

SUPERIOR COURT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Overview

<u>FY 2011 Enacted</u>		<u>FY 2012 Enacted</u>		<u>FY 2013 Request</u>		<u>Difference FY 2012/2013</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>
944	108,307,000	947	114,209,000	947	114,988,000	0	779,000

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 2010, 103,871 new cases were filed with the Superior Court. Of the total new filings, 53% were civil cases; 21% were criminal cases; 13% were family cases; 9% were domestic violence cases and the remaining 4% were probate and tax cases. In addition to new case filings, as of October 1, 2010, there were 47,977 cases pending. Tables 1 and 2 provide Superior Court caseload data.

Table 1
District of Columbia Superior Court Caseload

<u>Fiscal Year</u>	<u>New Cases</u>	<u>Start-of-Year Pending Cases</u>	<u>Total Cases</u>
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
2010	103,871	47,977	151,848

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

Table 2
District of Columbia Superior Court Efficiency Measures (Fiscal Year 2010 data)

	Cases Disposed	Cases Added	Clearance Rate*	Cases Pending		
				01-Oct	30-Sep	Change
Civil	57,892	55,219	105%	16,649	14,770	-11%
Criminal	23,227	22,365	101%	7,261	8,443	16%
Domestic Violence	9,240	8,993	103%	1,234	927	-25%
Family	15,890	13,545	117%	15,183	12,838	-15%
Probate	2,891	2,964	97%	6,845	6,918	1%
Tax	<u>266</u>	<u>785</u>	34%	<u>805</u>	<u>1,190</u>	48%
Total	109,406	103,871	105%	47,977	45,086	-6%

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

FY 2013 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.

In FY 2013, the Superior Court requests \$114,988,000 and 948 FTEs, a net increase of \$779,000 (1%) above the FY 2012 budget level. The request includes a budget reduction of \$250,000 and increases totaling \$1,029,000 to finance built-in cost increases.

Table 3
SUPERIOR COURT
Budget Authority by Object Class

	FY 2011 Enacted	FY 2012 Enacted	FY 2013 Request	Difference FY 2012/2013
11 – Compensation	74,781,000	75,765,000	76,581,000	816,000
12 – Benefits	17,449,000	17,709,000	17,922,000	213,000
Subtotal Personnel Cost	92,230,000	93,474,000	94,503,000	1,029,000
21 - Travel, Transp. of Persons	448,000	464,000	464,000	0
22 - Transportation of Things	11,000	13,000	13,000	0
23 - Rent, Commun. & Utilities	2,820,000	3,272,000	3,272,000	0
24 - Printing & Reproduction	558,000	584,000	584,000	0
25 - Other Services	10,644,000	14,714,000	14,464,000	-250,000
26 - Supplies & Materials	888,000	938,000	938,000	0
31 – Equipment	708,000	750,000	750,000	0
Subtotal Non-Personnel Cost	16,077,000	20,735,000	20,485,000	-250,000
TOTAL	108,307,000	114,209,000	114,988,000	779,000
FTE	944	947	947	0

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

<u>FY 2011 Enacted</u>		<u>FY 2012 Enacted</u>		<u>FY 2013 Request</u>		<u>Difference FY 2012/2013</u>	
<u>FTE</u>	<u>Obligations</u>	<u>FTE</u>	<u>Obligations</u>	<u>FTE</u>	<u>Obligations</u>	<u>FTE</u>	<u>Obligations</u>
204	26,306,000	204	26,400,000	204	26,525,000	0	125,000

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 2013 Request

In FY 2013, the Courts request \$26,525,000 for Judges and Chambers Staff, an increase of \$125,000 (0.5%) above the FY 2012 Enacted level. The requested increase consists entirely of built-in cost increases.

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

	FY 2011 Enacted	FY 2012 Enacted	FY 2013 Request	Difference FY 2012/2013
11 – Compensation	21,920,000	21,991,000	22,090,000	99,000
12 – Benefits	4,278,000	4,294,000	4,320,000	26,000
Subtotal Personnel Cost	26,198,000	26,285,000	26,410,000	125,000
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	7,000	9,000	9,000	0
25 - Other Services	0	0	0	0
26 - Supplies & Materials	55,000	58,000	58,000	0
31 – Equipment	46,000	48,000	48,000	0
Subtotal Non-Personnel Cost	108,000	115,000	115,000	0
TOTAL	26,306,000	26,400,000	26,525,000	125,000
FTE	204	204	204	0

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

<u>FY 2011 Enacted</u>		<u>FY 2012 Enacted</u>		<u>FY 2013 Request</u>		<u>Difference FY 2012/2013</u>	
<u>FTE</u>	<u>Obligations</u>	<u>FTE</u>	<u>Obligations</u>	<u>FTE</u>	<u>Obligations</u>	<u>FTE</u>	<u>Obligations</u>
49	6,995,000	49	7,018,000	49	7,028,000	0	10,000

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 2013 Request

In FY 2013, the Courts request \$7,028,000 for Magistrate Judges and Staff, an increase of \$10,000 (0.1%) above the FY 2012 Enacted level. The requested increase consists entirely of built-in cost increases.

Table 1
MAGISTRATE JUDGES AND STAFF
Budget Authority by Object Class

	FY 2011 Enacted	FY 2012 Enacted	FY 2013 Request	Difference FY 2012/2013
11 – Compensation	5,575,000	5,588,000	5,596,000	8,000
12 – Benefits	1,396,000	1,400,000	1,402,000	2,000
<i>Subtotal Personnel Cost</i>	<i>6,971,000</i>	<i>6,988,000</i>	<i>6,998,000</i>	<i>10,000</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	4,000	6,000	6,000	0
25 - Other Services	0	0	0	0
26 - Supplies & Materials	11,000	13,000	13,000	0
31 – Equipment	9,000	11,000	11,000	0
<i>Subtotal Non-Personnel Cost</i>	<i>24,000</i>	<i>30,000</i>	<i>30,000</i>	<i>0</i>
TOTAL	6,995,000	7,018,000	7,028,000	10,000
FTE	49	49	49	0

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

<u>FY 2011 Enacted</u>		<u>FY 2012 Enacted</u>		<u>FY 2013 Request</u>		<u>Difference FY 2012/2013</u>	
<u>FTE</u>	<u>Obligations</u>	<u>FTE</u>	<u>Obligations</u>	<u>FTE</u>	<u>Obligations</u>	<u>FTE</u>	<u>Obligations</u>
10	949,000	10	963,000	10	978,000	0	15,000

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 2013 Request

For FY 2013, the D.C. Courts request \$978,000 for the Office of the Clerk of the Court, an increase of \$15,000 (2%) above the FY 2012 enacted level. The requested increase consists entirely of built-in increases.

Table 1
CLERK OF THE COURT
Budget Authority by Object Class

	FY 2011 Enacted	FY 2012 Enacted	FY 2013 Request	Difference FY 2012/2013
11 – Compensation	781,000	789,000	801,000	12,000
12 – Benefits	158,000	160,000	163,000	3,000
<i>Subtotal Personnel Cost</i>	<i>939,000</i>	<i>949,000</i>	<i>964,000</i>	<i>15,000</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	0	0	0	0
25 - Other Services	0	0	0	0
26 - Supplies & Materials	7,000	9,000	9,000	0
31 – Equipment	3,000	5,000	5,000	0
<i>Subtotal Non-Personnel Cost</i>	<i>10,000</i>	<i>14,000</i>	<i>14,000</i>	<i>0</i>
TOTAL	949,000	963,000	978,000	15,000
FTE	10	10	10	0

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

<u>FY 2011 Enacted</u>		<u>FY 2012 Enacted</u>		<u>FY 2013 Request</u>		<u>Difference FY 2012/2013</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>
103	7,310,000	102	7,415,000	102	7,525,000	0	110,000

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 2010 there were more than 9,700 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 29 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 37,700 filings in fiscal year 2010. This branch has 20 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 2010, there were over 7,700 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;

- Partner with the Bar and community agencies to enhance services to the public;
- Provide ongoing and continuous evaluation and process improvement;
- To ensure a capable, ethical, and productive staff.

Initiatives

- Enhance case processing efficiency by collaborating with the Presiding Judge to develop a plan, including timeline and procedures, to implement a staggered calendaring system for landlord & tenant cases as well as small claims cases for implementation by the end of the year.
- Enhance job knowledge and skills of supervisory and managerial staff by developing a New Employee Guidebook for each branch and job function and incorporating them into the Division's cross-training program.
- Ensure timely case processing by performing Clerk's Office case processing activities within established time standards. Collaborate with judicial leadership to achieve established case processing standards in the areas of: Time to Disposition, Trial Date Certainty, and Age of Pending Pre-Disposition Caseload.
- Employ technology to enhance case processing efficiencies by developing a paper-on-demand plan, including timeline and procedures, for landlord and tenant and civil actions cases.
- Expand public access to justice by institutionalizing the Housing Conditions Calendar from a pilot project to a permanent calendar.

Management Action Plan (MAP) Objectives

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

- Ensure timely case processing by performing all activities within established time standards.
- Conduct periodic training to ensure judicial officers and court personnel understand the needs of persons who face potential barriers to Court access.
- 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.
- To implement data collection and reporting of court wide performance measures, applicable to the division and for division MAPS, coordinating with the Information Technology Division and the Research and Development Division to utilize best practices, facilitate court

wide report production, and ensure integrity of court wide and division-level performance data.

- Regularly review court processes and services to identify and eliminate barriers to access.
- Align the division’s staffing with the Courts’ strategic planning goals and objectives and the division’s MAPs to enhance the current and future delivery of services, and prepare for workforce changes.
- Continue a coordinated, in-house cross training program among supervisory and managerial staff that facilitates job knowledge and enhancement of skills among employees and expand knowledge by incorporating routine training in the production of “New Employee Guidebooks” in each branch.
- Review and analyze the use of a staggered calendaring system for landlord and tenant, small claims and civil actions cases.

Workload Data

As shown in Table 1 below, the Civil Division disposed of more than 57,000 cases in fiscal year 2010, including nearly 9,800 civil actions; 39,000 landlord and tenant cases; and 9,000 small claims cases. The Civil Division’s current caseload and efficiency measures are reflected in Table 1, and the key performance measures are displayed in Table 2.

Table 1
CIVIL DIVISION
Caseload and Efficiency Measures
(Fiscal Year 2010 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	9,732	9,797	101%	6,560	6,871	5%
Landlord & Tenant	37,709	39,054	103%	7,357	5,742	-22%
Small Claims	<u>7,778</u>	<u>9,041</u>	<u>116%</u>	<u>2,732</u>	<u>2,157</u>	<u>-21%</u>
Total	55,219	57,892	105%	16,649	14,770	-11%

Table 2
CIVIL DIVISION
Performance Indicators

Type of Indicator	Key Performance Indicator	Data Source	FY 2010*		FY 2011**		FY 2012		FY 2013	
			Goal	Actual	Goal	Estimate	Goal	Estimate	Goal	Estimate
Time to Disposition	General Civil II Complaints disposed within 24 months	CourtView Report	100%	99%	100%	98%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Time to Disposition	Landlord & Tenant Non-Jury cases disposed within 150 days	CourtView Report	100%	90%	100%	89%	100%	95%	100%	100%
Time to Disposition	Small Claims Non-Jury cases disposed within 12 months	CourtView Report	100%	98%	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 actual percentages are for cases filed after March 1, 2008 and disposed in FY 2010.

** Time to disposition estimated percentages are for cases filed after March 1, 2008 and disposed in FY 2011, year to date and based on historical monthly trends.

FY 2013 Request

In FY 2013, the Courts request \$7,525,000 for the Civil Division, an increase of \$110,000 (2%) above the FY 2012 enacted level. The FY 2013 request consists entirely of built-in increases.

Table 3
CIVIL DIVISION
Budget Authority by Object Class

	FY 2011 Enacted	FY 2012 Enacted	FY 2013 Request	Difference FY 2012/2013
11 – Compensation	5,794,000	5,873,000	5,960,000	87,000
12 – Benefits	1,451,000	1,471,000	1,494,000	23,000
Subtotal Personnel Cost	7,245,000	7,344,000	7,454,000	110,000
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	22,000	22,000	0
25 - Other Services	0	0	0	0
26 - Supplies & Materials	22,000	24,000	24,000	0
31 – Equipment	23,000	25,000	25,000	0
Subtotal Non-Personnel Cost	65,000	71,000	71,000	0
TOTAL	7,310,000	7,415,000	7,525,000	110,000
FTE	103	102	102	0

Table 4
CIVIL DIVISION
Detail Difference, FY 2012/2013

Object Class	Description of Request	FTE	Cost	Difference FY 2012/2013
11 - Compensation	Current Positions WIG	102		87,000
12 – Personnel Benefits	Current Positions WIG	102		23,000
21 - Travel, Transp. of Persons				
22 - Transportation of Things				
23 - Rent, Commun. & Utilities				
24 - Printing & Reproduction				
25 - Other Services				
26 - Supplies & Materials				
31 – Equipment				
TOTAL				110,000

Table 5

CIVIL DIVISION
Detail of Full-Time Equivalent Employment

Grade	FY 2011 Enacted	FY 2012 Enacted	FY 2013 Request
JS-3			
JS-4	6		1
JS-5	1		
JS-6	19	25	15
JS-7	14	14	20
JS-8	19	20	20
JS-9	22	20	22
JS-10	7	8	9
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	\$5,794,000	\$5,873,000	\$5,960,000
Total FTEs	103	102	102

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

<u>FY 2011 Enacted</u>		<u>FY 2012 Enacted</u>		<u>FY 2013 Request</u>		<u>Difference FY 2012/2013</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	805,000	7	816,000	7	827,000	0	11,000

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 2010, the Compensation Program was staffed by a Director, Accounting Officer, Administrative Assistant, three Legal Claims Examiners, two Victim Advocates, three Assistant Legal Claims Examiners, and a Deputy Clerk. There are a total of seven employees paid from the Crime Victims Compensation Program’s Superior Court 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 critically 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.
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.
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.
5. Explore demographic trends in the domestic violence population seeking temporary emergency housing and develop appropriate responses in the Crime Victims Compensation Program.

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.

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 many challenges faced by victims.

Workload Data

Table 1
CRIME VICTIMS COMPENSATION PROGRAM
Caseload Overview

	Actual FY2010	FY 2011 Estimated	% Change
New Cases Filed	3,186	3,200	0%
Determinations Made	3,346	3,100	-7%
Number of Cases Pending at End of Fiscal Year	925	1,025	+11%

Table 2
CRIME VICTIMS COMPENSATION PROGRAM
Performance Measurement Table

Type of Indicator	Performance Indicator	Data Source	FY 2010		FY 2011		FY 2012		FY 2013	
			Goal	Actual	Goal	Estimated	Goal	Projection	Goal	Projection
Input	# Of new claims filed	Case Management Software	2,950	3,186	2,950	3,200	3,200	3,200	3,200	3,200
Output	# Of claims processed	Case Management Software	2,950	3,346	3,000	3,100	3,200	3,200	3,200	3,200
Output	# Of payments	Case Management Software	15,000	14,428	8,500	¹ 8,400	8,500	8,500	8,500	8,500
Outcome	Dollar amount of payments	Case Management Software	\$9.2M	\$9.2M	\$8.7M	\$9.1M	\$9.2 M	\$9.2M	\$9.2M	\$9.2M
Outcome	Avg. claim processing time	Case Management Software	11 weeks	12 weeks	11 weeks	12 weeks	12 weeks	12 weeks	12 weeks	12 weeks

FY 2013 Request

In FY 2013, the D.C. Courts request \$827,000 for the Crime Victims Compensation Program, an increase of \$11,000 (1%) above the FY 2012 Enacted level. The requested increase consists entirely of built-in cost increases.

Table 3
CRIME VICTIMS COMPENSATION PROGRAM
Budget Authority by Object Class

	FY 2011 Enacted	FY 2012 Enacted	FY 2013 Request	Difference FY 2012/2013
11 - Personnel Compensation	621,000	625,000	634,000	9,000
12 - Personnel Benefits	161,000	162,000	164,000	2,000
Subtotal Personnel Cost	782,000	787,000	798,000	11,000
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	19,000	19,000	0
26 - Supplies & Materials	3,000	5,000	5,000	0
31 - Equipment	3,000	5,000	5,000	0
Subtotal Non-Personnel Cost	23,000	29,000	29,000	0
TOTAL	805,000	816,000	827,000	11,000
FTE	7	7	7	0

¹ During FY11 the Crime Victims Compensation Program implemented a new case management software system that does not count individual payments for food and transportation and combines payments to the same provider, which explains the sharp decrease in the number of payments.

Table 4
CRIME VICTIMS COMPENSATION PROGRAM
Detail Difference, FY 2012/2013

Object Class	Description of Request	FTE	Cost	Difference FY 2012/2013
11 - Personnel Compensation	Current Positions WIG	7		9,000
12 - Personnel Benefits	Current Positions WIG	7		2,000
21 - Travel, Transp. of Persons				
22 - Transportation of Things				
23 - Rent, Commun. & Utilities				
24 - Printing & Reproduction				
25 - Other Service				
26 - Supplies & Materials				
31 - Equipment				
Total				11,000

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

Grade	FY 2011 Enacted	FY 2012 Enacted	FY 2013 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	\$621,000	\$625,000	\$634,000
Total FTEs	7	7	7

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

<u>FY 2011 Enacted</u>		<u>FY 2012 Enacted</u>		<u>FY 2013 Request</u>		<u>Difference FY 2012/2013</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>
124	9,559,000	124	9,623,000	124	9,767,000	0	144,000

Mission Statement

The Superior Court of the District of Columbia’s Criminal Division’s mission is to provide fair and timely case processing; quality administrative and courtroom support services to judicial officers, court staff and the public; and to deliver accurate criminal case information 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.

Organizational Background

D.C. Code §11-902 establishes the court’s divisions and creates the Criminal Division. The Superior Court Rules for Criminal Procedure “provides for the just determination, secure simplicity in procedures and fairness in administration and the elimination of unjustifiable expense and delay of every criminal proceeding in the District of Columbia”.²

In addition to processing criminal cases in the District of Columbia that are not exclusively Federal, the Criminal Division analyzes and determines case assignments; prepares judicial calendars, and dockets; seeks improved services and new methods to better serve the public; recommends changes and improvements to the Criminal Rules and Procedures; automates operations and services to promote operational efficiencies; and compiles statistical and public information. The Criminal Division also promotes high standards of professional conduct.

The Criminal Division is comprised of the Director’s Office and four branches and oversees several problem-solving courts.

- 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 cases and processes motions and appeals for felony, U.S. misdemeanor, traffic, and District of Columbia cases and cases to be expunged and sealed. The branch also

² SUPERIOR COURT RULES OF CRIMINAL PROCEDURE page 1 Rule 1

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 32 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 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. This branch has 12 FTEs.

The Criminal Finance Office receipts Court ordered fines, fees, bonds, and restitution payments and processes bond refunds. This Office has 7 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 21 FTEs.
- The Criminal Division also promotes restorative and rehabilitative justice through its problem solving courts and oversees the operation of several specialized community courts which are: East of the River Community Court (ERCC), District of Columbia Misdemeanor and Traffic Community Court, Drug Court, Prostitution Court, and Mental Health Diversion Court. These specialized courts address 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 focus on therapeutic and restorative justice, with a much broader array of responses (i.e. treatment, community service, etc.) at their disposal. Community Courts seek not only to hold offenders accountable for their actions, but also to repair the harm caused to the community by the offense. 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 criminal activities by linking offenders to needed services. The Community Court has 5 FTEs.

Divisional MAP Objectives

The Criminal Division's strategic objectives for FY 2013 are as follows:

- Ensure that the Criminal Division cases are resolved in a timely manner 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 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 filings 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 on all dispositions.
- Enhance the program design, operations, management, and effectiveness of Community Courts by obtaining stakeholder and community input and evaluating program performance.
- 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 explore ways to improve services.
- Build a supportive management team to enhance employee performance and satisfaction, and to increase efficiency.

Divisional 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. Work processes are being redesigned to facilitate a change from paper records to electronic records, and only creating paper copies when demanded by the public or internal customers.

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. Additionally, the Criminal Division has developed procedures to reduce records storage costs by making the retrieval of vital archived information accessible electronically.

Workload Data

Table 1
CRIMINAL DIVISION
Caseload and Efficiency Measures

	New Filings	Pending Cases 31-Dec	Dispositions	Clearance Rate
D.C. Misdemeanor	1099	318	1,318	109%
Felony	4,502	1,946	4,923	104%
Traffic	4564	2,204	5,391	108%
U.S. Misdemeanors	<u>12,200</u>	<u>3,975</u>	<u>11,595</u>	97%
Total	22,365	8,443	23,227	101%

Table 2
CRIMINAL DIVISION
Key Performance Indicators
Time to Disposition

	Goal	Achieved
Felony I (Murder, Sexual Assault, etc.)	75 % within 12 mos. 90% within 18 mos. 98% within 24 mos.	82% within 12 mos. 94% within 12 mos. 99% with 24 mos.
Other Felony (Felony II and AFTC)	75% within 6 mos. 90% within 9 mos. 98% within 12 mos.	81% within 6 mos. 91% within 9 mos. 97% within 12 mos.
U.S. Misdemeanor D.C. Misdemeanor Traffic	75% within 3 mos. 90% within 6 mos. 98% within 9 mos.	70% within 3 mos. 90% within 6 mos. 97% within 9 mos.
DC Misdemeanor Behavioral Changes	75% within 6 mos. 90% within 9 mos. 98% within 12 mos.	93% within 6 mos. 97% within 9 mos. 88% within 12 mos.
D.C. Traffic Behavioral Changes	75% within 6 mos. 90% within 9 mos. 98% within 12 mos.	93% within 6 mos. 96% within 9 mos. 99% within 12 mos.
U.S. Misdemeanor Behavioral Changes	75% within 6 mos. 90% within 9 mos. 98% within 12 mos.	95% within 6 mos. 98% within 9 mos. 98% within 12 mos.
U.S. Misdemeanor (Drugs)	75% within 4 mos. 90% within 6 mos. 98% within 9 mos.	77% within 4 mos. 92% within 6 mos. 98% 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	72% within 2 nd trial date
Felony II	70% within 2 nd trial date	67% 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	66% within 2 nd trial date
D.C.	70% within 2 nd trial date	87% within 2 nd trial date
Traffic	70% within 2 nd trial date	83% within 2 nd trial date

Table 4
CRIMINAL DIVISION
Trial Certainty: Non Jury Trials

	Goal	Achieved
Felony	80% within 2 nd trial date	84% within 2 nd trial date
U.S. Misdemeanor	80% within 2 nd trial date	86% within 2 nd trial date
D.C.	80% within 2 nd trial date	95% within 2 nd trial date
Traffic	80% within 2 nd trial date	81% within 2 nd trial date

FY 2013 Request

For FY 2013, the D.C. Courts request \$9,767,000 for the Criminal Division, a \$144,000 (2%) increase from the FY 2012 Enacted level. The requested increase consists entirely of built-in increases.

Table 5
CRIMINAL DIVISION
Budget Authority by Object Class

	FY 2011 Enacted	FY 2012 Enacted	FY 2013 Request	Difference FY 2012/2013
11-Personnel Compensation	7,567,000	7,613,000	7,727,000	114,000
12-Personnel Benefits	1,896,000	1,908,000	1,938,000	30,000
<i>Subtotal Personnel Cost</i>	<i>9,463,000</i>	<i>9,521,000</i>	<i>9,665,000</i>	<i>144,000</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	49,000	49,000	0
25-Other Services	0	0	0	0
26-Supplies & Materials	22,000	24,000	24,000	0
31-Equipment	27,000	29,000	29,000	0
<i>Subtotal Non-Personnel Cost</i>	<i>96,000</i>	<i>102,000</i>	<i>102,000</i>	<i>0</i>
TOTAL	9,559,000	9,623,000	9,703,000	144,000
FTE	124	124	124	0

Table 6
CRIMINAL DIVISION
Detail Difference FY 2012/FY 2013

Object Class	Description of Request	FTE	Cost	Difference FY 2012/FY 2013
11 - Personnel Compensation	Current Positions WIG	124	114,000	
12 - Personnel Benefits	Current Positions WIG	124	30,000	
21 - Travel, Transp. of Persons				
22 - Transportation of Things				
23 - Rent, Commun. & Utilities				
24 - Printing & Reproduction				
25 - Other Services				
26 - Supplies & Materials				
31 - Equipment				
Total				144,000

Table 7

CRIMINAL DIVISION
Detail of Full-Time Equivalent Employment

	2011 Enacted	2012 Enacted	2013 Request
JS-3			
JS-4	1	1	1
JS-5			
JS-6	17	13	13
JS-7	10	16	17
JS-8	27	28	29
JS-9	35	32	30
JS-10	19	18	17
JS-11	1	2	2
JS-12	6	6	7
JS-13	6	6	5
JS-14			1
JS-15	1	1	1
CES	1	1	1
Total Salaries	\$7,567,000	\$7,613,000	\$7,727,000
Total FTEs	124	124	124

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

<u>FY 2011 Enacted</u>		<u>FY 2012 Enacted</u>		<u>FY 2013 Request</u>		<u>Difference FY 2012/2013</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	2,124,000	28	2,314,000	28	2,346,000	0	32,000

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 have 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 2010, the Domestic Violence Unit processed 8,933 new filings and reinstated cases and disposed of 9,240 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 2010 through 2013.

Table 1
DOMESTIC VIOLENCE UNIT
Caseload and Efficiency Measures
(Fiscal Year 2010 Data)

	Cases Filed	Cases Disposed	Clearance Rate*	Cases Pending		
				1-Oct	30-Sep	Change
Contempt Motions ³	399	550	137%	229	78	-66%
Intrafamily (Protection Orders)	4538	4539	100%	294	293	0%
Paternity & Child Support	467	476	101%	45	36	-20%
U.S. Misdemeanors	<u>3,529</u>	<u>3,675</u>	104%	<u>666</u>	<u>520</u>	-22%
Total	8,933	9,240	103%	1,234	927	-25%

* 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 2010		FY 2011		FY 2012		FY 2013	
			Goal	Actual	Goal	Estimate	Goal	Estimate	Goal	Estimate
Output/Activity	Hearings/events scheduled	Yearly stats/ Random sample	27,003	32,520	35,200	35,200	36,600	36,600	36,800	36,800
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%	90%	100%	90%
End Outcome	Domestic Violence dispositions	Daily/Monthly Statistics	10,471	9,240	9,600	9,600	9,900	9,900	10,300	10,300
Productivity/Efficiency	Case clearance rates	Yearly statistics	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

FY 2013 Request

The D.C. Courts' FY 2013 request for the Domestic Violence Unit is \$2,346,000, an increase of \$32,000 (1%) above the FY 2012 enacted level. The requested increase consists entirely of built-in cost increases.

³ There has been a significant reduction in the number of pending contempt cases as a result of an initiative to process these cases within a shorter timeframe.

Table 3
DOMESTIC VIOLENCE UNIT
Budget Authority by Object Class

	FY 2011 Enacted	FY 2012 Enacted	FY 2013 Request	Difference FY 2012/2013
11 – Compensation	1,690,000	1,837,000	1,862,000	25,000
12 – Benefits	423,000	462,000	469,000	7,000
<i>Subtotal Personnel Cost</i>	<i>2,113,000</i>	<i>2,299,000</i>	<i>2,331,000</i>	<i>32,000</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	0	0	0	0
25 - Other Services	0	0	0	0
26 - Supplies & Materials	5,000	7,000	7,000	0
31 - Equipment	6,000	8,000	8,000	0
<i>Subtotal Non-Personnel Cost</i>	<i>11,000</i>	<i>15,000</i>	<i>15,000</i>	<i>0</i>
TOTAL	2,124,000	2,314,000	2,346,000	32,000
FTE	25	28	28	0

Table 4
DOMESTIC VIOLENCE UNIT
Detail Difference, FY 2012/2013

Object Class	Description of Request	FTE	Cost	Difference FY 2012/2013
11 - Personnel Compensation	Current Position WIG	28		25,000
12 - Personnel Benefits	Current Position WIG	28		7,000
21 - Travel, Transp. of Persons				
22 - Transportation of Things				
23 - Rent, Commun. & Utilities				
24 - Printing & Reproduction				
25 - Other Service				
26 - Supplies & Materials				
31 - Equipment				
Total				32,000

Table 5

DOMESTIC VIOLENCE UNIT
Detail of Full-Time Equivalent Employment

Grade	FY 2011 Enacted	FY 2012 Enacted	FY 2013 Request
JS-3			
JS-4			
JS-5			
JS-6	1	2	2
JS-7			
JS-8	8	9	9
JS-9	9	9	9
JS-10	3	4	4
JS-11			
JS-12	1	1	1
JS-13	2	2	2
JS-14			
JS-15			
CES	1	1	1
Total Salaries	\$1,690,000	\$1,837,000	\$1,862,000
Total FTEs	25	28	28

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

<u>FY 2011 Enacted</u>		<u>FY 2012 Enacted</u>		<u>FY 2013 Request</u>		<u>Difference FY 2012/2013</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	15,514,000	178	15,842,000	178	16,055,000	0	213,000

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 habilitation, juvenile delinquency, marriage, and divorce. The Office of the Director, six administrative branches, two support offices, the Family Court Self Help Center, the Family Treatment Court, and the Fathering 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 FTEs.
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 Habilitation Branch is responsible for matters involving the emergency hospitalization or detention of individuals in need of mental health services and matters for persons with intellectual disabilities in need of habilitation services. 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 Fathering Reentry Court provides services to non-custodial parents returning from a period of incarceration who are unable to pay court-ordered child support and find stable employment that will enable them to become financially supportive of their children. The Fathering Court also empowers fathers to maintain a physical and emotional presence in the lives of their children.
12. 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.
- Promote efficiency by adopting paperless case processing procedures that eliminate the need for bulky case files in the courtrooms and storage areas.
- Decrease the wait time for litigants in paternity and support matters by developing a staggered calendar pilot.

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 an electronic interface 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 will automate the case initiation process, receipt of subsequent filings and the 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 that were revised in order to comply with the new law are now being translated into Spanish to accommodate the Spanish speaking members of the community. From the effective date of the law, March 3, 2010 through March 2, 2011, the Family Court accepted and processed 6,604 applications for marriages, which more than doubled the number of applications accepted and processed in 2009. Likewise, the number of civil weddings performed from March 3, 2010 through March 2, 2011 nearly tripled the number of civil weddings performed in 2009 with the vast majority of those ceremonies being performed by authorized 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 2010 Data)

	Cases Filed	Cases Disposed	Clearance Rate	Cases Pending		
				1-Oct	30-Sep	Change
Abuse & Neglect	805	925	115.00%	2,456	2,336	-4.90%
Adoption	246	243	99.00%	304	307	1.00%
Divorce/Custody/Miscellaneous	3,872	3,615	93.00%	3,021	3,278	8.50%
Juvenile Delinquency	3,620	3,718	103.00%	638	540	-15.40%
Family Special Proceedings	37	38	103.00%	5	4	-20.00%
Mental Health/	1,887	2,062	109.00%	629	454	-27.80%
Mental Habilitation	15	1,168	n/a	1,165	12*	n/a
Paternity & Child Support	3,063	4,121	135.00%	6,965	5,907	-15.20%
Total	13,545	15,890	117.00%	15,183	12,838	-15.40%

* In 2010, the method of calculating pending cases in mental habilitation cases was modified to include only those cases pending an initial disposition. Excluded are post-disposition cases under review by the Court.

Table 2
FAMILY COURT OPERATIONS
Key Performance Indicators

Performance Indicator	Data Source	FY 2010		FY 2011		FY 2012		FY 2013	
		Goal	Actual	Goal	Projection	Goal	Projection	Goal	Projection
Prisoner Transfers Processed	Monthly Statistics	2,800	4,335	4,335	4,628	4,922	4,922	5,209	5,209
Delinquency & Neglect Cases/Orders Reviewed	Monthly Statistics	23,089	17,192	17,192	17,735	18,279	18,279	18,491	18,491
Applications for Marriage Licenses & Minister Authorizations	Computer Reports	2,682	6,375	2,682	6,781	7,188	7,188	7,594	7,594
Marriage Licenses & Authorizations Issued	Computer Reports	2,536	5,913	2,536	6,266	6,620	6,620	6,973	6,973
DR & Child Support Petitions & Complaints Total Intake	Computer Reports	14,820	13,913	14,938	14,938	15,962	15,962	16,973	16,973
Domestic & Child Support Hearings Set	Computer Reports	32,793	18,249	17,561	17,561	16,873	16,873	16,064	16,064
Domestic Orders Issued	Computer Reports	9,603	10,056	10,385	10,385	10,714	10,714	11,043	11,043
Child Support Orders Issued	Computer Reports	2,294	2,585	2,800	2,800	3,015	3,015	3,128	3,128
ASFA case reviews in initial, further initial, pretrial, stipulation, disposition and permanency hearings	Monthly Statistics	4,017	4,005	4,366	4,366	4,590	4,590	4,900	4,900
Data input and other error notifications distributed by Attorney Advisors	Monthly Statistics	792	792	700	825	650	858	600	892
CCAN Attorneys appointed to Adult Parties in Abuse & Neglect cases	Monthly Statistics	1,305	1,492	1,212	1,426	1,212	1,359	1,212	1,212
Guardians <i>ad litem</i> Appointed	Monthly Statistics	688	732	688	705	688	677	605	605
Trainings Provided to Attorneys	CCAN Records	16	37	16	22	16	22	16	22
Attorneys Meeting CLE Requirements	CCAN Records	145	167	145	165	145	164	145	163

FY 2013 Request

In FY 2013 the D.C. Courts' request for the Family Court Operations Division is \$16,055,000, an increase of \$213,000 (1%) above the FY 2012 enacted level. The increase consists entirely of built-in increases.

Table 3
FAMILY COURT OPERATIONS
Budget Authority by Object Class

	FY 2011 Enacted	FY 2012 Enacted	FY 2013 Request	Difference FY 2012/2013
11 - Personnel Compensation	11,284,000	11,504,000	11,673,000	169,000
12 - Personnel Benefits	2,821,000	2,878,000	2,922,000	44,000
<i>Subtotal Personnel Cost</i>	<i>14,105,000</i>	<i>14,382,000</i>	<i>14,595,000</i>	<i>213,000</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	29,000	29,000	0
25 - Other Services	1,020,000	1,055,000	1,055,000	0
26 - Supplies & Materials	35,000	37,000	37,000	0
31 - Equipment	327,000	339,000	339,000	0
<i>Subtotal Non-Personnel Cost</i>	<i>1,409,000</i>	<i>1,460,000</i>	<i>1,460,000</i>	<i>0</i>
TOTAL	15,514,000	15,842,000	16,055,000	213,000
FTE	177	178	178	0

Table 4
FAMILY COURT OPERATIONS
Detail Difference, FY 2012/2013

Object Class	Description of Request	FTE	Cost	Difference FY 2012/2013
11 - Compensation	Current Position WIG	178		169,000
12 - Benefits	Current Position WIG	178		44,000
21 - Travel, Transp. of Persons				
22 - Transportation of Things				
23 - Rent, Commun. & Utilities				
24 - Printing & Reproduction				
25 - Other Services				
26 - Supplies & Materials				
31 - Equipment				
Total				213,000

Table 5
FAMILY COURT OPERATIONS
Detail of Full-Time Equivalent Employment

Grade	FY 2011 Enacted	FY 2012 Enacted	FY 2013 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	31	31	31
JS-10	13	14	14
JS-11	11	11	11
JS-12	9	9	9
JS-13	15	15	15
JS-14	1	1	1
JS-15	1	1	1
JS-16			
JS-17			
CEs	1	1	1
Total Salaries	\$11,284,000	\$11,504,000	\$11,673,000
Total FTEs	177	178	178

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

<u>FY 2011 Enacted</u>		<u>FY 2012 Enacted</u>		<u>FY 2013 Request</u>		<u>Difference FY 2012/2013</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	17,046,000	140	20,267,000	140	20,486,000	0	219,000

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 and coordination of comprehensive services and 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 6 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, manages distribution of court reports, oversees the general maintenance of the Division’s vehicles, and provides customer service to youth and families reporting to Building B, the central office for CSSD. The Unit has 5 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 6 FTEs.

- The Intake Services and Delinquency and Prevention Branch is comprised of three units, including two units dedicated to day and evening intake services and one unit responsible for community outreach and education as well as global positioning system (GPS) electronic monitoring. 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, presenting all referrals before a judicial officer (juvenile equivalent of an arraignment), and pre-trial recommendations. The Delinquency Prevention Unit (DPU) manages the Division's GPS electronic monitoring, coordinates diversion, by way of transportation from secure detention, youth whose parents are unable to retrieve them, and facilitates public safety community education presentations and outreach. Intake Units I and II operate twenty-four (24) hours a day, seven (7) days a week. The branch consists of 25 FTEs.
- The Pre/Post Probation Supervision Branch - Region I provides a seamless set of services, case management, and monitoring/supervision efforts provided by one probation officer of record. The branch consists of: 1) the Southeast Satellite Office (SESO) Balanced and Restorative Justice (BARJ) Drop-In Center, responsible for serving and supervising all youth residing in the historic Anacostia southeast quadrant of the District; 2) the Southwest Satellite Office (SWSO), created to serve youth residing in the southwest and lower northwest quadrants of the city (temporarily located in Building B); 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) Ultimate Transitions Ultimate Responsibilities Now (UTURN), responsible for case management, and the supervision of high-risk pre-and post-adjudicated youth across the city. The branch consists of 45 FTEs.
- The Pre/Post Probation Supervision Status Offender & Behavioral Health Branch - Region II is responsible for providing seamless services and monitoring/supervision efforts by one probation officer of record. The branch is also complimented by a unit specifically created to respond to the needs of status offenders and youth presenting with Axis I mental health needs who are eligible for diversion. The branch consists of: 1) the Northwest Satellite Office (NWSO) responsible for serving and supervising the vast majority of youth residing in the northwest quadrant of the city; 2) the Northeast Satellite Office (NESO) Balanced and Restorative Justice Drop-In Center; 3) the Status Offender and Behavioral Health Unit responsible for screening, diverting, petitioning, case managing, serving, and supervising all youth referred by the D.C. Public Schools, Charter Schools and/or a parent for alleged habitual truancy (status offense) or as a Person in Need of Supervision (PINS) and all youth participating in the Behavioral Health Court (BHC) diversion or post-disposition program; and 4) the Leaders of Today in Solidarity (LOTS), the city's first female gender-specific seamless probation program. This branch consists of 46 FTEs.

- The Child Guidance Clinic/Branch provides court ordered psychological, psycho-educational, neuro-psychological, competency, forensic evaluations, and Juvenile Behavioral Health initial clinical screenings to determine the needs of youth and family and guide judicial decision-making. The staff recommends eligible youth for the Juvenile Behavioral Health Court. The branch also provides psychotherapy to a limited number of uninsured youth and families. The unit has 7 FTEs and 5 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 (3) business days of initial hearing.
- Provide high quality screenings, assessments, services, and supervision to all youth determined eligible for diversion and petitioning within fifteen (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 (3) business days of the Probation Officer (PO) of record receiving the case.
- Coordinate and facilitate family group conferences (FGC) on all youth within eighteen (18) 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 93% of all juveniles.
- Conduct high-quality, comprehensive home studies for families involved in domestic relations cases by completing 95% of home studies within six (6) 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 twenty (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 twenty-five (25) business days.

Restructuring or Work Process Re-Design

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

To equip new staff with tools needed to carry out their duties, CSSD facilitated regional and team in-house training for all new staff. In May 2011, the Division's managers participated in an all day senior manager's training in preparation for CSSD's three (3) day all managers retreat in May 2011 which focused on leading change and the Division's strategic plan.

CSSD, in partnership with the Metropolitan Police Department (MPD) and DYRS, continued to operate the co-located Absconder Locator Unit, housed in Building B. These efforts resulted in a 30% reduction in the number of pending custody orders, per month.

Workload Data

Table 1
SOCIAL SERVICES DIVISION
Caseload (Fiscal Year 2011 data)

Case Type	New Cases	Cases Closed	Cases Pending Beginning of Year	Cases Pending End of Year
Juvenile Intake	2,570	2,570	211	369
Pre/ Post Disp. Supervision	2,363	2,678	1,368	1,053
Status Offenders	383	281	70	174
Behavior Health Court (effect. January 2011)	23	26	20	17
Domestic Relations	214	264	106	56
Child Guidance Clinic	647	640	9	16

Table 2
SOCIAL SERVICES DIVISION
Key Performance Indicators

Performance Indicators	Data Source	FY 2010		FY 2011		FY 2012		FY 2013	
		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	1,600	1,679	1,650	1,700	1,750	1,700	1,700	1,700
Juveniles under supervision and drug screening conducted	Pretrial Services Data	5,195	5,210	5,210	5,260	5,300	5,250	5,250	5,250
Juvenile probationers screening positive for drugs during probation	Pretrial Services Data	51%	50%	50%	50%	45%	48%	45%	45%
Percentage of juveniles successfully completing probation	CSSD Statistical Reports	78%	77%	80%	82%	80%	78%	80%	75%
Juveniles arrested for new offenses during probation	Superior Court Data	24%	21%	20%	18%	18%	20%	15%	20%
Average pre and post-disposition supervision caseloads and national standards: 1:25 min, 1:25 med, 1:25 max	CSSD Statistical Reports	25	25	25	25	25	25	25	25
Average pre and post-disposition intensive supervision caseloads and national standards 1:14	CSSD Statistical Reports	14	14	14	14	14	14	14	14
Increased curfew checks -- face-to-face contact	CSSD Statistical Reports	17,500	15,978	20,000	24,000	22,000	25,000	24,000	27,500
Increased curfew checks -- telephone calls	CSSD Statistical Reports	31,000	28,260	32,000	30,000	33,000	31,000	35,000	35,500
Increased compliance among youth with face-to-face and telephone call curfew checks ⁴	CSSD Statistical Reports	75%	71%	75%	75%	75%	75%	75%	75%

Division Outcomes and Accomplishments in FY 2010

In FY 2011, with an average daily population of roughly 1,600, of whom 1,304 or 82% were males and 296 or 18% were females, the CSSD continued to manage the front end of the District's juvenile justice system.

The Division continued to provide comprehensive and timely screenings and assessments of all newly referred youth resulting in more than 96% of new cases being ready prior to the initial

⁴ 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 shows a slight increase in serious offenses.

hearing. An average of 2,392 (an increase of 7% over FY 2010) monthly face-to-face curfew checks and an average of 3,771 (an increase of 8% over FY 2010) monthly curfew calls were made, in addition to the family group conference sessions and case staffing, 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, Northwest Satellite Office (NWSO) the Child Guidance Clinic (CGC), and the newly developed Juvenile Behavioral Diversion Court. In May 2010, the District of Columbia Courts completed renovation of the N.E. BARJ Drop-In Center, located at 2575 Reed St., N.E. and in FY 2011 programmatic services were completed enabling the facility to become fully operational in June 2011.

Also in FY 2011, the Capital Projects and Facilities Management Division (CPFMD), in tandem with the CSSD, issued a solicitation for the build-out of the Division's third (3rd) BARJ Drop-In Center, located in the southwest quadrant. The targeted completion timeline for this facility is November FY 2012.

Table 3
S.E. BARJ Drop-In Center

Month/Year	Oct 10	Nov 10	Dec 10	Jan 11	Feb 11	Mar 11	Apr 11	May 11
Youth in Program	31/174	28/201	28/185	25/182	32/177	32/177	26/178	31/174
% not suspended from school	97%	100%	96%	96%	97%	94%	96%	93%
% not rearrested	93%	93%	93%	92%	94%	93%	100%	96%

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 3%, 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 thirty (30) youth attending the Center for BARJ represents nearly 15% of the facility's average daily population of 185 post-disposition youth served and supervised at the location.

Table 4
Curfew Checks

Month/Year	Oct 10	Nov10	Dec 10	Jan 11	Feb 11	Mar 11	Apr 11	May 11
Face-to-Face	2,938	2,397	1,961	2,239	2,131	2,756	2,584	2,872
Telephone	3,387	3,826	4,219	4,219	3,548	4,167	3,926	4,016

Table 4 illustrates that from October 1, 2010 thru May 31, 2011, a total of 25,878 face-to-face curfew checks and 31,308 telephone curfew checks were conducted by case carrying probation officers. 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 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 10	Nov 10	Dec 10	Jan 11	Feb 11	Mar 11	Apr 11	May 11
Parent Participation Orders	977	1028	899	839	920	933	999	1153
Compliance	862	935	782	731	823	859	891	938
% Compliance among parents	88%	91%	87%	87%	89%	92%	89%	81%

National indicators confirm that parents, guardians, and custodians are the most suitable individuals to supervise and support adolescents involved in juvenile justice systems. From October 2010 through May 2011, participation among parents issued parent participation orders achieved a compliance rate of 88%.

Also in FY 2011, the Division's Child Guidance Clinic (CGC) completed 582 evaluations, the lion-share completed in twenty-five (25) days or less. With the support of interns and externs, the Clinic continued to successfully operate the only community-based comprehensive program for juveniles adjudicated for sexual offenses and other serious charges. 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 also completed several research studies, resulting in CGC staff presenting at a national conference held at the University of Michigan on the Clinic's use of the Millon Adolescent Clinical Inventory (MACI), a clinical test used on a sample of 325 African American males under CSSD's supervision.

In March and May 2011, the CSSD, in collaboration with one of its contract vendors, sponsored a Civil Rights Tour. As in the past, the trip culminated a journey to historic areas in Georgia and Alabama where youth were able relive experiences encountered by citizens during the Civil Rights struggle. Roughly, eighty (80) (adolescent males and females) under CSSD supervision participated in this eye opening awareness of the Civil Rights Movement, and visited Historically Black College Campuses. Each youth completed a 500 word essay on their experience. Participating youth also completed 30 hours of community service/service learning, in which they shared their experience through presentations at District of Columbia public and chartered schools as well as other youth-oriented community events. Subsequently, participating youth enter an essay contest highlighted during a banquet recognizing all attending youth for their progress under CSSD supervision. In August FY 2012, an additional forty (40) CSSD youth will participate in the Civil Rights Tour.

In January 2011, CSSD began attending city-wide crime analysis and response meetings convened by the Chief of the Metropolitan Police Department (MPD). Data examined during these meetings revealed an increase in violence within particular Ward 4 neighborhoods. Participating agencies were charged with examining intelligence information provided by the MPD and assessing their caseloads to determine whether or not youth and adults under respective supervision were violating conditions of community placement and at risk for the probation agency filing a motion to revoke community placement.

Upon analyzing the data further, CSSD determined the need to initiate a measure designed to reach the target population under the Division's supervision and penetrate the secondary and tertiary peers of CSSD's targeted youth. CSSD, in partnership with MPD officers patrolling

the neighborhoods of concern, developed the *Youth Engagement Sessions (YES)*, which ran for a total of eight (8) weeks, with each session facilitated by a guest speaker. Key topics of discussion were empowerment, making healthy choices, and resisting peer pressure. Upon completion of the YES groups, the youth participated in an all-day outdoor event which included a cookout, tag football, basketball, and an introduction to fishing.

CSSD continues to find innovative and creative programming (e.g., HBCU and Civil Rights Tours, camping, BARJ, LOTS) invaluable, as these programs provide a variety of ways to reach, stimulate, habilitate and rehabilitate court-involved youth. As in past years, many youth completing these programs and probation return to CSSD to serve as volunteers and interns.

FY 2013 Request

In FY 2013, the Courts request \$20,486,000 for the Family Court Social Services Division, an increase of \$219,000 (1%) above the FY 2012 enacted level. The FY 2013 request consists of \$219,000 for built-in cost increases.

Table 7
SOCIAL SERVICES DIVISION
Budget Authority by Object Class

	FY 2011 Enacted	FY 2012 Enacted	FY 2013 Request	Difference FY 2012/2013
11 - Personnel Compensation	11,613,000	11,683,000	11,857,000	174,000
12 - Personnel Benefits	2,909,000	2,927,000	2,972,000	45,000
Subtotal Personnel Cost	14,522,000	14,610,000	14,829,000	219,000
21 - Travel, Transp. of Persons	0	0	0	0
22 - Transportation of Things	0	0	0	0
23 - Rent, Commun. & Utilities	0	360,000	360,000	0
24 - Printing & Reproduction	0	0	0	0
25 - Other Services	2,458,000	5,225,000	5,225,000	0
26 - Supplies & Materials	32,000	36,000	36,000	0
31 - Equipment	34,000	36,000	36,000	0
Subtotal Non-Personnel Cost	2,524,000	5,657,000	5,657,000	0
TOTAL	17,046,000	20,267,000	20,486,000	219,000
FTE	140	140	140	0

Table 8
SOCIAL SERVICES DIVISION
Detail Difference, FY 2012/2013

Object Class	Description of Request	FTE	Cost	Difference FY 2012/2013
11 - Personnel Compensation	Current Positions WIG	140		174,000
12 - Personnel Benefits	Current Positions WIG	140		45,000
21 - Travel, Transp. of Persons				
22 - Transportation of Things				
23 - Rent, Commun. & Utilities				
24 - Printing & Reproduction				
25 - Other Services				
26 - Supplies & Materials				
31 - Equipment				
Total				219,000

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

Grade	2011 Enacted	2012 Enacted	2013 Request
JS-2			
JS-3			
JS-4			
JS-5			
JS-6	2	2	3
JS-7	5	7	5
JS-8	20	16	19
JS-9	14	24	26
JS-10	2	1	1
JS-11	16	15	12
JS-12	56	49	48
JS-13	19	19	20
JS-14	4	5	4
JS-15	1	1	1
CES	1	1	1
Total Salaries	\$11,613,000	\$11,683,000	\$11,857,000
Total FTEs	140	140	140

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

<u>FY 2011 Enacted</u>		<u>FY 2012 Enacted</u>		<u>FY 2013 Request</u>		<u>Difference FY 2012/2013</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>
21	2,519,000	21	2,627,000	21	2,657,000	0	30,000

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 provides resource information, agency referrals, conciliation, and mediation to individuals and families. The program addresses landlord-tenant, consumer fraud, contract, domestic relations, and personal injury issues before a case is filed. The Family Mediation Program addresses domestic relations issues of custody, support, visitation, and property distribution. The Family Mediation Program also includes PAC, a Parent Education Seminar for 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 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 2010	8283	4487	2077	46%
FY 2011	9084	5225	2591	50%

*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.

Multi-Door expanded services in the Program for Agreement and Cooperation in Contested Custody Disputes (PAC) to include an education seminar for Spanish speaking 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 Division expanded services in its Community Information and Referral Program by establishing a satellite office at the Central American Resource Center in the Adams Morgan section of the District of Columbia to assist Spanish speaking residents with resolving community disputes.

The Multi-Door Division, in collaboration with the Civil Division, piloted a housing conditions mediation program that assisted in enforcing housing code regulations in the District of Columbia. Multi-Door also began offering mediation services on all collection cases filed in Small Claims Court.

Multi-Door expanded 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 period.

The Multi-Door Division completed and launched an innovative technology project with the Information Technology Division 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 based voucher system).

The database system assists 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 web based agreement writing system enhances and improves the quality of family agreements, and the web based voucher system improves the efficiency and accuracy of stipend payments to mediators.

Workload Data

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

Type of Indicator	Performance Indicator	Data Source	FY 2010 Actual	FY 2011 Estimated	Projection FY 2012	Projection FY 2013
Input	Cases Scheduled	CourtView	6,420	7,360	7,550	7,600
Output	Mediation Sessions Held	CourtView	3,753	4,597	4,800	5,000
Outcome	Case settlement rate	CourtView	43%	47%	50%	52%
Outcome/Quality	Participant Satisfaction w/ ADR Process	SPSS database	94%	95%	95%	95%
Outcome/Quality	Participant Satisfaction w/ Outcome	SPSS database	84%	85%	85%	85%
Outcome/Quality	Neutral Performance Satisfaction	SPSS database	95%	95%	95%	95%

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

Type of Indicator	Performance Indicator	Data Source	FY 2010 Actual	FY 2011 Estimated	Projection FY 2012	Projection FY 2013
Input	Mediation Sessions Scheduled	Court view	1,863	1,724	1,750	1,800
Output	Mediation sessions held	CourtView	1,249	1,242	1,260	1,300
Outcome	*Case settlement rate	CourtView	64%	67%	68%	69%
Outcome/Quality	Participant satisfaction w/ process	SPSS database	98%	90%	92%	94%
Outcome/Quality	Participant satisfaction w/outcome	SPSS database	92%	84%	86%	88%
Outcome/Quality	Neutral performance satisfaction	SPSS database	99%	92%	94%	96%

*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.

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 2010		FY 2011		FY 2012		FY 2013	
			Goal	Actual	Goal	Estimate	Goal	Estimate	Goal	Estimate
Output	Settlement Rate	IJIS database	50%	46%	50%	50%	50%	50%	50%	50%
Outcome	Overall client satisfaction (ratings of satisfied plus highly satisfied)	SPSS database	80%	94%	90%	90%	90%	91%	90%	92%

FY 2013 Request

In FY 2013, the D.C. Courts request \$2,657,000 for the Multi-Door Dispute Resolution Division, an increase of \$30,000 (1%) above the FY 2012 enacted level. The FY 2013 request consists entirely of built-in increases.

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

	FY 2011 Enacted	FY 2012 Enacted	FY 2013 Request	Difference FY 2012/FY 2013
11 - Personnel Compensation	1,604,000	1,668,000	1,692,000	24,000
12 - Personnel Benefits	402,000	425,000	431,000	6,000
<i>Subtotal Personnel Cost</i>	<i>2,006,000</i>	<i>2,093,000</i>	<i>2,123,000</i>	<i>30,000</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	0	0	0	0
25 - Other Services	499,000	516,000	516,000	0
26 - Supplies & Materials	8,000	10,000	10,000	0
31 - Equipment	6,000	8,000	8,000	0
<i>Subtotal Non-Personnel Cost</i>	<i>513,000</i>	<i>534,000</i>	<i>534,000</i>	<i>0</i>
TOTAL	<i>2,519,000</i>	<i>2,627,000</i>	<i>2,657,000</i>	<i>30,000</i>
FTE	21	21	21	0

Table 6
MULTI-DOOR DISPUTE RESOLUTION DIVISION
Detail Difference, FY 2012/2013

Object Class	Description of Request	FTE	Cost	Difference FY 2012/2013
11 - Personnel Compensation	Current Positions WIG	21		24,000
12 - Personnel Benefits	Current Positions WIG	21		6,000
21 - Travel, Transp. of Persons				
22 - Transportation of Things				
23 - Rent, Commun. & Utilities				
24 - Printing & Reproduction				
25 - Other Service				
26 - Supplies & Materials				
31 - Equipment				
Total				30,000

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

Grade	FY 2011 Enacted	FY 2012 Enacted	FY 2013 Request
JS-3			
JS-4			
JS-5			
JS-6			
JS-7			
JS-8	1	1	1
JS-9	1		
JS-10	9	10	10
JS-11	5	5	5
JS-12	1	1	1
JS-13	3	3	3
JS-14			
JS-15			
CES	1	1	1
Total Salaries	\$1,604,000	\$1,668,000	\$1,692,000
Total FTEs	21	21	21

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

<u>FY 2011 Enacted</u>		<u>FY 2012 Enacted</u>		<u>FY 2013 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>
4	387,000	4	478,000	4	483,000	0	5,000

Mission Statement

The mission of the Office of the Auditor-Master is to assist the Judiciary and parties in cases by expeditiously stating accounts for persons under the authority of the Court. The Office plays a critical role in assisting the Court in its responsibility to safeguard and recover assets of incapacitated adults, minors, decedent estates, and trusts 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, or another person having access to assets, has failed to properly account to the Court or the parties. The Office also assists the Court by investigating and resolving controversies involving complex financial computations and transactions in the Civil, Probate, 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 compiling all available documentation and evidence, issuing subpoenas for additional documentation and witnesses to supplement the record, and conducting hearings during which evidence is presented and testimony is secured under oath. Following the hearings, the Auditor-Master states the accounts by determining the value of assets, the income, allowable expenses, and liabilities; 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 considered by the Court in a hearing with the parties. Over 99% of the reports issued by the Office have been approved, under the direction of the incumbent Auditor-Master.

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, an Attorney-Advisor, an Accountant, and a Legal 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 FY 2010, and projects that the completion standards established for FY 2011 will also be met as reflected in the chart below. The Office of the Auditor-Master has established more aggressive standards for FY 2012 and beyond to assist in the timely resolution of cases.

Workload Data

Table 1
FY 2010 Caseload Overview

Case Activity			Cases Pending		
Reports (Dispositions)	Cases Referred	Clearance Rate	Oct 1	Sep 30	Change
32	51	63%	10	28	180%

Table 2
Projected FY 2011 Caseload Overview

Case Activity			Cases Pending		
Reports (Dispositions)	Cases Referred	Clearance Rate	Oct 1	Sep 30	Change
55	37	149%	28	8	-72%

Key Performance Indicators

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

Type of Indicator	Key Performance Indicator	Data Source	FY 2010		FY 2011		FY 2012		FY 2013	
			Goal	Actual	Goal	Projected	Goal	Estimate	Goal	Estimate
Output	Percentage of cases completed within four months	Monthly Reports	50%	59%	50%	31%	55%	60%	55%	65%
Output	Percentage of cases completed within six months	Monthly Reports	60%	78%	70%	64%	75%	75%	75%	75%
Output	Percentage of cases completed within nine months	Monthly Reports	75%	91%	75%	89%	80%	85%	80%	85%
Output	Percentage of cases completed within 12 months	Monthly Reports	75%	94%	80%	96%	85%	90%	85%	90%
Output	Percentage of cases completed within 18 months	Monthly Reports	90%	94%	90%	100%	95%	95%	95%	95%

FY 2013 Request

In FY 2013, the Courts request \$483,000 for the Office of the Auditor-Master, an increase of \$5,000 (1%) above the FY 2012 enacted level. The FY 2013 request consists entirely of built-in increases.

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

	FY 2011 Enacted	FY 2012 Enacted	FY 2013 Request	Difference FY 2012/2013
11 – Compensation	294,000	362,000	366,000	4,000
12 – Benefits	74,000	91,000	92,000	1,000
<i>Subtotal Personnel Cost</i>	368,000	453,000	458,000	5,000
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	6,000	6,000	0
26 - Supplies & Materials	4,000	6,000	6,000	0
31 – Equipment	11,000	13,000	13,000	0
<i>Subtotal Non-Personnel Cost</i>	19,000	25,000	25,000	0
TOTAL	387,000	478,000	483,000	5,000
FTE	4	4	4	0

Table 5
OFFICE OF THE AUDITOR-MASTER
Detail Difference, FY 2012/2013

Object Class	Description of Request	FTE	Cost	Difference FY 2012/2013
11- Personnel Compensation	Current Positions WIG	4		4,000
12- Personnel Benefits	Current Positions WIG	4		1,000
21 - Travel, Transp. of Persons				
22 - Transportation of Things				
23 - Rent, Commun & Utilities				
24 - Printing & Reproduction				
25 - Other Service				
26 - Supplies & Materials				
31 - Equipment				
Total				5,000

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

Grade	FY 2011 Enacted	FY 2012 Enacted	FY 2013 Request
JS-3			
JS-4			
JS-5			
JS-6			
JS-7			
JS-8			
JS-9			
JS-10	1	1	
JS-11	1	1	1
JS-12			1
JS-13	1	1	1
JS-14			
JS-15			
CES	1	1	1
Total Salaries	\$294,000	\$362,000	\$366,000
Total FTEs	4	4	4

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

<u>FY 2011 Enacted</u>		<u>FY 2012 Enacted</u>		<u>FY 2013 Request</u>		<u>Difference FY 2012/2013</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	4,922,000	49	5,039,000	49	5,113,000	0	74,000

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 certain 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. It is estimated that 20% of the population of the United States will be elderly by 2030. During FY 2010, the number of adult guardianship cases filed in the Probate Division increased by 9% over the prior year.

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 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. The Probate Division also provides public access via the web to docket information concerning wills, disclaimers and major litigation in the Probate Division, and has created an extensive Probate Division webpage, with general information, answers to frequently asked questions, an expanded web library of brochures and videos and nearly 200 fillable Probate Division forms designed to assist members of the public.

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 and Deputy Program Manager for the Guardianship Assistance Program, for a total of 4 FTEs.
- The Probate Clerk's Office is the operational center of the Probate Division and the primary point of contact for the public. This central office has 9 FTEs, consisting of a supervisor and nine deputy clerks who handle filings, requests for jackets and copies and all cashier functions.
- The Quality Assurance Office also has 9 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 three deputy clerks.
- The Legal Branch has 7 FTEs, and is headed by the Deputy Register of Wills. There are three attorneys, one legal assistant to the Branch Manager and two small estate specialists/paralegals. 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 2 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 also 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 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 case processing activities within established time standards.

Objective 2. Continue to provide enhanced services to incapacitated adults under Court supervision through the Guardianship Assistance Program.

Objective 3. Design and hold an Auditing Conference to provide assistance and information to family-member and attorney fiduciaries who handle the financial affairs of incapacitated adults, minors, and other wards of the Court.

Divisional Restructuring and/or Work Process Redesign

During FY2010, the Probate Division:

- Prepared an updated Continuity of Operations Plan (COOP) for emergency planning;
- Completed a two year project to expand the information available to the public through on-line web access, including the creation of a Probate Division webpage library of brochures and videos;
- Expanded the Guardianship Assistance Program, a partnership between the Court and the social work departments of local universities to provide improved services to those incapacitated adults who are under Court supervision;
- Created a series of Probate Division Bench Books for use by judicial officers, covering the topics of Administration of Decedents' Estates, Intervention Proceedings, Major Litigation, Old Law Conservatorships, Disclaimers, Guardianships of the Estates of Minors, and Trusts;
- Designed and implemented a cross training program for all Probate Division deputy clerks;
- Developed a monthly Probate Division Dashboard, with readily accessible measures of performance;
- Automated the collection of Management Action Plan (MAP) statistical data throughout the Probate Division;
- Implemented a pilot project, Live Chat, staffed by the Probate Division, to provide answers to non-legal questions from members of the public, available Monday through Friday between the hours of 10:00 a.m. to 12:00 noon and from 2:00 p.m. to 4:00 p.m., through a link on the Probate Division website; and
- Continued efforts to provide improved customer service.

Workload Data

As shown in Table 1, below, the Probate Division disposed of 2,891 cases during FY 2010, a clearance rate of 97% 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 2010 Data)

	Cases Filed	Cases Disposed	Clearance Rate*	Cases Pending		
				1-Oct	30-Sept	Change
Old Law Conservatorship	1	37	**	97	61	-37%
Foreign Proceedings	126	120	95%	136	142	+4%
Decedent's Estate	1,645	1,695	103%	4,273	4,223	-1%
Guardianships of Minors	32	52	162%	320	300	-6%
Adult Guardianships/Conservatorships	426	280	66%	1,841	1,987	+8%
Small Estates	699	674	96%	61	86	+41%
Trusts	35	33	94%	117	119	+2%
Total	2,964	2,891	97%	6,845	6,918	+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. One case was reopened in May 2010.						

Key Performance Indicators

Table 2
PROBATE DIVISION
Key Performance Indicators

Performance Indicator	Data Source	FY 2010		FY 2011		FY2012		FY2013	
		Goal	Actual	Goal	Estimate	Goal	Estimate	Goal	Estimate
Time Standard from Filing to Disposition									
Small estates: within 120 days	Monthly Report	95%	98%	95%	95%	95%	95%	95%	95%
Requests for compensation without account and from Guardianship Fund: within 25 days	Monthly Reports	95%	96%	95%	96%	95%	95%	95%	95%
Requests for compensation without account: within 25 days	Monthly Reports	95%	96%	95%	96%	95%	95%	95%	95%
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%	99%	95%	98%	95%	95%	95%	95%
Uncontested petitions within 30 days	Monthly Report	95%	98%	95%	98%	95%	95%	95%	95%
Supervised decedents' estates within 37 months	Monthly Reports	95%	*	95% *	50% **	95%	60%	95%	70%
Unsupervised decedents' estates within 37 months	Monthly Reports	95%	100%	95% *	98%	95%	95%	95%	95%
Intervention Proceedings – Appointment of fiduciary within 90 days of filing	Monthly Reports	95%	95%	95%	95%	95%	95%	95%	95%
Percentage of business days mechanical filing systems operable	Monthly Reports					99%	99%	99%	99%
* This indicator is based upon data beginning March 2008, the 37 month time standard, which did not elapse during FY2010.									
** This estimate is based upon incomplete data because the time standard has not yet elapsed.									

FY 2013 Request

In FY 2013, the Courts request \$5,113,000 for the Probate Division, an increase of \$74,000 (1%) above the FY 2012 enacted level. The requested increase is entirely built-in cost increases.

Table 3
PROBATE DIVISION
Budget Authority by Object Class

	FY 2011 Enacted	FY 2012 Enacted	FY 2013 Request	Difference FY 2012/2013
11 - Personnel Compensation	3,918,000	4,008,000	4,067,000	59,000
12 - Personnel Benefits	980,000	1,003,000	1,018,000	15,000
<i>Subtotal Personnel Cost</i>	<i>4,898,000</i>	<i>5,011,000</i>	<i>5,085,000</i>	<i>74,000</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	0	0	0	0
25 - Other Services	0	0	0	0
26 - Supplies & Materials	13,000	15,000	15,000	0
31 - Equipment	11,000	13,000	13,000	0
<i>Subtotal Non-Personnel Cost</i>	<i>24,000</i>	<i>28,000</i>	<i>28,000</i>	<i>0</i>
TOTAL	4,922,000	5,039,000	5,113,000	74,000
FTE	49	49	49	0

Table 4
PROBATE DIVISION
Detail Difference, FY 2012/2013

Object Class	Description of Request	FTE	Cost	Difference FY 2012/2013
11 - Personnel Compensation	Current Positions WIG	49		59,000
12 - Personnel Benefits	Current Positions WIG	49		15,000
21 - Travel, Transp. of Persons				
22 - Transportation of Things				
23 - Rent, Commun. & Utilities				
24 - Printing & Reproduction				
25 - Other Service				
26 - Supplies & Materials				
31 - Equipment				
Total				74,000

Table 5
PROBATE DIVISION
Detail of Full Time Equivalent Employment

Grade	FY 2011 Enacted	FY 2012 Enacted	FY 2013 Request
JS-3			
JS-4			
JS-5	2	2	1
JS-6	6	5	6
JS-7	5	8	6
JS-8	4	3	5
JS-9	2		
JS-10	2	2	2
JS-11	4	5	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	\$3,918,000	\$4,008,000	\$4,067,000
Total FTEs	49	49	49

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

<u>FY 2011 Enacted</u>		<u>FY 2012 Enacted</u>		<u>FY 2013 Request</u>		<u>Difference FY 2012/2013</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>
31	3,460,000	31	4,129,000	31	4,167,000	0	38,000

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 (10 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 (4 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/hard of hearing 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 conducts 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 have also been developed and implemented to bring in citizens who do not respond to the juror summons. These procedures are gradually helping 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, 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. Jury staff utilizes an electronic Juror-Help mail box to handle online juror inquiries, requests for assistance with the juror summons, as well as requests for special accommodations from jurors with disabilities.

The Tax Division has enhanced service to the public by eliminating the Court's administrative procedures in connection with the District of Columbia's Office of Tax and Revenue Voucher form. The result is that the petitioner will directly receive their refund from the District without the Court having to process the voucher form and send it to the District for distribution of the refund to the petitioner. By eliminating this step the Tax Office has provided the public an expeditious process to receive their refund.

To enhance the timely availability of foreign and sign language interpreters for court proceedings, the Office of Court Interpreting Services (OCIS) collaborates with the operating divisions on procedures that identify cases requiring interpreting services early so they can prioritize the scheduling of these cases. The Office has developed training modules for

courtroom clerks, law clerks, judges, and frontline staff on the use of interpreters. The Office is implementing new software to schedule interpreter services more efficiently and economically.

To enhance service to the public, the Child Care Center staff worked with the Information Technology Division 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. Additionally, the Child Care Center has updated the Frequently Asked Questions (FAQs) posted on the Courts' website.

The Appeals Coordinator's Office is working with Information Technology to redesign its computer system. This system will be a more efficient and comprehensive tool for the management of all appeal cases from receipt, processing, and record certification to final disposition. The system will generate record documents and management reports in an effort to establish a paperless work environment.

Workload Data

In FY 2010, the Special Operations Division's Jurors' Office sent 205,478 summonses to District of Columbia citizens to appear on juries; the Office of Court Interpreting Services received and fulfilled over 9,620 requests for courtroom interpreting services; the Tax Division heard and disposed of 266 tax petitions; and the Appeals Coordinators' Office received 1,360 new appeals that were processed and forwarded to the Court of Appeals within three days of receipt. This office also prepared 1,735 appeal records and supplemental records that were forwarded to the Court of Appeals within 60 days or less of receipt of transcript lists from the Court Reporting Division. In 2010, 1,627 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 2010		FY 2011		FY 2012		FY 2013	
			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	256,000	206,702	254,000	261,264	252,000	256,039	250,000	250,919
Output/Activity	Jurors qualified to serve on <i>voir dire</i> panels	IT Division	64,000	45,843	65,000	59,496	66,000	58,306	67,000	57,140
Outcome	Judicial requests for <i>voir dire</i> panels met	Court's R & D Division	84%	72%	86%	74%	88%	76%	90%	78%
Outcome	Jury Yield	IT Division	24%	22%	26%	24%	28%	26%	30%	28%

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 2010		FY 2011		FY 2012		FY 2013	
			Goal	Actual	Goal	Projection	Goal	Projection	Goal	Projection
Input	Requests for interpreters	OCIS statistics	7755	7751	8292	7960	8866	8511	9479	9100
End Outcome	Requests for interpreters met	OCIS statistics	100%	99.95%	100%	96%	100%	96%	100%	96%

Table 3
SPECIAL OPERATIONS DIVISION
Tax Division
Key Performance Indicators

Type of Indicator	Performance Indicator	Data Source	FY 2010		FY 2011		FY 2012		FY 2013	
			Goal	Actual	Goal	Projection	Goal	Projection	Goal	Projection
Input	Number of tax petitions filed	Court data	700	785	900	850	1000	900	1,100	1,000
Output/Activity	Number of cases prepared for hearing	Court data	1,300	1,534	1,450	1,500	1,400	1,450	1,300	1,400
End Outcome	Cases disposed	Court data	300	266	350	297	400	324	450	370
Productivity/Efficiency	Cases disposed/cases filed	Court data	42%	34%	39%	35%	40%	36%	41%	37%

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

Type of Indicator	Key Performance Indicator	Data Source	FY 2010		FY 2011		FY 2012		FY 2013	
			Goal	Actual	Goal	Projection	Goal	Projection	Goal	Projection
Input	Appeals received	Monthly statistical reports	1,140	1,360	1,200	1,200	1,200	1,200	1,225	1,225
Output/Activity	Appeal documents to the Court of Appeals within 60 days	Transcript lists, weekly worksheets, and team lists	85%	100%	88%	96%	90%	96%	90%	96%
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 2010		FY 2011		FY 2012		FY 2013	
			Goal	Actual	Goal	Projection	Goal	Projection	Goal	Projection
Output	Research Assistance Provided	Library Staff Data	New this year	2,184	2,402	2,402	2,643	2,643	2,907	2,907
Outcome	Users	Library Staff Data	9,772	10,922	12,014	12,014	13,215	13,215	14,536	14,536

FY 2013 Request

In FY 2013, the Courts request \$4,167,000 for the Special Operations Division, an increase of \$38,000 (1%) above the FY 2012 enacted level. The FY 2013 request includes \$38,000 for built-in cost increases.

Table 6
SPECIAL OPERATIONS DIVISION
Budget Authority by Object Class

	FY 2011 Enacted	FY 2012 Enacted	FY 2013 Request	Difference FY 2012/2013
11 – Personnel Compensation	1,978,000	2,085,000	2,115,000	30,000
12 – Personnel Benefits	496,000	523,000	531,000	8,000
<i>Subtotal Personnel Cost</i>	<i>2,474,000</i>	<i>2,608,000</i>	<i>2,646,000</i>	<i>38,000</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	151,000	151,000	0
25 - Other Services	599,000	1,119,000	1,119,000	0
26 - Supplies & Materials	233,000	241,000	241,000	0
31 - Equipment	8,000	10,000	10,000	0
<i>Subtotal Non-Personnel Cost</i>	<i>986,000</i>	<i>1,521,000</i>	<i>1,521,000</i>	<i>0</i>
TOTAL	3,460,000	4,129,000	4,167,000	38,000
FTE	31	31	31	0

Table 7
SPECIAL OPERATIONS DIVISION
Detail Difference, FY 2012/2013

Object Class	Description of Request	FTE	Cost	Difference FY 2012/2013
11 - Personnel Compensation	Current Positions WIG	31		30,000
12 - Personnel Benefits	Current Positions WIG	31		8,000
21 - Travel, Transp. of Persons				
22 - Transportation of Things				
23 - Rent, Commun. & Utilities				
24 - Printing and Reproduction				
25 - Other Services				
26 - Supplies & Materials				
31 - Equipment				
Total				38,000

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

Grade	FY 2011 Enacted	FY 2012 Enacted	FY 2013 Request
JS-4			
JS-5			
JS-6	4	4	4
JS-7	6	6	4
JS-8	3	3	5
JS-9	6	6	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	\$1,978,000	\$2,085,000	\$2,115,000
Total FTEs	31	31	31

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

<u>FY 2011 Enacted</u>		<u>FY 2012 Enacted</u>		<u>FY 2013 Request</u>		<u>Difference FY 2012/2013</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	10,411,000	0	11,278,000	0	11,031,000	0	-247,000

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 2013 Request

In FY 2013, the Courts request \$11,031,000 for the Management Account, which includes a budget reduction of \$250,000 and an increase of \$3,000, or a net reduction of \$247,000 (2%) from the FY 2012 enacted level. The request’s increase consists entirely of built-in cost increases.

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

	FY 2011 Enacted	FY 2012 Enacted	FY 2013 Request	Difference FY 2012/2013
11 - Personnel Compensation	142,000	139,000	141,000	2,000
12 - Personnel Benefits	4,000	5,000	6,000	1,000
<i>Subtotal Personnel Cost</i>	<i>146,000</i>	<i>144,000</i>	<i>147,000</i>	<i>3,000</i>
21 - Travel, Transp. of Persons	448,000	464,000	464,000	0
22 - Transportation of Things	11,000	13,000	13,000	0
23 - Rent, Commun. & Utilities	2,820,000	2,912,000	2,912,000	0
24 - Printing & Reproduction	307,000	318,000	318,000	0
25 - Other Services	6,047,000	6,774,000	6,524,000	-250,000
26 - Supplies & Materials	438,000	453,000	453,000	0
31 - Equipment	194,000	200,000	200,000	0
<i>Subtotal Non-Personnel Cost</i>	<i>10,265,000</i>	<i>11,134,000</i>	<i>10,884,000</i>	<i>-250,000</i>
TOTAL	10,411,000	11,278,000	11,031,000	-247,000
FTE	0	0	0	0

Table 2
MANAGEMENT ACCOUNT
Detail Difference, FY 2012/2013

Object Class	Description of Request	FTE	Cost	Difference FY 2012/2013
11 - Personnel Compensation	Built-in		2,000	
12 - Personnel Benefits	Built-in		1,000	
<i>Subtotal</i>				3,000
21 - Travel, Transp. of Persons				
22 - Transportation of Things				
23 - Rent, Commun. & Utilities				
24 - Printing & Reproduction				
25 - Other Service	Budget Reduction			-250,000
26 - Supplies & Materials				
31 - Equipment				
Total				-247,000