processing of CPOs. The additional FTEs being requested will enhance the safety of domestic violence victims by reducing the time required to process CPOs from 85% in 48 hours to 98% in only 24 hours and will improve the speed and accuracy of the review process.

⁴ U.S. Department of Health and Human Services Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, "Youth Risk Behavior Surveillance-United States, 2005, Morbidity and Mortality Weekly Report, June 9, 2006, N0. SS5

⁵ US Census Bureau Public Information Office "Census Bureau Releases First Ever Data on Daytime Population for Cities and Counties", Report October 20, 2005

Relationship to Courtwide Strategic Issues, Goals or Strategies. The request would support the D.C. Court’s goal of enhancing public safety by: a) providing adequate resources to protect victims of domestic violence; b) ensuring the accuracy of the court protection orders; and c) promoting the swift, fair, and accessible administration of justice.

Relationship to Divisional MAP Objectives. The additional staff will enhance the safety of domestic violence victims and the timely processing of cases.

Relationship to Existing Funding. There is currently no funding in the Unit’s base budget for these positions.

Methodology. The positions will be classified in accordance with the Court’s classification standards and personnel policies.

Expenditure plan. The Unit will recruit and hire these positions in accordance with D.C. Court’s personnel policies.

Key Performance Indicators. Key performance indicators include the following: 1) reduction in the time to process court orders, 2) enhanced accuracy of court data, and 3) enhanced safety of domestic violence victims.

Table 3
DOMESTIC VIOLENCE UNIT
New Positions Requested

Position	Grade	Number	Annual Salary	Benefits	Total Personnel Costs
Calendar Coordinator	10	1	\$58,000	\$16,000	\$74,000
Deputy Clerk	6/7/8	2	\$79,000	\$20,000	\$99,000
Total		3	\$137,000	\$36,000	\$173,000

Table 4
DOMESTIC VIOLENCE UNIT
Budget Authority by Object Class

	FY 2010 Enacted	FY 2011 Annualized CR	FY 2012 Request	Difference FY 2010/2012
11 – Compensation	1,693,000	1,693,000	1,881,000	188,000
12 – Benefits	424,000	424,000	474,000	50,000
Subtotal Personnel Cost	2,117,000	2,117,000	2,355,000	238,000
21 - Travel, Transp. of Persons	0	0	0	0
22 - Transportation of Things	0	0	0	0
23 - Rent, Commun. & Utilities	0	0	0	0
24 - Printing & Reproduction	0	0	0	0
25 - Other Services	0	0	0	0
26 - Supplies & Materials	5,000	5,000	7,000	2,000
31 - Equipment	6,000	6,000	8,000	2,000
Subtotal Non-Personnel Cost	11,000	11,000	15,000	4,000
TOTAL	2,128,000	2,128,000	2,370,000	242,000
FTE	25	25	28	3

Table 5
DOMESTIC VIOLENCE UNIT
Detail Difference, FY 2010/2012

Object Class	Description of Request	FTE	Cost	Difference FY 2010/2012
11 - Personnel Compensation	Current Position WIG		51,000	
	Calendar Coordinator	1	58,000	
	Deputy Clerk	2	79,000	
	<i>Subtotal 11</i>			<i>188,000</i>
12 - Personnel Benefits	Current Position WIG		14,000	
	Calendar Coordinator	1	16,000	
	Deputy Clerk	2	20,000	
	<i>Subtotal 12</i>			<i>50,000</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 increases			2,000
31 - Equipment	Built-in increases			2,000
Total				242,000

Table 6
DOMESTIC VIOLENCE UNIT
Detail of Full-Time Equivalent Employment

Grade	FY 2010 Enacted	FY 2011 Annualized CR	FY 2012 Request
JS-3			
JS-4			
JS-5			
JS-6	1	1	2
JS-7			
JS-8	8	8	9
JS-9	9	9	9
JS-10	3	3	4
JS-11			
JS-12	1	1	1
JS-13	2	2	2
JS-14			
JS-15			
CES	1	1	1
Total Salaries	1,693,000	1,693,000	1,881,000
Total FTEs	25	25	28

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

<u>FY 2010 Enacted</u>		<u>FY 2011 Annualized CR</u>		<u>FY 2012 Request</u>		<u>Difference FY 2010/2012</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>
177	15,545,000	177	15,545,000	179	16,830,000	2	1,285,000

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, termination of parental rights, 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, termination of parental rights 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 25 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 14 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 2010, the Religious Freedom and Civil Marriage Equality Amendment Act of 2009 became law in the District of Columbia. The law afforded same sex couples the legal right to marry in the District resulting in a need to redesign processes and forms in the Marriage Section of the Domestic Relations Branch of the Family Court. Brochures, marriage license applications, minister authorizations and other forms were revised to make them gender neutral in order to comply with the new law. Employees were trained on procedures developed to support the law and the number of employees authorized as officiates to perform civil weddings in Court was increased in order to meet the growing demand for weddings from gay and lesbian couples. From the effective date of the law, March 3, 2010 through May 31, 2010, the Family Court

accepted and processed 2,407 applications for marriages almost tripling the 880 applications processed for the same time period during 2009. Likewise, the number of civil weddings virtually tripled for the same time period in 2010 (239 in 2009 to 669 in 2010) with the vast majority of those unions performed by Court employees.

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 when the Court is requesting that prisoners be transported to the Court. The automation replaces the manual process of completing and transmitting paper documents to accomplish the transfer of prisoners. The Family Court Operations Division, in conjunction with the IT Division, has also developed a daily courtroom calendar that automatically displays “alerts” on parties indicating the existence of, among other things, outstanding bench warrants on persons who are scheduled to appear before any judicial officer assigned to the Family Court. These initiatives further the Court’s strategic objective to utilize technology to support and improve operational efficiency.

Workload Data

Table 1
FAMILY COURT OPERATIONS
Caseload and Efficiency Measures
(Fiscal Year 2009 Data)

	Cases Filed	Cases Disposed	Clearance Rate	Cases Pending		
				1-Oct	30-Sep	Change
Abuse & Neglect	616	725	115.3%	2,590	2,494	-3.8%
Adoption	224	227	101.3%	307	304	-1.0%
Divorce/Custody/Miscellaneous	3,705	3,415	92.2%	2,731	3,021	9.6%
Juvenile Delinquency	3,716	3,799	101.3%	721	671	-7.5%
Family Special Proceedings	17	119	700.0%	107	5	-2040.0%
Mental Health/	1,328	1,527	95.7%	560	629	11.0%
Mental Retardation	22	108	n/a	1,251	1,165	-7.4%
Paternity & Child Support	3,469	4,137	114.7%	7,495	6,965	-7.6%
Total	13,097	14,057	107.3%	15,762	15,254	-3.3%

* Family Court Annual Reports exclude clearance rates for mental retardation cases.

Table 2
FAMILY COURT OPERATIONS
Key Performance Indicators

Performance Indicator	Data Source	FY 2009		FY 2010		FY 2011		FY 2012	
		Goal	Actual	Goal	Projection	Goal	Projection	Goal	Projection
Prisoner Transfers Processed	Monthly Statistics	2,726	3,399	2,800	3,585	3,771	3,771	3,958	3,958
Delinquency & Neglect Cases/Orders Reviewed	Monthly Statistics	21,703	17,222	23,089	17,861	18,500	18,500	19,139	19,139
Delinquency & Neglect Cases Corrected	Monthly Statistics	767	861	823	932	1,004	1,004	1,075	1,075
Applications for Marriage Licenses & Minister Authorizations	Computer Reports	2,649	2,277	2,682	8,610	9,324	9,324	10,048	10,048
Marriage Licenses & Authorizations Issued	Computer Reports	2,431	2,665	2,536	7,540	8,126	8,126	8,712	8,712
Petitions & Complaints Total Intake	Computer Reports	14,603	13,687	13,721	13,721	13,653	13,653	13,647	13,647
Domestic & Child Support Hearings Set	Computer Reports	29,787	31,403	32,793	32,793	32,793	35,722	32,793	38,004
Domestic Orders Issued	Computer Reports	8,832	10,846	9,603	11,362	11,877	11,877	12,393	12,393
Child Support Orders Issued	Computer Reports	1,875	2,294	2,294	2,497	2,497		2,497	
MR Advocate Training Sessions	Computer Log	60	7	74	74	104	104	154	154
New MR Advocates Recruited	Computer Log	100	6	70	70	100	100	150	150
MR Advocates Trained	Computer; Training Log	150	26	90	90	120	120	170	170
MR Cases with MR Advocates	Computer Log	560	231	301	301	401	401	551	551
ASFA case reviews in initial, further initial, pretrial, stipulation, disposition and permanency hearings	Monthly Statistics	3,850	3,877	4,017	4,017	4,235	4,235	4,401	4,401
Data input and other error notifications distributed by Attorney Advisors	Monthly Statistics	737	758	792	792	825	825	858	858
CCAN Attorneys appointed to Adult Parties in Abuse & Neglect cases	Monthly Statistics	801	1,268	1,153	1,153	1,039	1,039	924	924
Guardians <i>ad litem</i> Appointed	Monthly Statistics	394	601	547	547	494	494	440	440
Trainings Provided to Attorneys	CCAN Records	16	31	22	22	22	22	22	22
Attorneys Meeting CLE Requirements	CCAN Records	148	165	163	163	160	160	158	158

FY 2012 Request

In FY 2012 the D.C. Courts' request for Family Court Operations Division is \$16,830,000, an increase of \$1,285,000 (8%) above the FY 2010 Enacted Budget. New FY 2012 request consists of \$74,000 for one FTE to strengthen families and parent/child relationships in families with child support orders by implementing the D.C. Family Court Fathering Court Initiative, \$595,000 for special advocates for abused and neglected children, and \$499,000 for built-in cost increases (see Table 5).

Fathering Court Initiative, \$74,000
Fathering Court Case Manager (JS-10)

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 2009 there were more than 55,300 Title IV-D⁶ child support cases in the District. In slightly over 31,000 cases the non-custodial parent was in arrears, representing over \$267.8 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 are behind in child support payments. The program provides services to help these individuals find stable and substantive employment so they can make support payments and to acquire the tools needed to become fully participating parents in the lives of their children. Through stable employment and strengthened family relationships, the program also helps to reduce recidivism and crime in our community today and in the future. 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.

The success of the program was recognized when Judge Milton Lee, the Fathering Court presiding judge, was invited to testify at a hearing before the House Ways and Means Committee, Subcommittee on Income Security and Family Support, on Responsible Fatherhood Programs. In addition, the U.S. Department of Justice cited the Superior Court's program in its announcement of a similar program to be directed by Attorney General Holder.

The Court's pilot program was a grant-funded venture for 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 whom report unemployment at the time of release. In many cases these fathers are simply ill-equipped to handle the rigors of parenting, and therefore, have no meaningful chance to build a healthy family unit. 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 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.

⁶ Title IV-D of the Social Security Act (42 U.S. Code 651 *et seq*)

As of June 2010, all 35 active program 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.

The FY 2012 budget request will permit the Court to expand the Fathering Court to serve more of the target population of fathers reentering the community, to help them sustain employment, make child support payments, and establish healthy relationships with their children.

The Court proposes to hire a Case Manager to interview and conduct assessments for each Fathering Court Program participant to identify their employment and other social services or treatment needs. The Case Manager will prepare the participants' individual service plans, service schedules and personally link the participants to the services providers. Through site visits, telephone contacts and service provider reporting, the Case Manager will monitor and record the participants' compliance as well as the services provided by government agencies, cooperating partners or contracted vendors. The Case Manager will evaluate the participants' progress, facilitate their development, respond to crisis situations that affect their progress, and intervene with service providers to resolve immediate problems. The Case Manager will provide legal information and or priority service referrals to the Family Court Self Help Center for pro-se customer services. He or she will maintain individual case file records and maintain program data on the number of participants served by the program and the number and types of participant activities in order to provide further guidance to the respondents and periodic reports to the Court and program administrators. The Case Manager will make individualized progress reports on each participant at his or her scheduled court appearance.

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. A program manager was requested in FY 2011 to keep the program functioning at the current level when grant funding is exhausted at the end 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 baseline 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.

Special Advocates for Abused and Neglected Children, \$595,000

Introduction. Court Appointed Special Advocates (CASAs) for abused and neglected children are volunteers who closely monitor victimized youth and report to the court. CASAs are an invaluable resource to Family Court judges and magistrate judges and to families and children in the District. CASA volunteers 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 that the child might need. CASA volunteers review environmental issues contributing to the child's situation, academic background, and physical/mental health. CASAs 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. CASA programs that recruit, screen, train, and support the volunteer advocates have significant resource requirements, and the local CASA program is no longer able to provide these volunteer advocates without charge to the Family Court. Accordingly, the Courts request additional resources to contract with an organization to provide these special advocates. This request is critical to continue to receive the services of CASA volunteers to help abused and neglected children get needed services and remain in stable, nurturing homes.

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 resources would finance a CASA program to provide an advocate for 150 children for a year. The local CASA program would be 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 CASA volunteers.
- Providing judges with recommendations based on each CASA'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.

Table 3
FAMILY COURT OPERATIONS
New Position Requested

Position	Grade	Number	Salary	Benefits	Total Personnel Cost
Fathering Court Case Manager	10	1	\$58,000	\$16,000	\$74,000

Table 4
FAMILY COURT OPERATIONS
Budget Authority by Object Class

	FY 2010 Enacted	FY 2011 Annualized CR	FY 2012 Request	Difference FY 2010/2012
11 - Personnel Compensation	11,306,000	11,306,000	11,802,000	496,000
12 - Personnel Benefits	2,827,000	2,827,000	2,957,000	130,000
<i>Subtotal Personnel Cost</i>	<i>14,133,000</i>	<i>14,133,000</i>	<i>14,759,000</i>	<i>626,000</i>
21 - Travel, Transp. of Persons	0	0	0	0
22 - Transportation of Things	0	0	0	0
23 - Rent, Commun. & Utilities	0	0	0	0
24 - Printing & Reproduction	27,000	27,000	29,000	2,000
25 - Other Services	1,022,000	1,022,000	1,662,000	640,000
26 - Supplies & Materials	35,000	35,000	37,000	2,000
31 - Equipment	328,000	328,000	343,000	15,000
<i>Subtotal Non-Personnel Cost</i>	<i>1,412,000</i>	<i>1,412,000</i>	<i>2,071,000</i>	<i>659,000</i>
TOTAL	15,545,000	15,545,000	16,830,000	1,285,000
FTE	177	177	179	2

Table 5
FAMILY COURT OPERATIONS
Detail Difference, FY 2010/2012

Object Class	Description of Request	FTE	Cost	Difference FY 2010/2012
11 - Compensation	Current Position WIG		344,000	
	Fathering Court Prg Mgr (FY11 Pres. Rec.)	1	94,000	
	Fathering Court Case Manager	1	58,000	
<i>Subtotal 11</i>				<i>496,000</i>
12 - Benefits	Current Positions WIG		91,000	
	Fathering Court Prg Mgr (FY11 Pres. Rec.)	1	23,000	
	Fathering Court Case Manager	1	16,000	
<i>Subtotal 12</i>				<i>130,000</i>
21 - Travel, Transp. of Persons				
22 - Transportation of Things				
23 - Rent, Commun. & Utilities				
24 - Printing & Reproduction	Built-in			2,000
25 - Other Service	Built-in		45,000	
	Court Appointed Special Advocate Stipends		595,000	
<i>Subtotal 25</i>				<i>640,000</i>
26 - Supplies & Materials	Built-in			2,000
31 - Equipment	Built-in			15,000
Total				1,285,000

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

Grade	FY 2010 Enacted	FY 2011 Annualized CR	FY 2012 Request
JS-3			
JS-4	3	3	3
JS-5			
JS-6	25	25	25
JS-7	16	16	16
JS-8	51	51	51
JS-9	32	32	32
JS-10	13	13	14
JS-11	11	11	11
JS-12	9	9	9
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	11,306,000	11,306,000	11,802,000
Total FTEs	177	177	179

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

<u>FY 2010 Enacted</u>		<u>FY 2011 Annualized CR</u>		<u>FY 2012 Request</u>		<u>Difference FY 2010/2012</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	17,080,000	140	17,080,000	140	21,103,000	0	4,023,000

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 community supervision to protect communities, enhance public safety, and prevent recidivism.

Organizational Background

As the juvenile probation agency for the District of Columbia, which includes juvenile pre-trial services and probation, 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 newly referred youth’s risk to public safety; 2) making initial detention/release decisions; 3) conducting youth and family assessments; 4) making petition recommendations to the Office of the Attorney General (OAG); 5) advising and making recommendations to the Court throughout all phases of the adjudication process; 6) conducting home, school and community assessments toward the development of comprehensive pre-trial and post-disposition probation services/supervision plans and alternatives to detention; 7) recommending and facilitating commitment of youth to the DYRS; and 8) 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. This office also houses several probation officers who staff the city’s Co-Located Absconder Unit, which includes several Metropolitan Police Officers (MPD) and several DYRS personnel. The office has 10 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 6 FTEs.
- The Contract Monitoring, Data and Financial Analysis Unit coordinates all court-ordered referrals, oversees the procurement of services and coordination of reimbursement for contractual service providers, and compiles CSSD’s data. The Unit also coordinates the Division’s general internships and staff training. The unit has 4 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 each newly referred youth's risk to public safety, conducting social assessments (youth and family) on all youth referred by law enforcement and the District of Columbia Public Schools (DCPS), presenting all referrals before a judicial officer (juvenile equivalent of an arraignment), and pre-trial recommendations. The Status Offender and Juvenile Drug Court Unit is responsible for screening, diverting, petitioning, managing cases, serving, and supervising all youth referred by the DCPS, Charter Schools and/or a parent for alleged habitual truancy (status offense) or as a Person in Need of Supervision (PINS) and all youth 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 seamless 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 female gender-specific seamless probation program; 2) the Southwest Satellite Office (SWSO), created to serve youth residing in the southwest quadrant of the city (temporarily located at the Court); 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; and 4) the Delinquency Prevention Unit (DPU), which manages the CSSD's GPS electronic monitoring, coordinates diversion of low-to-moderate risk youth from secure detention, and facilitates public safety community education and outreach. The branch consists of 41 FTEs.
- The Pre/Post Probation Supervision Branch - Region II is responsible for seamless 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, 3) the Southeast Satellite Office (SESO) Balanced and Restorative Justice Drop-In Center, responsible for serving and supervising all youth residing in the historic Anacostia southeast quadrant of the District; and 4) Ultimate Transitions Ultimate Responsibilities Now (UTURN), responsible for case management, serving, and supervising high-risk pre-and post-adjudicated youth across the city. This branch consists of 46 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 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.
- 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.
- 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 at least 92% of all juveniles.
- Conduct high-quality, comprehensive home studies for families involved in domestic relations cases by completing 95% of home studies within six 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 20 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 for all Court ordered youth within 25 business days.

Restructuring or Work Process Re-Design

Building on a major re-design effort launched in FY 2006, in 2010 CSSD managers continued to sustain the Division's adaptation of its strength-based model to guide juvenile probation. Additionally, the Division continues to enhance its one probation officer, one youth/family model for youth and families coming before the Family Court on delinquency matters. CSSD also continued to secure extensive training for staff in the areas of staff development, substance

abuse prevention, mental health services, attendance at public forums, and the coordination of community supervision, public safety, and leadership.

CSSD recruited 24 or new employees in 2010 (14% of the Division staff). To equip staff with tools needed to carry out their duties, CSSD will facilitate an in-house Training Academy for all new staff in August 2010. Building on this measure, all new employees will participate in Family Group Conferencing (FGC) in FY 2011. Senior Team meetings, all manager meetings, and all staff meeting will also continue 2011 to increase communication among staff and ensure the sharing of information necessary to fulfill CSSD’s mission.

In 2009, the CSSD, in partnership with the Metropolitan Police Department (MPD) and DYRS, launched the city’s first-ever co-located Absconder Locator Unit, staffed by three CSSD POs, two DYRS’ employees and four police officers. However, due to competing priorities among partnering agencies, in 2010, CSSD began conducting abscondence retrieval efforts independent of the partnering agencies. These efforts have proven successful, evidenced by the fact that to date, a total of 974 youth under custody orders have been retrieved and returned to the Court, resulting in a 29% reduction in the number of pending custody orders, per month.

Workload Data

Table 1
SOCIAL SERVICES DIVISION
Caseload (Fiscal Year 2010 data)

Case Type	New Cases	Cases Closed	Cases Pending Beginning of Year	Cases Pending End of Year
Juvenile Intake	2,729	2,673	155	211
Pre/ Post Disp. Supervision	3,416	3,447	1,399	1,368
Juvenile Drug Court	48	54	26	20
Domestic Relations	303	270	73	106
Child Guidance Clinic	748	741	2	9

Table 2
SOCIAL SERVICES DIVISION
Key Performance Indicators

Performance Indicators	Data Source	FY 2009		FY 2010		FY 2011		FY 2012	
		Goal	Actual	Goal	Estimate	Goal	Projection	Goal	Projection
Juveniles under supervision and Domestic Relations (DR) monthly cases average of total CSSD cases	Superior Court Data	1,500	1,621	1,600	1,679	1,650	1,700	1,700	1,750
Juveniles under supervision and drug screening conducted	Pretrial Services Data	5,180	5,200	5,195	5,210	5,210	5,250	5,260	5,300
Juvenile probationers screening positive for drugs during probation	Pretrial Services Data	50%	50.5%	51%	50%	50%	48%	50%	45%
Percentage of juveniles successfully completing probation	CSSD Statistical Reports	75%	71%	78%	77%	80%	78%	82%	80%
Juveniles arrested for new offenses during probation	Superior Court Data	24%	21%	24%	21%	20%	20%	18%	18%
Average pre and post-disposition supervision caseloads and national standards: 1:25 min, 1:25 med, 1:25 max	CSSD Statistical Reports	25	30	25	25	25	25	25	25
Average pre and post-disposition intensive supervision caseloads and national standards 1:14	CSSD Statistical Reports	14	18	14	14	14	14	14	14
Increased curfew checks -- face-to-face contact	CSSD Statistical Reports	18,000	13,739	17,500	15,978	18,000	17,500	18,250	18,000
Increased curfew checks -- telephone calls	CSSD Statistical Reports	30,000	24,463	31,000	28,260	32,000	32,000	32,000	30,050
Increased compliance among youth with face-to-face and telephone call curfew checks ⁷	CSSD Statistical Reports	75%	71%	75%	71%	75%	75%	75%	75%

Division Outcomes and Accomplishments in FY 2010

In FY 2010, with an average daily population of roughly 1,700, of whom 1,373 or 81% were males and 327 or 19% were females, the CSSD continued to manage the front end of the juvenile justice system.

The Division continued to provide timely screenings and assessments of all newly referred youth resulting in more than 95% of new cases being ready prior to the initial hearing. An average of 1,717 monthly face-to-face curfew checks and an average of 3,057 monthly curfew

⁷ Fiscal years 2010 and 2011 projections were based on average juvenile arrest and offense rate trends reported by the District of Columbia Metropolitan Police Department (MPD), which show a steady volume of juvenile arrests overall across 2006, 2007, 2008, and 2009; however, the data also show a slight increase in serious offenses.

calls were made, in addition to the family group conference sessions, case staffing, and 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 and comprehensive services under 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, and the Child Guidance Clinic (CGC). In May 2010, the District of Columbia Courts completed renovation of the newly developed N.E. BARJ Drop-In Center, located at 2575 Reed St., N.E. Program and services development is underway with a goal of becoming fully operational in August 2010.

Table 3
S.E. BARJ Drop-In Center

Month/Year	Oct 09	Nov 09	Dec 09	Jan 10	Feb 10	Mar 10	Apr 10	May 10
Youth in Program	28/238	27/247	28/244	32/235	32/253	37/254	37/218	32/214
% not suspended from school	96%	95%	95%	96%	95%	92%	97%	97%
% not rearrested	96%	95%	100%	96%	95%	97%	97%	94%

Table 3 shows outcomes achieved by the S.E. BARJ Drop-In Center in FY 2010. The Center houses both BARJ activities for pre-trial youth and post-disposition services and supervision. Among the youth participating in the S.E. BARJ Drop-In Center, recidivism rates averaged 4%, less than 4% of participating youth were suspended from school, and more than 96% of participating youth completed the S.E. BARJ Drop-In Center program. The average daily population of 32 youth attending the Center for BARJ represents nearly 15% of the facility's average daily population of 238 post-disposition youth served and supervised at the location.

Table 4
Curfew Checks

Month/Year	Oct 09	Nov 09	Dec 09	Jan 10	Feb 10	Mar 10	Apr 10	May 10
Face-to-Face	2,015	2,153	1,823	1,875	1,572	2,048	2,049	1,628
Telephone	3,396	3,640	3,807	3,284	3,068	3,378	3,587	2,772

Table 4 illustrates that from October 1, 2009 thru May 31, 2010, a total of 15,163 face-to-face curfew checks and 26,932 telephone curfew checks were conducted. The population of youth receiving face-to-face curfew checks includes youth residing in the city, D.C. youth adjudicated outside the city, and youth adjudicated in the D.C. who reside within a 20-mile radius of the city. The population of youth receiving telephone curfew checks includes all youth supervised by CSSD with court-ordered curfews.

Table 5
Parent Participation

Month/Year	Oct 09	Nov 09	Dec 09	Jan 10	Feb 10	Mar 10	Apr 10	May 10
Parent Participation Orders	1,203	1,115	1,139	1,167	1,169	1,135	1,056	1,072
Compliance	1,103	1,009	953	1,056	1,052	898	968	912
% Compliance among parents	92%	91%	84%	91%	90%	87%	92%	85%

National indicators indicate that parents, guardians, and custodians are the best source to supervise and support adolescents involved in juvenile justice systems. From October 2009

through May 2010, the compliance among parents issued parent participation orders achieved a compliance rate of 89%.

Also in 2010, the Division's Child Guidance Clinic (CGC) completed 453 evaluations. The CGC's nationally accredited doctoral internship permits interns and externs to work under the supervision of licensed psychologists, augmenting full-time staff. The Clinic continued to successfully operate the only community-based comprehensive program for juveniles adjudicated for sexual offenses. In FY 2010 the CGC, in collaboration with Children's Hospital, launched a medical and behavioral health screening initiative at the D.C. Superior Court. The CGC completed several research studies, including one CGC staff presented at a national conference at the University of Michigan on its Millon Adolescent Clinical Inventory (MACI), a clinical testing tool used based upon a sample of 325 African American males under CSSD's supervision. Responses to these studies have been overwhelming and, as a result, the CGC is planning to conduct additional sample research studies aimed at broadening the understanding among behavioral health practitioners and other stakeholders on how best to work with system-involved African American adolescents.

In August 2010, the CSSD, in collaboration with one of its contract vendors, sponsored a Civil Rights Tour. As in the past, the trip culminates in a journey to historic areas in Georgia and Alabama where youth relive experiences encountered by citizens during the Civil Rights struggle. Roughly forty (40) adolescent males under CSSD supervision participate in the tour, and upon returning, they complete a 500 word essay on their experience. Participating youth also complete 30 hours of community service/service learning, in which they share their experience through presentations at schools and community events. Then, participating youth enter an essay contest for prizes donated by CSSD staff. There are a number of benefits derived from the in the trips, tours and other outings, including their ability to interact with youth from other jurisdictions.

Additionally in August 2010, the CSSD sponsored a tour of several Historically Black Colleges and Universities (HBCUs) on the East Coast. As in the past, the HBCU trips are designed to introduce CSSD youth, many of whom view attending college as merely a dream (ostensibly because of their juvenile history), to colleges and increase the likelihood of their enrollment in a two-year or four-year college.

Over the past five years, CSSD has found innovative and creative programming (e.g., HBCU and Civil Rights Tours, camping, BARJ, LOTS) invaluable, in that these programs provide a variety of ways to reach, stimulate, habilitate and rehabilitate court-involved youth. In fact, many completing these programs return to CSSD, subsequent to the completion of their probation, to serve as volunteers and interns.

Additionally in 2010, the CSSD Director attended the Senior Executive Government Fellowship at Harvard University's Kennedy School of Government. The fellowship, which hosted 80 senior managers from various federal agencies, provided an opportunity to examine leadership and management using case studies and analysis from actual situations across federal, state, and local governments. Information acquired from the fellowship will continue

to be shared with CSSD managers to support the continued development and accomplishments of the Division.

FY 2012 Request

In FY 2012, the Courts request \$21,103,000 for the Family Court Social Services Division, an increase of \$4,023,000 (24%) above the FY 2010 Enacted Budget. New FY 2012 request consists of \$2,522,000 for a drop-in center for juvenile girls under supervision and \$576,000 for built-in cost increases (see Table 5).

Drop-In Center for Juvenile Girls, \$2,522,000

Problem Statement. To enhance the habilitation and rehabilitation of juvenile girls under supervision and reduce recidivism, the D.C. Courts seek resources for a Balanced and Restorative Justice Drop-In Center for girls.

To serve boys in Southeast and Northeast, the Division operates BARJ Drop-In Centers in Wards 5 and 8 that replaced and expanded juvenile probation satellite offices in those quadrants of the District. Funds were provided in FY 2010 for a third BARJ Drop-in Center to serve boys in Southwest. In 2012, the Courts request resources for a centrally-located BARJ Drop-In Center to serve adolescent girls under supervision. The BARJ Drop-In Centers offer an alternative to detention by providing a structured environment for these youth after school and on Saturdays. In addition to providing services, such as tutoring and counseling, and recreation under the supervision of probation officers, the community-based setting facilitates family involvement in the youth's rehabilitation.

In FY 2005, in response to an increase in girl gang/crew activity arrests, the Social Services Division began assessing the needs of adolescent girls. Extensive literature reviews and data trends in juvenile justice revealed the increase in criminal activity among girls was not limited to the District of Columbia, information from the MPD indicated that a wave of violence (e.g. simple assault, aggravated assault and auto theft) was directly associated with the influx of girl gang/crew activity. Assessment interviews with girls' immediate family members (following the girls' arrest) and a review of adolescent girls' development theory pointed to the need for a bold new approach to working with adolescent girls following arrest.

In February 2006, the Leaders of Today in Solidarity (LOTS) Unit was launched to address the needs of adolescent girls supervised by CSSD. Within less than six months of operation, LOTS staff realized that, although their efforts were very effective in redirecting LOTS girls and reducing recidivism, the outcomes would improve significantly by also focusing on the peers of girls in the LOTS program. The major limitation faced by staff has been the lack of adequate dedicated space to work with such a large population of girls. A Drop-In Center for girls will help address that limitation and provide a venue for positive activities and services for these youth. Because the District of Columbia does not have a secure detention facility for girls, the Court's Drop-In Center will provide another option to protect public safety while keeping girls in the local area under intensive supervision, where they can maintain contact and build better relationships with their families.

As illustrated in Table 3, the BARJ Drop-In Center model is successful in reducing school suspensions and rearrests. Based on quantitative outcomes recognized by the Annie E. Casey Foundation, the Coalition on Juvenile Justice, and other national organizations, replication of BARJ Drop-In Centers is the most comprehensive way to engage, serve, supervise, and monitor at-risk youth. Our findings are also supported by positive feedback from the communities in which BARJ Drop-In Centers are located. With an average daily population of 200 girls (20% of the CSSD average daily population), the services concentrated at a BARJ Drop-in Center are necessary to serve this population and to enhance public safety.

Relationship to Court Vision, Mission, and Goals. 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 community supervision to all youth determined eligible for diversion and petitioning.

Relationship to Existing Funding. Following careful reengineering of existing resources, additional funds are needed to ensure court-involved youth are adequately served and supervised. Existing funds are not sufficient to support the development of an additional BARJ Drop-In Center.

Methodology. As illustrated in Table 6, this request is comprised of the cost of an annual lease for space, build-out of that space, and additional services to be provided at the BARJ Drop-In Center.

Table 6
LOTS (Female) BARJ Drop-In Center Cost Detail

Breakdown of Cost	Annual Lease	One time Build-Out	Services	Total
LOTS (Female) BARJ Drop-In Center	360,000	1,800,000	362,000	2,522,000

Expenditure Plan. The lease, build-out, and services for the Balanced and Restorative Justice Drop-In Centers will be procured in accordance with Court policies.

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

- Increase in school attendance and academic performance
- Reduction in number of girls testing positive for drugs
- Reduction in number of girls remanded to detention facility
- Increase in girls successfully completing probation

Table 7
SOCIAL SERVICES DIVISION
Budget Authority by Object Class

	FY 2010 Enacted	FY 2011 Annualized CR	FY 2012 Request	Difference FY 2010/FY 2012
11 - Personnel Compensation	11,636,000	11,636,000	11,988,000	352,000
12 - Personnel Benefits	2,915,000	2,915,000	3,009,000	94,000
Subtotal Personnel Cost	14,551,000	14,551,000	14,997,000	446,000
21 - Travel, Transp. of Persons	0	0	0	0
22 - Transportation of Things	0	0	0	0
23 - Rent, Commun. & Utilities	0	0	360,000	360,000
24 - Printing & Reproduction	0	0	0	0
25 - Other Services	2,463,000	2,463,000	5,674,000	3,211,000
26 - Supplies & Materials	32,000	32,000	36,000	4,000
31 - Equipment	34,000	34,000	36,000	2,000
Subtotal Non-Personnel Cost	2,529,000	2,529,000	6,106,000	3,577,000
TOTAL	17,080,000	17,080,000	21,103,000	4,023,000
FTE	140	140	140	0

Table 8
SOCIAL SERVICES DIVISION
Detail Difference, FY 2010/2012

Object Class	Description of Request	FTE	Cost	Difference FY 2010/2012
11 - Personnel Compensation	Current Positions WIG			352,000
12 - Personnel Benefits	Current Positions WIG			94,000
21 - Travel, Transp. of Persons				
22 - Transportation of Things				
23 - Rent, Commun. & Utilities	LOTS BARJ Drop-In Center Lease			360,000
24 - Printing & Reproduction				
25 - Other Services	Expanded Youth Services (FY11 Pres Rec)		925,000	
	LOTS BARJ, Build-out		1,800,000	
	LOTS BARJ, Additional Services		360,000	
	Built-in		126,000	
Subtotal 25				3,211,000
26 - Supplies & Materials	Additional Supplies for LOTS BARJ		2,000	
	Built-in		2,000	
Subtotal 26				4,000
31 - Equipment	Built-in			2,000
Total				4,023,000

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

Grade	2010 Enacted	2011 Annualized CR	2012 Request
JS-2			
JS-3			
JS-4			
JS-5			
JS-6	2	2	3
JS-7	5	5	5
JS-8	20	20	19
JS-9	14	14	26
JS-10	2	2	1
JS-11	16	16	12
JS-12	56	56	48
JS-13	19	19	20
JS-14	4	4	4
JS-15	1	1	1
CES	1	1	1
Total Salaries	11,636,000	11,636,000	11,988,000
Total FTEs	140	140	140

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

<u>FY 2010 Enacted</u>		<u>FY 2011 Annualized CR</u>		<u>FY 2012 Request</u>		<u>Difference FY 2010/2012</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	2,524,000	20	2,524,000	22	2,849,000	2	325,000

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’s role is to facilitate negotiations between the parties in an effort to resolve the case. The Division is comprised of the Director’s office and three branches, Civil ADR, Family ADR, and Program Assessment and Training.

1. The Civil ADR Branch provides mediation and arbitration for most of the Superior Court’s civil cases. Mediation is provided for small claims, landlord/tenant, and civil cases. This branch also provides mediation services to the Tax and Probate Courts.
2. The Family ADR Branch includes three programs: Child Protection Mediation, Community Information and Referral, and Family Mediation. Child Protection Mediation is a process which includes multiple stakeholders addressing family plans and legal issues in child neglect cases. The Community Information and Referral Program provide 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 parents and their children involved in 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 participate in a mediated resolution of the dispute in a manner that is in the best interest of the children.
3. The Program Assessment and Training 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 stipend for their services.

4. International and domestic visitors look to the Multi-Door as a model program upon which to base their existing or fledging programs. The professional ADR staff of the Multi-Door Division provides program information and technical assistance to 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 2009	8103	4171	1918	46%
FY 2010	8284	4588	2053	45%

*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 meet client needs ; 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 scheduled, 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 participant 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 MAP objectives follow:

- Further the delivery of justice through effective and appropriate 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 ensure the integrity of courtwide data and the quality of all mediated agreements.

- Increase understanding of and access to ADR by producing high-quality written materials in multiple languages 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 a well-trained roster of neutrals in all mediation programs by maintaining an open enrollment application process and providing basic and advanced mediation skills training and maintaining a bi-annual renewal process to assure the quality of mediator performance.
- 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.

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, Probate, and Tax 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 its outcomes.

The division expanded ADR services to litigants by increasing the number and type of cases where ADR services are provided. Multi-Door is planning to extend services this fiscal year by expanding the Program for Agreement and Cooperation in Contested Custody Disputes (PAC) to include an education seminar for Spanish language parents in contested custody disputes. 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.

The Multi-Door Division, in collaboration with the Civil Division, will pilot a housing conditions mediation program that will assist in enforcing housing code regulations in the District of Columbia.

Multi-Door continues to expand its roster of qualified mediators through an open enrollment process that allows trained and experienced mediators to join its roster of neutrals. The division conducted more than a dozen specialized ADR trainings across all programs for its mediators during this fiscal year.

The Multi-Door Division continued a multi-year project with the Information Technology Division in several areas to improve the performance of mediators (database), the crafting of mediated agreements (web based agreement writing system) and the efficiency of the stipend payment process (web voucher system). The divisions developed all requirements for a

comprehensive database system to track mediator performance and the experience of litigants in mediation, and the requirements for the web based agreement writing and voucher systems. 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 and improve mediator performance by informing staff of subject matter upon which to base future specialized trainings.

The Database, Web Voucher, and Web Based Agreement Writing systems are scheduled to be in use 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 2009 Actual	FY 2010 Estimated	Projection FY 2011	Projection FY 2012
Input	Cases Scheduled	CourtView	6029	6300	6350	6350
Output	Mediation Sessions Held	CourtView	3500	3750	3800	3800
Outcome	Case settlement rate	CourtView	41%	42%	43%	43%
Outcome/Quality	Participant Satisfaction w/ ADR Process	SPSS database	92%	95%	95%	95%
Outcome/Quality	Participant Satisfaction w/ Outcome	SPSS database	84%	85%	85%	85%
Outcome/Quality	Neutral Performance Satisfaction	SPSS database	94%	95%	95%	95%

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

Type of Indicator	Performance Indicator	Data Source	FY 2009 Actual	FY 2010 Estimated	Projection FY 2011	Projection FY 2012
Input	Mediation Sessions Scheduled	Court view	2,074	1,984	2,100	2,200
Output	Mediation sessions held	CourtView	1,386	1,281	1,400	1,500
Outcome	*Case settlement rate	CourtView	72%	57%	60%	62%
Outcome/Quality	Participant satisfaction w/ process	SPSS database	98%	98%	98%	98%
Outcome/Quality	Participant satisfaction w/outcome	SPSS database	92%	95%	96%	97%
Outcome/Quality	Neutral performance satisfaction	SPSS database	97%	98%	98%	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 mediation is completed. 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 in the civil ADR program are based on the number of civil cases filed in the court and the number of cases referred to mediation. In the family ADR branch, projections are based on the actual number of sessions held per case during the fiscal year. Family cases typically involve participation in 3-5 mediation sessions; therefore the number of family mediation sessions is larger than the actual number of cases referred. 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 92% and 98%.

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 2009		FY 2010		FY 2011		FY 2012	
			Goal	Actual	Goal	Estimate	Goal	Estimate	Goal	Estimate
Output	Settlement Rate	IJIS database	50%	46%	50%	45%	50%	45%	50%	45%
Outcome	Overall client satisfaction (ratings of satisfied plus highly satisfied)	SPSS database	80%	88%	80%	94%	80%	94%	80%	94%

FY 2012 Request

In FY 2012, the D.C. Courts request \$2,849,000 for the Multi-Door Dispute Resolution Division, an increase of \$325,000 (13%) above the FY 2010 Enacted Budget. New FY 2012 request consists of \$161,000 for one FTE to assist with leadership in the division and \$89,000 for built-in cost increases (see Table 5).

Deputy Director (JS-15), \$161,000

Introduction. To meet divisional objectives to promote high standards of ADR practice and maintain a skilled and diverse neutral panel to assist in the resolution of disputes, a senior management position is required to work on high-level planning, policy-making, and leadership in the Multi-Door Division.

Problem statement. A Deputy Director is critical to assist the director in shaping and implementing personnel policies, assist with financial management and strategic planning, program analysis and reporting, program outreach and education, creating and implementing neutral policies and procedures, and assist in improving the design of dispute resolution systems throughout the court. This position is necessary to assist the division director in workforce planning and reorganization and the creation and implementation of new policies and procedures to manage the expansion of services that the Multi-Door Division provides to the court and the citizens of the District of Columbia.

The Multi-Door Division manages and supervises 20 full time professional staff, three full time mediators from the family division, six contractual part time dispute resolution specialists, and 300 volunteer neutrals. The Division Director works closely with the Civil, Family, and Probate Divisions of the Superior Court, designing dispute systems in order to provide alternative dispute resolution services to over 6,000 cases per year. In addition, the Multi-Door Division has a full operating branch devoted to the education and training of over 300 neutrals through annual evaluations, supervision and training. The Division Director also works with divisions within Court Systems, which includes information technology, security, capital projects, procurement, and budget and finance. The division has an active international and national visitors program providing presentations, mediation observations and training to judges and lawyers from around the world.

The Multi-Door Division is currently without high-level senior staff to assist the director and to serve as Acting Director in her absence. The management positions that exist in the division, two branch chiefs and a training manager, do not possess the necessary level of knowledge, skills and abilities. Branch Chief duties are primarily limited to the day-to-day operation of their respective branches, and the training manager is responsible for curriculum design and training delivery. Because of the consistently high demand for mediation services across the court, the Multi-Door Division is requesting a full-time Deputy Director position be created within the Multi-Door Division.

Relationship to Court Mission, Vision, and Strategic Goals. The need for a full-time Deputy Director relates directly to the Courts' Strategic Issue 1: Fair and Timely Case Resolution, particularly Goal 1.2 to resolve cases promptly and efficiently. This request for a deputy director broadly supports Strategy 1.2.1, to use alternative dispute resolution and best practices to manage cases.

Relationship to Divisional Objectives. This position is essential to the success of the Division's strategic objective to promote high standards of ADR practice and maintain a skilled and diverse neutral panel to assist in the resolution of disputes. The position will assist with cross-divisional and court-wide initiatives.

Relationship to Existing Funding. The Division controls no excess personnel funding for this position.

Methodology. The position is graded at a grade 15 based on the Courts' classification policies for comparable staff positions.

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

Performance Indicators. Success of the position will be measured through the employee's performance plan, which will include a high level of personnel management, financial responsibilities and the development and implementation of ADR practices and procedures.

Table 5
MULTI-DOOR DISPUTE RESOLUTION DIVISION
New Position Requested

Position	Grade	Number	Annual Salary	Benefits	Total Personnel Costs
Deputy Director	15	1	128,000	33,000	\$161,000

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

	FY 2010 Enacted	FY 2011 Annualized CR	FY 2012 Request	Difference FY 2010/FY 2012
11 - Personnel Compensation	1,607,000	1,607,000	1,839,000	232,000
12 - Personnel Benefits	403,000	403,000	469,000	66,000
Subtotal Personnel Cost	2,010,000	2,010,000	2,308,000	298,000
21 - Travel, Transp. of Persons	0	0	0	0
22 - Transportation of Things	0	0	0	0
23 - Rent, Commun. & Utilities	0	0	0	0
24 - Printing & Reproduction	0	0	0	0
25 - Other Services	500,000	500,000	523,000	23,000
26 - Supplies & Materials	8,000	8,000	10,000	2,000
31 - Equipment	6,000	6,000	8,000	2,000
Subtotal Non-Personnel Cost	514,000	514,000	541,000	27,000
TOTAL	2,524,000	2,524,000	2,849,000	325,000
FTE	20	20	22	2

Table 7
MULTI-DOOR DISPUTE RESOLUTION DIVISION
Detail Difference, FY 2010/2012

Object Class	Description of Request	FTE	Cost	Difference FY 2010/2012
11 – Personnel Compensation	Current Positions WIG		49,000	
	Civil ADR Case Mgr (FY11 Pres Rec)	1	55,000	
	Deputy Director	1	128,000	
Subtotal 11				232,000
12 – Personnel Benefits	Current Positions WIG		13,000	
	Civil ADR Case Mgr (FY11 Pres Rec)	1	20,000	
	Deputy Director	1	33,000	
Subtotal 12				66,000
21 - Travel, Transp. of Persons				
22 - Transportation of Things				
23 - Rent, Commun. & Utilities				
24 - Printing & Reproduction				
25 - Other Service	Built-in			23,000
26 - Supplies & Materials	Built-in			2,000
31 - Equipment	Built-in			2,000
Total				325,000

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

Grade	FY 2010 Enacted	FY 2011 Annualized CR	FY 2012 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			1
CES	1	1	1
Total Salaries	1,607,000	1,607,000	1,839,000
Total FTEs	20	20	22

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

<u>FY 2010 Enacted</u>		<u>FY 2011 Annualized CR</u>		<u>FY 2012 Request</u>		<u>Difference FY 2010/2012</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	388,000	3	388,000	4	488,000	1	100,000

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 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 four FTEs: the Auditor-Master, the Attorney Advisor to the Auditor-Master, an Accountant, and an Administrative Assistant.

Divisional MAP Objective

In accordance with the Time to Disposition Standards effective October 1, 2009, the Office of the Auditor-Master established and met completion standards for FY 2009, and projects that the completion standards established for FY 2010 will also be met as reflected in the chart below. The Office of the Auditor-Master has established even tighter standards for FY 2011 and FY 2012 in an aggressive effort to assist the Court in meeting its Time to Disposition Standards.

Workload Data

Table 1
FY 2009 Caseload Overview

Case Activity Fiscal Year 2009			Cases Pending Fiscal Year 2009		
Dispositions	Cases Referred	Clearance Rate	1 Oct	30 Sep	Change
37	29	128%	18	10	-44%

Table 2
Projected FY 2010 Caseload Overview

Case Activity Fiscal Year 2010			Cases Pending Fiscal Year 2010		
Dispositions	Cases Referred	Clearance Rate	1 Oct	30 Sep	Change
33	30	110%	10	7	-30%

FY 2010 Projected Statistics are a combination of actual figures to date and projected completion rates through the end of the fiscal year.

Key Performance Indicators

Table 3
**OFFICE OF THE AUDITOR-MASTER
Key Performance Indicators**

Type of Indicator	Key Performance Indicator	Data Source	FY 2009		FY 2010		FY 2011		FY 2012	
			Goal	Actual	Goal	Projected	Goal	Estimate	Goal	Estimate
Output	Percentage of cases completed within nine months	Monthly Reports	45%	82%	55%	82%	75%	83%	80%	85%
Output	Percentage of cases completed within 12 months	Monthly Reports	70%	85%	70%	94%	80%	85%	85%	90%
Output	Percentage of cases completed within 18 months	Monthly Reports	90%	94%	90%	97%	90%	95%	90%	95%

FY 2012 Request

In FY 2012, the Courts request \$488,000 for the Office of the Auditor-Master, an increase of \$100,000 (26%) above the FY 2010 Enacted Budget. New FY 2012 request consists entirely of built-in increases (see Table 5).

Table 4
OFFICE OF THE AUDITOR-MASTER
Budget Authority by Object Class

	FY 2010 Enacted	FY 2011 Annualized CR	FY 2012 Request	Difference FY 2010/2012
11 – Compensation	295,000	295,000	370,000	75,000
12 – Benefits	74,000	74,000	93,000	19,000
<i>Subtotal Personnel Cost</i>	369,000	369,000	463,000	94,000
21 - Travel, Transp. of Persons	0	0	0	0
22 - Transportation of Things	0	0	0	0
23 - Rent, Commun. & Utilities	0	0	0	0
24 - Printing & Reproduction	0	0	0	0
25 - Other Services	4,000	4,000	6,000	2,000
26 - Supplies & Materials	4,000	4,000	6,000	2,000
31 – Equipment	11,000	11,000	13,000	2,000
<i>Subtotal Non-Personnel Cost</i>	19,000	19,000	25,000	6,000
TOTAL	388,000	388,000	488,000	100,000
FTE	3	3	4	1

Table 5
OFFICE OF THE AUDITOR-MASTER
Detail Difference, FY 2010/2012

Object Class	Description of Request	FTE	Cost	Difference FY 2010/2012
11- Personnel Compensation	Current Positions WIG		9,000	
	Accountant (FY11 Pres. Rec.)	1	66,000	
<i>Subtotal 11</i>				75,000
12- Personnel Benefits	Current Positions WIG		2,000	
	Accountant (FY11 Pres. Rec.)	1	17,000	
<i>Subtotal 12</i>				19,000
21 – Travel, Transp. of Persons				
22 – Transportation of Things				
23 – Rent, Commun & Utilities				
24 – Printing & Reproduction				
25 – Other Service	Built-in			2,000
26 – Supplies & Materials	Built-in			2,000
31 - Equipment	Built-in			2,000
Total				100,000

Table 6
OFFICE OF THE AUDITOR-MASTER
Detail of Full-Time Equivalent Employment

Grade	FY 2010 Enacted	FY 2011 Annualized CR	FY 2012 Request
JS-3			
JS-4			
JS-5			
JS-6			
JS-7			
JS-8			
JS-9			
JS-10	1	1	1
JS-11			1
JS-12			
JS-13	1	1	1
JS-14			
JS-15			
CES	1	1	1
Total Salaries	295,000	295,000	370,000
Total FTEs	3	3	4

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

<u>FY 2010 Enacted</u>		<u>FY 2011</u>		<u>FY 2012 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>
48	4,932,000	48	4,932,000	49	5,170,000	1	238,000

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, guardianships of mentally challenged adults, minors and certain trusts; to audit fiduciary accounts to ensure that the funds of disabled persons and other persons under court supervision are handled properly; and to make recommendations to judges on all ex parte filings in matters over which the Superior Court has probate jurisdiction.

Introduction

The Probate Division/Office of the Register of Wills has jurisdiction over decedents' estates, trusts, guardianships of minors' estates, guardianships of mentally challenged adults, and guardianships and conservatorships of adults otherwise incapacitated. Due to the aging of the baby-boomer generation, the work of the Division will only increase over the next decade, as more adults become incapacitated and need court-appointed fiduciaries to handle their personal, medical and financial affairs and as more decedents' estates are opened.

The duties of the Division include processing requests to open a decedent's estate, requests to open a small estate when the assets are less than \$40,000, requests to establish a guardianship for a minor's estate, 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 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, the administration of a decedent's estate 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 FY2009, the Division went public – providing public access via the Court webpage to docket information concerning wills, disclaimers and major litigation in the Probate Division, in addition to the website access provided beginning in FY2008 to dockets of large and small estates and foreign estates.

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 Guardianship Assistance Program, for a total of 3 FTEs.
- The Probate Clerk's Office is the operational center of the Probate Division and the primary point of contact for the public. This office has 8 FTEs, consisting of a supervisor and seven deputy clerks, one of whom is bilingual. All of the deputy clerks have been cross trained to handle the cashier functions of this office.
- The Quality Assurance Office also has 8 FTEs, and 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.
- The Legal Branch also has 8 FTEs, and is headed by the Deputy Register of Wills. There are three attorneys, one legal assistant to the Branch Manager, two small estate specialists/paralegals, and one deputy clerk. The primary duties of the attorneys are to review pleadings and prepare recommendations to the judges on uncontested matters, represent the office in hearings before the Court, 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' estates and trusts under court supervision, examines requests for compensation, prepares audit reports, informs attorneys and fiduciaries on accounting procedures, monitors the filing of inventories, accounts and receipts, and conducts appraisals of tangible property. This branch has 18 FTEs, consisting of a branch manager, a supervisory auditor, thirteen auditors, one appraiser, and two deputy clerks.
- The Probate Systems Office has three FTEs and is responsible for all systems of the Probate Division, including CourtView, Remote Public Access to Probate Division dockets and the Computers in the Courtroom pilot project. The Probate Systems Office maintains the file room and original wills stored on site and arranges for the retrieval of off-site records as needed. This office consists of the Probate Systems Administrator, one deputy clerk and one records clerk.

Divisional MAP Objectives

The Probate Division 2011 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 the Probate Division's docket for large and small estates by remote public access.

Objective 3. Ensure continuity of operations and protect the Probate Division's vital records in the event of an emergency or disaster.

Divisional Restructuring and/or Work Process Redesign

During FY2009, the Probate Division:

- Prepared a detailed Continuity of Operations Plan (COOP) for emergency planning;
- Provided on-line web access to the Probate Division court rules and to dockets and upcoming scheduled events for large and small estates, foreign estates, wills, disclaimers and major litigation cases;
- Created, beginning January 1, 2009, the LIT case type for major litigation in the Probate Division, designed to promote prompt resolution of contested cases while improving party maintenance and promoting the continued monitoring of necessary filings while litigation is pending;
- Expanded the Guardianship Assistance Program, a partnership between the Court and the social work departments of local universities to provide enhanced services to those incapacitated adults who are under Court supervision, which hosted the first ever Guardianship Conference to provide information to family members and attorneys serving as guardians for incapacitated adults;
- Completed the purchase of will safes for all wills secured on site at the Probate Division to ensure their safety and implemented a new project to create a digitalized data base of all wills filed in the District of Columbia since 1801;
- Prepared a series of publications to assist members of the public, including "After Death", a publication explaining the probate process in the District of Columbia, "Now That You're a Guardian", a publication to assist guardians of disabled adults, "Now That You're a Conservator", a publication to assist persons handling the financial affairs of disabled adults, an updated Inventory and Accounting Guide and publications on filing court petitions to open large and small estates, foreign estates, guardianships of the estates of minors, and adult guardianships and conservatorships; and
- Completed the major reorganization of the Probate Division to provide improved customer service.

Workload Data

As shown in Table 1, below, the Probate Division disposed of 2,929 cases during FY 2009, a clearance rate of 104% overall for the fiscal year. Efforts continue to close out aged large estate cases and to promptly resolve small estate cases. There has been an increase in the number of cases filed involving incapacitated adults, which remain open until the ward dies, recovers or is transferred to the care of another jurisdiction.

Table 1
Caseload and Efficiency Measures
(Fiscal Year 2009 Data)

	Cases Filed	Cases Disposed	Clearance Rate*	Cases Pending		
				1-Oct	30-Sept	Change
Old Law Conservatorship	0	19	**	116	97	-16%
Foreign Proceedings	119	144	121%	161	136	-16%
Decedent's Estate	1,602	1,724	108%	4,395	4,273	-3%
Guardianships of Minors	34	89	262%	375	320	-15%
Adult Guardianships/Conservatorships	391	253	65%	1,703	1,841	+8%
Small Estates	657	679	103%	83	61	-27%
Trusts	24	21	88%	114	117	+3%
Total	2,827	2,929	104%	6,947	6,845	-1%
* Ratio of cases disposed to cases filed in a given year. A standard efficiency measure is 100%, meaning one case disposed for each case filed.						
** Ratio of cases disposed to cases pending as of 9/30/07 for this case type. There are no new cases of this type due to enactment of the Guardianship Protective Proceedings and Durable Power of Attorney Act of 1989. Disabled persons are now included in the Adult Guardianships/Conservatorships category.						

Key Performance Indicators

Table 2
PROBATE DIVISION
Key Performance Indicators

Performance Indicator: Time Standard from Filing to Disposition	Data Source	FY 2009		FY 2010		FY 2011		FY 2012	
		Goal	Actual	Goal	Actual	Goal	Estimate	Goal	Estimate
Small estates: within 120 days	Monthly Report	95%	94%	95%	98%	95%	95%	95%	95%
Requests for compensation from Guardianship Fund and without account: within 30 days	Monthly Reports	95%	99%	95%	99%	95%	98%	95%	98%
Submit accounts to Court for approval or schedule hearing on approval within 90 days of filing, absent summary hearings and objections, or Court approved time extension on requirements.	Monthly Reports	95%	96%	95%	97%	95%	95%	95%	95%
Uncontested petitions within 30 days	Monthly Report	95%	96%	95%	98%	95%	95%	95%	95%
Supervised decedents' estates within 37 months	Monthly Reports	95%	*	95%	*	95%	20%	95%	25%
Unsupervised decedents' estates within 37 months	Monthly Reports	95%	*	95%	*	95%	95%	95%	95%
*As this indicator is based upon data beginning March 2008, the 37 month time standards marked with an asterisk have not yet elapsed									

FY 2012 Request

In FY 2012, the Courts request \$5,170,000 for the Probate Division, an increase of \$238,000 (5%) above the FY 2010 Enacted Budget. New FY 2012 request consists entirely of built-in increases (see Table 5).

Table 3
PROBATE DIVISION
Budget Authority by Object Class

	FY 2010 Enacted	FY 2011 Annualized CR	FY 2012 Request	Difference FY 2010/2012
11 - Personnel Compensation	3,926,000	3,926,000	4,112,000	186,000
12 - Personnel Benefits	982,000	982,000	1,030,000	48,000
<i>Subtotal Personnel Cost</i>	4,908,000	4,908,000	5,142,000	234,000
21 - Travel, Transp. of Persons	0	0	0	0
22 - Transportation of Things	0	0	0	0
23 - Rent, Commun. & Utilities	0	0	0	0
24 - Printing & Reproduction	0	0	0	0
25 - Other Services	0	0	0	0
26 - Supplies & Materials	13,000	13,000	15,000	2,000
31 - Equipment	11,000	11,000	13,000	2,000
<i>Subtotal Non-Personnel Cost</i>	24,000	24,000	28,000	4,000
TOTAL	4,932,000	4,932,000	5,170,000	238,000
FTE	48	48	49	1

Table 4
PROBATE DIVISION
Detail Difference, FY 2010/2012

Object Class	Description of Request	FTE	Cost	Difference FY 2010/2012
11 - Personnel Compensation	Current Positions WIG		120,000	
	Deputy Prog Mgr (FY11 Pres Rec)	1	66,000	
<i>Subtotal 11</i>				186,000
12 - Personnel Benefits	Current Positions WIG		31,000	
	Deputy Prog Mgr (FY11 Pres Rec)	1	17,000	
<i>Subtotal 12</i>				48,000
21 - Travel, Transp. of Persons				
22 - Transportation of Things				
23 - Rent, Commun. & Utilities				
24 - Printing & Reproduction				
25 - Other Service				
26 - Supplies & Materials	Built-in			2,000
31 - Equipment	Built-in			2,000
Total				238,000

Table 5
PROBATE DIVISION
Detail of Full Time Equivalent Employment

Grade	FY 2010 Enacted	FY 2011 Annualized CR	FY 2012 Request
JS-3			
JS-4			
JS-5	1	1	1
JS-6	6	6	5
JS-7	5	5	8
JS-8	4	4	4
JS-9	2	2	
JS-10	2	2	2
JS-11	4	4	5
JS-12	16	16	16
JS-13	5	5	5
JS-14	1	1	1
JS-15	1	1	1
CES	1	1	1
Total Salaries	3,926,000	3,926,000	4,112,000
Total FTEs	48	48	49

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

<u>FY 2010 Enacted</u>		<u>FY 2011 Annualized CR</u>		<u>FY 2012 Request</u>		<u>Difference FY 2010/2012</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	3,467,000	29	3,467,000	31	4,314,000	2	847,000

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 (6 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 (3 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 that 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.

To encourage citizens to report when summoned for jury duty, the **Jurors' Office** is conducting regularly scheduled hearings for those who fail to report on their designated dates. A number of bench warrants have been issued and carried out on jurors who fail to report for the hearings. These jurors were arrested, brought before the Chief Judge, issued fines, and given new dates to report. Procedures are also being developed to bring in citizens who do not respond to the juror summons. These procedures will help to increase the number of jurors reporting for service (i.e. juror yield).

The Court, in an ongoing effort to enhance jury service and improve customer satisfaction, now offers WIFI access to jurors in the Juror Business Center as well as the Jurors' Lounge. The Jurors' Office is continually updating the content of its website to include more relevant information on the jury service experience. Also, improvements have been made to enhance the functionality of the e-Juror Services portion of the website. This enhanced functionality has resulted in a corresponding increase in positive responses to online e-Juror customer service surveys. An electronic Juror-Help mail box has been set up to handle online juror inquiries, requests for assistance with the juror summons, as well as requests for special accommodations from jurors with disabilities. The new automated jury management system, which is already in use in a number of state courts across the nation, produces reports on jury-related statistics such as jury yield and utilization.

The **Tax Division** has enhanced service to the public by implementing Electronic Filing of all pleadings except for the initial petition. The Tax Office is reporting statistics through performance standard reports. The next objective for the Tax Office is to expedite the case management process by receipting fees for tax filings in the office.

The **Office of Court Interpreting Services (OCIS)**, to enhance the timely availability of foreign and sign language interpreters for court proceedings, collaborates with the operating divisions on procedures that identify cases requiring interpreting services early so that they can prioritize the

scheduling of these cases. The Office has also completed the development of training modules for courtroom clerks, law clerks, judges, and frontline staff in connection with the use of interpreters.

To enhance service to the public, the **Child Care Center** staff worked with IT in 2009-2010 to implement a computerized registration system that has reduced the amount of time customers have to spend on the registration process after their first visit. Phase I of the process involved designing the registration and enrollment documents, testing the model and putting the model into production mode. Clients still are able to print forms from the Internet; however, the information has to be entered into the system. Staff enters the information from the hard copy and provides the printed registration and enrollment forms when the customer returns to pick up children for lunch. Phase I will be completed with the installation of an additional computer that will reduce liability presented by children entering in the center prior to being registered. In Phase II the plan is to link the system to CourtView so judges' staff can check whether children have been enrolled in the Child Care Center on a given day.

Additionally, the Child Care Center has updated the Frequently Asked Questions (FAQs) posted on the Courts' website. The Child Care Center is also working toward developing a "virtual tour" of the Child Care Center to give potential customers a visual image prior to arriving at the Center.

To enhance service to the public, the Child Care Center continues to conduct role-play trainings on good customer service practices. Training has also focused on curriculum development, child development, and handling special situations and children. More employees have been encouraged to take first aid and cardiopulmonary resuscitation (CPR) training. Also in compliance with guidelines for child care centers in high risk zones for terrorism, the Center is storing provisions in case of a "shelter-in-place" emergency.

The **Appeals Coordinator's Office** is working with Information Technology to complete its computer system so that staff can manage the workflow of all appeal cases from time of receipt to final disposition by the D.C. Court of Appeals. Also, the system will eventually generate management reports for the office. The "A Self-Help Guide for Filing Your Notice of Appeal" guide is now available in Spanish and on the Internet.

Workload Data

In FY 2009, the Special Operations Division's Jurors' Office sent 229,376 summonses to District of Columbia citizens to appear on juries; the Office of Court Interpreting Services received and fulfilled over 10,610 requests for courtroom interpreting services; the Tax Division heard and disposed of 177 tax petitions; and the Appeals Coordinators' Office received 1,248 new appeals that were filed in various division offices. This office also certified 2,108 appeal records and supplemental records that were forwarded to the Court of Appeals. In 2009, 1,263 children used the Child Care Center. Tables 1 through 5 provide performance data for the Jurors' Office, the Office of Court Interpreting Services, the Tax Division, the Appeals Coordinators Office, and the Library respectively.

Table 1
SPECIAL OPERATIONS DIVISION
Jurors' Office
Key Performance Indicators

Type of Indicator	Key Performance Indicator	Data Source	FY 2009		FY 2010		FY 2011		FY 2012	
			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	258,000	229,376	256,000	266,595	254,000	261,264	252,000	256,039
Output/Activity	Jurors qualified to serve on <i>voir dire</i> panels	IT Division	62,000	61,948	64,000	60,710	65,000	59,496	66,000	58,306
Outcome	Judicial requests for <i>voir dire</i> panels met	Court's R & D Division	82%	84%	84%	86%	86%	88%	88%	90%
Outcome	Jury Yield	IT Division	22%	20%	24%	28%	26%	30%	28%	32%

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

Type of Indicator	Performance Indicator	Data Source	FY 2009		FY 2010		FY 2011		FY 2012	
			Goal	Actual	Goal	Projection	Goal	Projection	Goal	Projection
Input	Requests for interpreters	OCIS statistics	8,480	8,463	10,133	9,728	12,109	11,625	14,470	13,891
End Outcome	Requests for interpreters met	OCIS statistics	100%	96%	100%	96%	100%	96%	100%	96%

Table 3
SPECIAL OPERATIONS DIVISION
Tax Division
Key Performance Indicators

Type of Indicator	Performance Indicator	Data Source	FY 2009		FY 2010		FY 2011		FY 2012	
			Goal	Actual	Goal	Projection	Goal	Projection	Goal	Projection
Input	Number of tax petitions filed	Court data	500	438	550	550	600	600	650	630
Output/Activity	Number of cases prepared for hearing	Court data	450	480	400	500	350	520	300	550
End Outcome	Cases disposed	Court data	200	177	225	200	250	230	300	250
Productivity/Efficiency	Cases disposed/cases filed	Court data	40%	22%	41%	28%	42%	27%	46%	26%

Table 4
SPECIAL OPERATIONS DIVISION
Appeals Coordinator's Office
Key Performance Indicators

Type of Indicator	Key Performance Indicator	Data Source	FY 2009		FY 2010		FY 2011		FY 2012	
			Goal	Actual	Goal	Projection	Goal	Projection	Goal	Projection
Input	Appeals received	Monthly statistical reports	1,020	1,248	1,140	1,140	1,150	1,150	1,160	1,160
Output/Activity	Appeal documents to the Court of Appeals within 60 days	Transcript lists, weekly worksheets, and team lists	75%	73%	85%	96%	87%	98%	90%	98%
End Outcome	Records available for pick-up by the Court of Appeals	Court of Appeals pick-up log	98%	98%	98%	98%	98%	98%	98%	98%

Table 5
SPECIAL OPERATIONS DIVISION
Library
Key Performance Indicators

Type of Indicator	Performance Indicator	Data Source	FY 2009		FY 2010		FY 2011		FY 2012	
			Goal	Actual	Goal	Projection	Goal	Projection	Goal	Projection
Output	Volumes held	Library Staff Data	24,000	23,600	24,500	23,900	25,000	24,100	25,000	24,500
Outcome	Users	Library Staff Data	10,750	9,337	9,772	9,772	10,292	10,292	10,850	10,850

FY 2012 Request

In FY 2012, the Courts request \$4,314,000 for the Special Operations Division, an increase of \$847,000 (24%) above the FY 2010 Enacted Budget. New FY 2012 request consists of \$103,000 to update legal reference materials in the judges’ chambers, \$500,000 to meet increased demand for court interpreters, and \$126,000 for built-in cost increases (see Table 5).

Updating Judges’ Chambers Reference Materials, \$103,000

Problem Statement. To meet judicial chambers’ requirements for up-to-date legal reference materials, whose costs increase much faster than inflation, additional resources are necessary. The library maintains certain law books and legal reference materials that judges use on a frequent or daily basis in judges’ chambers or in courtrooms. These materials must be up-to-date so that judges have current and accurate information on which to base decisions. The price of books increases about 15% per annum, much higher than the standard inflationary factor included in the Courts’ annual budget (usually 1% to 2%).

Relationship to the Courts’ Strategic Issues, Goals, or Strategies. This request supports Strategic Issue 1, Fair and Timely Case Resolution, and Goal 1.2, that the D.C. Courts will resolve cases promptly and efficiently. In particular, it supports Strategy 1.2.3, to provide accurate and timely information to judicial officers, court personnel, and other court participants. Providing timely and accurate information to judges is obviously a critical matter, and the library takes it very seriously.

Relationship to Division MAP Objectives. This request supports the Special Operations Division [Library] Management Action Plan objective of “Maintaining the judges’ chambers’ collection up to date.”

Relationship to Existing Funding. Current funding in the division is insufficient to support this objective due to the high rate of inflation for books.

Methodology. The Superior Court Library supports 111 judicial officers, including associate judges, senior judges, and magistrate judges, who require legal reference materials. The requested amount is based on the estimated FY 2012 cost of the materials for each judicial chambers.

Performance Indicators. The requested funds will permit the Division to meet its MAP objective of maintaining the judges' chambers' collection up to date.

Increase in Court Interpreters - \$500,000

Problem Statement. To meet Federal law and the increasing demand for the foreign language and sign language interpreters who enable all members of the public to participate fully in court proceedings, thereby facilitating access to justice, the Courts require additional resources for contractual court interpreters. The first eight months of FY 2010 saw a 24% increase in court interpreter costs over the same period in FY 2009.

The Justice Department has recently interpreted Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, 42 U.S.C. § 2000d to require institutions receiving federal funds to provide interpreters for all limited English proficient (LEP) persons, regardless of their ability to pay. The Federal guidance regarding such services states that "at a minimum, every effort should be taken to ensure competent interpretation for LEP individuals during all hearings, trials, and motions during which the LEP individual must and/or may be present." 67 Fed. Reg. at 41455, 41471 (June 18, 2002). An August 2010 letter from the Department of Justice made it clear that court systems that receive federal financial assistance (1) must provide interpreters for all court proceedings, (2) may not assess interpreter costs to a litigant, (3) must provide interpreters in court offices, and (4) must ensure that LEP parties can communicate effectively with court-appointed personnel. These requirements greatly expand the services to be provided by the Superior Court beyond both criminal proceedings and for those unable to pay, and will require the hiring of additional qualified foreign language interpreters.

Furthermore, to enhance access to justice to LEP persons, the Courts are translating official documents into several of the most frequently-requested languages (in addition to Spanish, in which many forms and documents are already available). These translations have required additional contract interpreters and translators.

The Courts also need at least one contractor each day for American Sign Language and American Sign Language-Relay events to ensure court access for deaf and hard-of-hearing persons. Sign language interpreters are needed for jurors several times a week.

Relationship to Court Mission and Strategic Goals. Increasing the number of interpreters available will ensure that the Court provides adequate, high-quality interpreting and translation services for non-English-speaking, deaf, and hard-of-hearing persons interacting in the court system, thereby supporting the Courts' Strategic Goal 2.1 of promoting access to justice for all persons.

Relationship to Division MAP Objectives. This request would support the Division's MAP objective to ensure access to court proceedings by non-English-speaking and deaf and hearing-impaired persons by providing foreign and sign language interpreters within ten minutes of receipt of a "ready" request from a courtroom at least 95% of the time.

Methodology. It is anticipated that interpreter expenses will increase by approximately 25% each year, resulting in a cost increase of \$500,000 for FY 2012.

Expenditure Plan. Interpreters would be contracted and compensated in accordance with the D.C. Courts' Procurement Policies.

Performance Indicators. With the increased funding, the Court will be able to continue to meet its goal of satisfying 100% of requests for interpreters, despite the increased demand for interpreters. The Division is currently surpassing its goal of providing an interpreter within ten minutes of receipt of a "ready" request from a courtroom 95% of the time for previously scheduled events. Without an increase in the number of interpreters provided, the Division projects a decline in performance, as fewer interpreters will be available to meet the needs of the Court.

Table 6
SPECIAL OPERATIONS DIVISION
Budget Authority by Object Class

	FY 2010 Enacted	FY 2011 Annualized CR	FY 2012 Request	Difference FY 2010/2012
11 – Personnel Compensation	1,983,000	1,983,000	2,139,000	156,000
12 – Personnel Benefits	497,000	497,000	538,000	41,000
<i>Subtotal Personnel Cost</i>	<i>2,480,000</i>	<i>2,480,000</i>	<i>2,677,000</i>	<i>197,000</i>
21 - Travel, Transp. of Persons	0	0	0	0
22 - Transportation of Things	0	0	0	0
23 - Rent, Commun. & Utilities	0	0	0	0
24 - Printing & Reproduction	146,000	146,000	153,000	7,000
25 - Other Services	600,000	600,000	1,127,000	527,000
26 - Supplies & Materials	233,000	233,000	347,000	114,000
31 - Equipment	8,000	8,000	10,000	2,000
<i>Subtotal Non-Personnel Cost</i>	<i>987,000</i>	<i>987,000</i>	<i>1,637,000</i>	<i>650,000</i>
TOTAL	3,467,000	3,467,000	4,314,000	847,000
FTE	29	29	31	2

Table 7
SPECIAL OPERATIONS DIVISION
Detail Difference, FY 2010/2012

Object Class	Description of Request	FTE	Cost	Difference FY 2010/2012
11 - Personnel Compensation	Current Positions WIG		62,000	
	Deputy Clerk (FY11 Pres. Rec.)	1	40,000	
	Court Clerk (FY11 Pres. Rec.)	1	54,000	
<i>Subtotal 11</i>				<i>156,000</i>
12 - Personnel Benefits	Current Positions WIG		17,000	
	Deputy Clerk (FY11 Pres. Rec.)	1	10,000	
	Court Clerk (FY11 Pres. Rec.)	1	14,000	
<i>Subtotal 12</i>				<i>41,000</i>
21 - Travel, Transp. of Persons				
22 - Transportation of Things				
23 - Rent, Commun. & Utilities				
24 - Printing and Reproduction	Built-in			7,000
25 - Other Services	Built-in		27,000	
	Interpreter increase		500,000	
<i>Subtotal 25</i>				<i>527,000</i>
26 - Supplies & Materials	Built-in		11,000	
	Books for Judges' Chambers		103,000	
<i>Subtotal 26</i>				<i>114,000</i>
31 - Equipment	Built-in			2,000
Total				847,000

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

Grade	FY 2010 Enacted	FY 2011 Annualized CR	FY 2012 Request
JS-4			
JS-5			
JS-6	3	3	4
JS-7	6	6	6
JS-8	3	3	3
JS-9	5	5	6
JS-10	1	1	1
JS-11	2	2	2
JS-12	5	5	5
JS-13	3	3	3
JS-14			
JS-15			
CES	1	1	1
Total Salaries	1,983,000	1,983,000	2,139,000
Total FTEs	29	29	31

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

<u>FY 2010 Enacted</u>		<u>FY 2011 Annualized CR</u>		<u>FY 2012 Request</u>		<u>Difference FY 2010/2012</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>
0	10,432,000	0	10,432,000	0	9,210,000	0	(1,222,000)

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 2012 Request

In FY 2012, the Courts request \$9,210,000 for the Management Account, which includes a decrease of \$1,222,000 (-12%) from the FY 2010 Enacted Budget. The request includes a \$1,600,000 reduction from a non-recurring item in FY 2010 and \$378,000 for built-in cost increases.

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

	FY 2010 Enacted	FY 2011 Annualized CR	FY 2012 Request	Difference FY 2010/2012
11 - Personnel Compensation	142,000	142,000	150,000	8,000
12 - Personnel Benefits	4,000	4,000	7,000	3,000
<i>Subtotal Personnel Cost</i>	<i>146,000</i>	<i>146,000</i>	<i>157,000</i>	<i>11,000</i>
21 - Travel, Transp. of Persons	449,000	449,000	467,000	18,000
22 - Transportation of Things	11,000	11,000	13,000	2,000
23 - Rent, Commun. & Utilities	2,826,000	2,826,000	2,941,000	115,000
24 - Printing & Reproduction	308,000	308,000	323,000	15,000
25 - Other Services	6,059,000	6,059,000	4,647,000	-1,412,000
26 - Supplies & Materials	439,000	439,000	459,000	20,000
31 - Equipment	194,000	194,000	203,000	9,000
<i>Subtotal Non-Personnel Cost</i>	<i>10,286,000</i>	<i>10,286,000</i>	<i>9,053,000</i>	<i>-1,233,000</i>
TOTAL	10,432,000	10,432,000	9,210,000	-1,222,000
FTE	0	0	0	0

Table 2
MANAGEMENT ACCOUNT
Detail Difference, FY 2010/2012

Object Class	Description of Request	FTE	Cost	Difference FY 2010/2012
11 - Personnel Compensation	Built-in			8,000
12 - Personnel Benefits	Built-in			3,000
21 - Travel, Transp. of Persons	Built-in			18,000
22 - Transportation of Things	Built-in			2,000
23 - Rent, Commun. & Utilities	Built-in			115,000
24 - Printing & Reproduction	Built-in			15,000
25 - Other Service	Built-in		188,000	
	Non-recurring item		-1,600,000	
<i>Subtotal 25</i>				<i>-1,412,000</i>
26 - Supplies & Materials	Built-in			20,000
31 - Equipment	Built-in			9,000
Total				-1,222,000