

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA SUPERIOR COURT
Overview

<u>FY 2007 Enacted</u>		<u>FY 2008 Enacted</u>		<u>FY 2009 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>
912	87,342,000	912	98,359,000	929	110,135,000	17	11,776,000

Introduction

The Superior Court of the District of Columbia is unique among the nation’s trial courts. It accounts for among the highest number of case filings per capita in the United States (as reported by the National Center for State Courts for several years) as it serves all those residing, visiting, and conducting business in the Nation’s Capital as its only trial court. It receives its funding directly from the Federal government and operates in the nation’s most visible arena. With the support of 110 judicial officers, including 59 active judges, 26 senior judges, and 25 magistrate judges, the Superior Court is the court of general jurisdiction over virtually all local legal matters. Supported by approximately 800 non-judicial personnel, the Court operates six major divisions identified below and the Special Operations Division (including the Tax Division), the Domestic Violence Unit, the Crime Victims Compensation Program, and the Office of the Auditor-Master. The major divisions are--

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

Caseload and Case Filings

During FY 2006, 124,003 new cases were filed with the Superior Court. Of the total new filings, 57% were civil cases; 24% were criminal cases; 11% were family cases; 6% were domestic violence cases and the remaining 2% were probate and tax cases. In addition to new case filings, as of October 1, 2005, there were 69,817 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>
2001	142,623	51,083	209,181
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

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

Table 2
District of Columbia Superior Court Efficiency Measures (Fiscal Year 2006 data)

	<u>Cases Disposed</u>	<u>Cases Added</u>	<u>Clearance</u>	<u>Cases Pending</u>		
			<u>Rate*</u>	<u>01-Oct</u>	<u>30-Sep</u>	<u>Change</u>
Civil	63,584	71,486	**	26,526	29,480	11%
Criminal	35,193	29,203	**	5,900	10,098	69%
Domestic Violence	7,919	7,691	103%	1,035	807	-22%
Family	12,938	14,329	90%	13,091	14,482	11%
Probate	4,100	2,852	na	5,312	4,064	-24%
Tax	226	196	115%	473	443	-6%
Total	123,960	125,757	na	52,337	59,374	13%

*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.

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

FY 2009 Request

The D.C. Courts' mission is to protect rights and liberties, uphold and interpret the law, and resolve disputes peacefully, fairly and effectively in the Nation's Capital. To perform the mission and realize their vision of a court that is open to all, trusted by all, and provides justice for all, the D.C. Courts have identified 6 strategic issues, which comprise the center of our strategic goals:

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

The Superior Court has aligned its FY 2009 request around three of the six issues—fair and timely case resolution; access to justice, and public trust and confidence.

In FY 2009, the Superior Court requests \$110,135,000 and 929 FTEs, an increase of \$11,776,000 (12%) and 17 FTEs above the FY 2008 Enacted Budget. The request includes increases to support the following Court goals:

Strategic Issue 1: Fair and timely case resolution--\$494,000 and 8 FTEs

The Superior Court's FY 2009 request includes \$494,000 and 8 FTEs to address the Courts' strategic issue of fair and timely case resolution, including \$159,000 and 2 FTEs to enhance monitoring of incapacitated adults; \$151,000 and 3 FTEs to meet increases in intervention and trust caseloads; \$93,000 and 2 FTEs to enhance jury service; and \$91,000 and 1 FTE to enhance mediation toward settlements in complex civil cases.

Strategic Issue 2: Access to justice--\$1,137,000 and 4 FTEs

The Superior Court's FY 2009 request includes \$1,137,000 and 4 FTEs to address the Courts' strategic issue of access to justice, including \$872,000 and 2 FTEs to enhance services to persons with intellectual disabilities under court supervision; \$105,000 for a rate increase for foreign language and sign language interpreters; \$91,000 and 1 FTE to enhance services for defendants with mental illness; and \$69,000 and 1 FTE to improve the quality of justice in Landlord Tenant Court.

Strategic Issue 6: Public Trust and Confidence--\$5,412,000 and 5 FTEs

The Superior Court's FY 2009 request includes \$5,412,000 and 5 FTEs to address the Courts' strategic issue of public trust and confidence, including \$5,283,000 and 5 FTEs to enhance services and programs for juvenile offenders and \$129,000 to increase the transit subsidy for court personnel.

Table 3
SUPERIOR COURT
Budget Authority by Object Class

	FY 2007 Enacted	FY 2008 Enacted	FY 2009 Request	Difference FY 2008/2009
11 – Compensation	60,340,000	67,982,000	72,354,000	4,372,000
12 – Benefits	12,923,000	15,697,000	16,919,000	1,222,000
<i>Sub-total Personnel Cost</i>	<i>73,263,000</i>	<i>83,679,000</i>	<i>89,273,000</i>	<i>5,594,000</i>
21 - Travel, Transp. of Persons	284,000	296,000	303,000	7,000
22 - Transportation of Things	9,000	9,000	10,000	1,000
23 - Rent, Commun. & Utilities	4,536,000	4,748,000	5,569,000	821,000
24 - Printing & Reproduction	491,000	526,000	541,000	15,000
25 - Other Services	7,307,000	7,612,000	12,875,000	5,263,000
26 - Supplies & Materials	804,000	828,000	866,000	38,000
31 – Equipment	648,000	661,000	698,000	37,000
<i>Sub-total Non Personnel Cost</i>	<i>14,079,000</i>	<i>14,680,000</i>	<i>20,862,000</i>	<i>6,182,000</i>
TOTAL	87,342,000	98,359,000	110,135,000	11,776,000
FTE	912	912	929	17

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

<u>FY 2007 Enacted</u>		<u>FY 2008 Enacted</u>		<u>FY 2009 Request</u>		<u>Difference</u> <u>FY 2008/2009</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	20,941,000	204	24,149,000	205	25,308,000	1	1,159,000

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 2006, Superior Court judges handled nearly 130,000 new case filings. The 59 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 2009 Request

In FY 2009, the Courts request \$25,308,000 for Judges and Chambers Staff, an increase of \$1,159,000 (4.8%) above the FY 2008 Enacted Budget. The requested increase consists of \$69,000 for Landlord and Tenant Law Clerk position and built-in cost increases. The FTE request is based upon the voluminous Landlord and Tenant caseload and implementation of legislative changes that have impacted case processing.

FTE Request: 1 Landlord & Tenant Law Clerk, JS-10, \$69,000

Problem Statement. The Landlord and Tenant Branch continues to experience a very high volume of case filings. These cases require significant attention in light of the fact that individuals' living quarters are at risk in each case. With at least 250 cases on each day's calendar, it is nearly impossible for the judge to review every case at the level of detail necessary for the enhanced administration of justice. The law clerk will review complaints and other pleadings for legal compliance and prepare notices of deficient pleadings as necessary. Further, the law clerk will review each case as it is scheduled for a hearing to help the judge make informed decisions and manage the caseload; this will include a review of lengthy motions. The position exists, albeit on a temporary basis, and has proven invaluable. Funding is unavailable to support this critical position on a permanent basis. To quote Judge Joan Zeldon, the Presiding Judge of the Civil Division:

The Landlord and Tenant Court law clerk provides invaluable assistance to the judge sitting on the bench in that Court. The Bar is very supportive of this position because it enables the judge to handle many motions requiring expertise on the day they are set for a hearing. Simply put, the quality of justice offered by the Landlord & Tenant Court is significantly improved by having a law clerk in

that Court to assist the judge, court staff, litigants, and pro bono lawyers and law students.

In addition, this individual will be required to:

- Prepare proposed orders and other documents as directed by the Court.
- Serve as a member of the Landlord and Tenant Rules Committee.
- Assist the Landlord and Tenant Clerks office when legal questions regarding procedures and operating standards arise.

Relationship to Court Mission and Goals.

Access to Justice. By reviewing cases just prior to a hearing, the law clerk is in the best position to provide a synopsis of the case for the sitting judge, which enables the judge to handle many motions on the hearing date. The law clerk will review pleadings, prepare orders and to explain legal matters in a clear and concise manner.

Public Trust and Confidence. The new position of Landlord and Tenant Law Clerk will insure that the Landlord and Tenant judge is fully aware of the past record and current issues of each case before the court. This will result in a more expeditious ruling and engender the confidence of the litigants. Regardless of which party prevails, all parties will know that the judge made an informed decision and they will feel that the process was fair.

Relationship to Divisional Objectives. The requested position will support the Court’s objectives by increasing the Landlord and Tenant Court’s capacity to process cases, thereby reducing the case processing time.

Proposed Solution. The proposed solution is to increase the Judges and Chambers staff by one Landlord and Tenant Law Clerk.

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

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

Table 1
JUDGES AND CHAMBERS
New Positions Requested

Position	Grade	Number	Annual Salary	Benefits	Total Personnel Costs
Landlord and Tenant Law Clerk	JS 10	1	\$55,000	\$14,000	\$69,000

Table 2
JUDGES AND CHAMBERS STAFF
Budget Authority by Object Class

	FY 2007 Enacted	FY 2008 Enacted	FY 2009 Request	Difference FY 2008/2009
11 – Compensation	18,011,000	20,210,000	21,134,000	924,000
12 – Benefits	2,835,000	3,840,000	4,071,000	231,000
Subtotal Personnel Cost	<i>20,846,000</i>	<i>24,050,000</i>	<i>25,205,000</i>	<i>1,155,000</i>
- Travel, Transp. of Persons				
22 - Transportation of Things				
23 - Rent, Commun. & Utilities				
24 - Printing & Reproduction	5,000	5,000	6,000	1,000
25 - Other Services				
26 - Supplies & Materials	49,000	51,000	53,000	2,000
31 – Equipment	41,000	43,000	44,000	1,000
Subtotal Non Personnel Cost	<i>95,000</i>	<i>99,000</i>	<i>103,000</i>	<i>4,000</i>
TOTAL	20,941,000	24,149,000	25,308,000	1,159,000
FTE	204	204	205	1

Table 3
JUDGES AND CHAMBERS STAFF
Detail, Difference FY 2008/2009

Object Class	Description of Request	FTE	Cost	Difference FY 2008/2009
11 - Compensation	Current Positions WIG	204	20,000	
	Current Positions COLA	204	849,000	
	New Law Clerk	1	55,000	
	Subtotal			924,000
12 - Benefits	Current Positions WIG	204	5,000	
	Current Positions COLA	204	212,000	
	New Law Clerk	1	14,000	
	Subtotal			231,000
21 - Travel, Transp. of Persons				
22 - Transportation of Things				
23 - Rent, Commun. & Utilities				
24 - Printing & Reproduction	Built-in		1,000	1,000
25 - Other Service				
26 - Supplies & Materials	Built-in		2,000	2,000
31 - Equipment	Built-In		1,000	1,000
Total				1,159,000

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

<u>FY 2007 Enacted</u>		<u>FY 2008 Enacted</u>		<u>FY 2009 Request</u>		<u>Difference FY 2008/2009</u>	
FTE	Obligations	FTE	Obligations	FTE	Obligations	FTE	Obligations
47	5,543,000	47	6,443,000	47	6,722,000	0	279,000

The Superior Court has 25 Magistrate Judges, 16 of whom are assigned to Family Court matters. Magistrate Judges in the Family Court and the Domestic Violence Unit of the Superior Court are responsible for the following: (1) administering oaths and affirmations and taking acknowledgements; (2) conducting hearings, making findings and entering judgments in connection with questions of child support handled by the Family Court and Domestic Violence Unit, including establishing temporary support obligations and entering default orders; (3) making findings and entering interim and final orders or judgments in other contested or uncontested proceedings in the Family Court and the Domestic Violence Unit, except for jury trials or felony trials; and (4) ordering imprisonment of up to 180 days for contempt.

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

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

FY 2009 Request

In FY 2009, the Courts request \$6,722,000 for Magistrate Judges and Staff, an increase of \$279,000 (4.3%) above the FY 2008 Enacted Budget. The requested increase consists entirely of built-in cost increases.

Table 1
MAGISTRATE JUDGES AND STAFF
Budget Authority by Object Class

	FY 2007 Enacted	FY 2008 Enacted	FY 2009 Request	Difference FY 2008/2009
11 - Compensation	4,457,000	5,140,000	5,361,000	221,000
12 - Benefits	1,070,000	1,285,000	1,340,000	55,000
Subtotal Personnel Cost	5,527,000	6,425,000	6,701,000	276,000
21 - Travel, Transp. of Persons				
22 - Transportation of Things				
23 - Rent, Commun. & Utilities				
24 - Printing & Reproduction	2,000	2,000	3,000	0
25 - Other Services				
26 - Supplies & Materials	8,000	9,000	10,000	1,000
31 - Equipment	6,000	7,000	8,000	1,000
Subtotal Non Personnel Cost	16,000	18,000	21,000	1,000
TOTAL	5,543,000	6,443,000	6,722,000	279,000
FTE	47	47	47	0

Table 2
MAGISTRATE JUDGES AND STAFF
Detail, Difference FY 2008/2009

Object Class	Description of Request	FTE	Cost	Difference FY 2007/2008
11 - Compensation	Current Positions WIG	47	5,000	
	Current Positions COLA	47	216,000	
Subtotal				221,000
12 - Benefits	Current Positions WIG	47	1,000	
	Current Positions COLA	47	54,000	
Subtotal				55,000
21 - Travel, Transportation of Persons				
22 - Transportation of Things				
23 - Rent, Communications & Utilities				
24 - Printing & Reproduction	Built-in		1,000	1,000
25 - Other Services				
26 - Supplies & Materials	Built-in		1,000	1,000
31 - Equipment	Built-in		1,000	1,000
Total				279,000

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

<u>FY 2007 Enacted</u>		<u>FY 2008 Enacted</u>		<u>FY 2009 Request</u>		<u>Difference FY 2008/2009</u>	
FTE	Obligations	FTE	Obligations	FTE	Obligations	FTE	Obligations
5 ¹	988,000	5	646,000	5	686,000	0	40,000

Mission Statement

The Office of the Clerk of the Court manages the day-to-day operations of the Superior Court. The Clerk provides policy guidance, administrative direction, and supervision for ten divisions and offices within the Superior Court, reviews and issues final decisions in employee disciplinary actions and grievances, approves division requests for staff, equipment and other resources, plans and monitors the implementation of court improvement projects, and develops the Superior Court’s annual budget. The Office of the Clerk of the Court contributes to the Court’s strategic goals of providing managerial assistance and support to the operating divisions so they can provide fair, swift and accessible justice, enhancing public safety, and ensuring public trust and confidence in the justice system.

Organizational Background

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

FY 2009 Request

For FY 2009, the D.C. Courts request \$686,000 for the Office of the Clerk of the Court, an increase of \$40,000 (6%) above the FY 2008 Enacted Budget. The requested increase consists entirely of built-in increases.

¹ Five positions were reassigned to the Information Technology Division.

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

	2007 Enacted	FY 2008 Enacted	FY 2009 Request	Difference FY 2008/2009
11 - Personnel Compensation	792,000	512,000	542,000	30,000
12 - Personnel Benefits	190,000	128,000	136,000	8,000
Subtotal Personnel Cost	982,000	640,000	678,000	38,000
21 - Travel, Transp. of Persons				
22 - Transportation of Things				
23 - Rent, Commun. & Utilities				
24 - Printing & Reproduction				
25 - Other Services				
26 - Supplies & Materials	5,000	5,000	6,000	1,000
31 - Equipment	1,000	1,000	2,000	1,000
Subtotal Non Personnel Cost	6,000	6,000	8,000	2,000
TOTAL	988,000	646,000	686,000	40,000
FTE	5	5	5	0

Table 2
OFFICE OF THE CLERK OF THE COURT
 Detail, Difference FY 2008/2009

Object Class	Description of Request	FTE	Cost	Difference FY 2008/ 2009
11 - Personnel Compensation	Current Positions WIGS	5	8,000	
	Current Positions COLA	5	22,000	
Subtotal				30,000
12 - Personnel Benefits	Current Positions WIGS	5	2,000	
	Current Positions COLA	5	6,000	
Subtotal				8,000
21 - Travel, Transp. of Persons				
22 - Transportation of Things				
23 - Rent, Commun. & Utilities				
24 - Printing & Reproduction				
25 - Other Service				
26 - Supplies & Materials	Built-in		1,000	1,000
31 - Equipment	Built-in		1,000	1,000
Total				\$40,000

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

	FY 2007 Enacted	FY 2008 Enacted	FY 2009 Request
JS-3			
JS-4			
JS-5			
JS-6			
JS-7			
JS-8	1	1	1
JS-9			
JS-10			
JS-11	1	1	1
JS-12			
JS-13			
JS-14	2	2	2
JS-15			
JS-16			
JS-17			
CES	1	1	1
JS Salaries	792,000	512,000	542,000
TOTAL	5	5	5

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

<u>FY 2007 Enacted</u>		<u>FY 2008 Enacted</u>		<u>FY 2009 Request</u>		<u>Difference FY 2008/2009</u>	
<u>FTE</u>	<u>Obligations</u>	<u>FTE</u>	<u>Obligations</u>	<u>FTE</u>	<u>Obligations</u>	<u>FTE</u>	<u>Obligations</u>
3	271,000	3	348,000	3	370,000	0	22,000

Mission Statement

The mission of the Office of the Auditor-Master is to assist the judiciary and parties in actions filed in the D.C. Superior Court to expeditiously state accounts for persons under the authority of the Court who have defaulted in their fiduciary responsibilities and to resolve controversies involving complex financial computations and transactions in the Civil, Probate, and Tax Divisions and Family Court.

The principal role of the Auditor-Master is to state accounts and determine the value of assets and liabilities, and make other complex financial calculations where no agreement has been reached among the parties, thus conserving judicial time and resources. The Auditor-Master is also available to assist the judiciary by presiding over discovery and settlement negotiations and other pretrial issues, as well as post-trial monitoring of judgments, consent decrees, and settlements in complex civil litigation. The Auditor-Master presides over hearings, takes testimony, and issues subpoenas to establish the record.

Organizational Background

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

Divisional MAP Objectives

The objectives of the Office of the Auditor-Master are as follows:

- Objective 1. Ensure the timely processing of non-complex cases referred to the Office of the Auditor-Master by resolving at least 70% of them within 150 days and 80% of them within 210 days of referral.
- Objective 2. Ensure the timely processing of complex cases referred to the Office of the Auditor-Master by resolving at least 45% of them within 210 days and 80% of the cases within 270 days of referral.
- Objective 3. Increase the use of the Office of the Auditor-Master by continuing to educate the public on the function and utilization of the Office by developing informational pamphlets for court participants.

Table 1
OFFICE OF THE AUDITOR-MASTER
Caseload Overview

Case Activity Calendar Year 2006			Cases Pending Fiscal Year 2006		
Dispositions	Cases Referred	Clearance Rate ²	1 Oct	30 Sep	Change
53	42	126%	41	20	-47%

Table 2
OFFICE OF THE AUDITOR-MASTER
Key Performance Indicators

Key Performance Indicator	Data Source	FY 2005		FY 2006		Projection FY 2007	Projection FY 2008
		Goal	Actual	Goal	Estimate		
Newly Referred Noncomplex Orders of Reference resolved in 150 days	Monthly Reports	70%	100%	65%	80%	65%	70%
Newly Referred Complex Orders of Reference resolved in < 270 days	Monthly Reports	80%	100%	70%	75%	80%	80%

FY 2009 Request

In FY 2009, the D.C. Courts request \$370,000 for the Office of the Auditor-Master, an increase of \$22,000 (6%) above the FY 2008 Enacted Budget. The requested increase consists entirely of built-in increases.

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

	FY 2007 Enacted	FY 2008 Enacted	FY 2009 Request	Difference FY 2008/2009
11 – Compensation	209,000	268,000	283,000	15,000
12 – Benefits	50,000	67,000	71,000	4,000
Subtotal Personnel Cost	<i>259,000</i>	<i>335,000</i>	<i>354,000</i>	<i>19,000</i>
21 - Travel, Transp. of Persons				
22 - Transportation of Things				
23 - Rent, Commun. & Utilities				
24 - Printing & Reproduction				
25 - Other Services	2,000	2,000	3,000	1,000
26 - Supplies & Materials	2,000	2,000	3,000	1,000
31 – Equipment	8,000	9,000	10,000	1,000
Subtotal Non Personnel Cost	<i>12,000</i>	<i>13,000</i>	<i>16,000</i>	<i>3,000</i>
TOTAL	271,000	348,000	370,000	22,000
FTE	3	3	3	0

² Ratio of cases disposed to cases added in a given year. A standard efficiency measure is 100% meaning one case disposed for each case filed.

Table 4
OFFICE OF THE AUDITOR-MASTER
Detail Difference, FY 2008/2009

Object Class	Description of Request	Grade	FTE	Cost	Difference FY 2008/2009
11- Personnel Compensation	Current Positions WIGS		3	4,000	
	Current Positions COLA		3	11,000	
Subtotal					15,000
12- Personnel Benefits	Current Positions WIGS		3	1,000	
	Current Positions COLA		3	3,000	
Subtotal					4,000
21 – Travel, Transp. of Persons					
22 – Transportation of Things					
23 – Rent, Commun & Utilities					
24 – Printing & Reproduction					
25 – Other Service	Built-in			1,000	1,000
26 – Supplies & Materials	Built-in			1,000	1,000
31 - Equipment	Built-in			1,000	1,000
Total					\$22,000

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

	FY 2007 Enacted	FY 2008 Enacted	FY 2009 Request
JS-3			
JS-4			
JS-5			
JS-6			
JS-7			
JS-8			
JS-9	1	1	1
JS-10			
JS-11			
JS-12	1	1	1
JS-13			
JS-14			
JS-15			
JS-16			
JS-17			
CES	1	1	1
Total Salaries	209,000	268,000	283,000
Total	3	3	3

**DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA SUPERIOR COURT
CIVIL DIVISION**

<u>FY 2007 Enacted</u>		<u>FY 2008 Enacted</u>		<u>FY 2009 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>
98	6,096,000	98	6,649,000	98	7,027,000	0	378,000

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

Organizational Background

The Division is comprised of a Director’s Office, which has 3 FTEs and four branches described as follows:

1. The Civil Actions Branch receives and processes all new civil cases filed in the District of Columbia where the amount in controversy exceeds \$5,000, including cases requesting equitable relief (such as an injunction or temporary restraining order). In FY 2006 there were more than 9,000 civil actions filed. Responsibilities also include providing procedural information to the public, accurately maintaining the official case file and the storage of all civil cases, physically and electronically. This branch has 31 FTEs.
2. The Quality Review Branch (formerly the Civil Assignment Branch) monitors compliance with time limits imposed by civil delay reduction mandates; processes all types of post-judgment implementation; schedules events in civil actions cases, including landlord tenant and small claims jury cases; handles IJIS-related identity consolidation matters; issues notices; and manages courtroom staffing and operations. This branch has 27 FTEs.
3. The Landlord Tenant Branch processes all actions for the possession of rental property and violations of lease agreements filed by landlords. The branch handled a caseload of over 55,000 filings in fiscal year 2006 and has 18 FTEs.
4. The Small Claims and Conciliation Branch oversees the processing, scheduling, and adjudication of cases where the amount in controversy is \$5,000 or less. In FY 2006, there were over 21,000 small claims cases filed. This branch has 19 FTEs.

Divisional Objectives

- To ensure prompt and efficient processing of all cases filed within its jurisdictional authority and to accurately record all information related to case filings;

- To allow easy access to data related to civil cases in a prompt and accurate manner;
- To provide quality customer service in a prompt, professional, and courteous manner;
- To maintain vital links to the community, local government agencies, and the Bar to address issues of concern to these entities;
- To provide ongoing and continuous evaluation of all work units and processes to ensure maximum efficiency in civil case processing;
- To ensure a capable, ethical, and productive staff through implementation of a systematic program of human resources management and skill development.

Workload Restructuring

During FY 2006, the Division continued to implement the CourtView case management system, also known as the Integrated Justice Information System (IJIS). During the same period, the Division continued to address several customer service initiatives through the development of Management Action Plans (MAPs), which tie these initiatives to the Court's five-year Strategic Plan. In addition, the Division reengineered several position functions and established more comprehensive staff training, particularly in light of the implementation of IJIS.

Management Action Plans

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

- Facilitate expeditious, easy and secure case filing and access to case information, thereby increasing access to justice and enhanced customer service, by instituting E-Filing in all Civil cases.
- Ensure the timely processing of civil cases in all sections of the branch by performing all case processing activities in compliance with standard operating procedures.
- Enhance customer satisfaction by ensuring that at least 90% of customers are served within 10 minutes of their arrival in the Clerk's Offices.
- Enhance understanding of the court process by Spanish-speaking persons by ensuring that at least one bi-lingual staff member is assigned to each public office.
- Enhance staff performance and increase operational efficiency in the Division by requiring that 50% of all deputy clerks and courtroom clerks complete ten hours of cross training.
- Enhance employee performance and professional development by requiring at least 75% of all employees to complete a minimum of 10 hours of job related training annually.
- Enhance the understanding of the court process by Spanish-speaking persons by translating appropriate forms/orders.

Workload Data

As shown in Table 1 below, the Civil Division disposed of 63,584 cases in fiscal year 2006, including more than 10,000 civil actions; 44,258 landlord tenant cases; and 8,809 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 2006 Data)

	<u>Dispositions</u>	<u>New Filings</u>	<u>Clearance</u> <u>Rate*</u>	<u>Pending Cases**</u>		
				<u>1-Oct</u>	<u>30-</u> <u>Sep</u>	<u>Change</u>
Civil Actions	10,517	9,329	*	11,063	8,843	-20%
Landlord & Tenant	44,258	46,819	*	8,353	10,511	26%
Small Claims	8,809	15,320	*	7,110	10,126	42%
Total	63,584	71,486	*	26,526	29,480	11%

*The caseload figures for the Civil Division will be subject to adjustment in the future as a result of ongoing data verification activities due to the conversion to the court's integrated justice information system. Accordingly, the calculation of clearance rates for this caseload would not be appropriate.

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

Table 2
CIVIL DIVISION
Key Performance Measures
(Fiscal Year 2006 Data)

Type of Indicator	Performance Indicator	Data Source	Actual FY 2006	Estimate FY 2007	Projection FY 2008	Projection FY 2009
Input	Number of cases filed	Court reports	69,810	65,750	61,200	57,000
Output	Number of cases disposed	Civil Case Processing System	64,904	64,000	58,905	54,300
Outcome	Cases disposed in < 18 months*	Court's Monthly Statistical Report	82%	85%	87%	90%

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

FY 2009 Request

In FY 2009, the Courts request \$7,027,000 for the Civil Division, an increase of \$378,000 (6%) above the FY 2008 Enacted Budget. The requested increase consists of built-in increases.

Table 4
CIVIL DIVISION
Budget Authority by Object Class

	FY 2007 Enacted	FY 2008 Enacted	FY 2009 Request	Difference FY 2008/2009
11 - Compensation	4,871,000	5,272,000	5,572,000	300,000
12 – Benefits	1,169,000	1,318,000	1,393,000	75,000
Subtotal Personnel Cost	<i>6,040,000</i>	<i>6,590,000</i>	<i>6,965,000</i>	<i>375,000</i>
21 - Travel, Transp. of Persons				
22 - Transportation of Things				
23 - Rent, Commun. & Utilities				
24 - Printing & Reproduction	17,000	18,000	19,000	1,000
25 - Other Services				
26 - Supplies & Materials	19,000	20,000	21,000	1,000
31 – Equipment	20,000	21,000	22,000	1,000
Subtotal Non Personnel Cost	<i>56,000</i>	<i>59,000</i>	<i>62,000</i>	<i>3,000</i>
TOTAL	6,096,000	6,649,000	7,027,000	378,000
FTE	98	98	98	0

Table 5
CIVIL DIVISION
Detail, Difference FY 2008/2009

Object Class	Description of Request	FTE	Cost	Difference FY 2008/2009
11 - Compensation	Current Positions COLA	98	221,000	
	Current Positions WIGS	98	79,000	
Subtotal				300,000
12 – Personnel Benefits	Current Positions COLA	98	55,000	
	Current Positions WIGS	98	20,000	
Subtotal				75,000
21 - Travel, Transp. of Persons				
22 - Transportation of Things				
23 - Rent, Commun. & Utilities				
24 - Printing & Reproduction	Built-in		1,000	1,000
25 - Other Services				
26 - Supplies & Materials	Built-in		1,000	1,000
31 - Equipment	Built-in		1,000	1,000
Total				378,000

Table 6
CIVIL DIVISION
Detail of Full-Time Equivalent Employment

	FY 2007 Enacted	FY 2008 Enacted	FY 2009 Request
JS-3			
JS-4	11	10	10
JS-5	1	1	1
JS-6	19	8	8
JS-7	24	17	17
JS-8	8	25	25
JS-9	21	18	18
JS-10	6	6	6
JS-11	3	3	3
JS-12	4	4	4
JS-13	4	4	4
JS-14	1	1	1
JS-15	1	1	1
JS-16			
JS-17			
Total Salaries	4,871,000	5,272,000	5,572,000
TOTAL	98	98	98

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

<u>FY 2007 Enacted</u>		<u>FY 2008 Enacted</u>		<u>FY 2009 Request</u>		<u>Difference</u>	
<u>FTE</u>	<u>Obligations</u>	<u>FTE</u>	<u>Obligations</u>	<u>FTE</u>	<u>Obligations</u>	<u>FTE</u>	<u>Obligations</u>
7	\$639,000	7	\$717,000	7	\$760,000	0	\$43,000

Mission Statement

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

Organizational Background

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

Administrative and Grant Funding

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

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

Division MAP Objectives

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

- Provide timely service to crime victims by processing at least 80% of uncomplicated claims for assistance within 10-12 weeks.
- Collaborate with other agencies to enhance the coordination of services to victims, beginning October 1, 2006.
- Ensure the effective administration of the CVCP by securing and managing grant awards to pay crime victim claims and operate the program, by 6/30 annually.
- Enhance employee performance by requiring all staff to complete at least 10 hours of job-related training, by September annually.
- Enhance employee performance by evaluating employees under new performance plans that link employee job elements and standards with CVCP MAP objectives for all staff, by August 1 of each year.
- Enhance public awareness of the CVCP by making at least six presentations at organized community events or staff meeting of agencies and organizations that have contact with victims, by September 30, annually.
- Explore trends in the criminal justice system that affect crime victims and develop appropriate responses in the Crime Victims Compensation Program by September 2009.
- Enhance the professionalism and skills of Crime Victim Compensation Program employees by increasing their knowledge of resources available to victims in the community and the criminal justice system, by inviting at least 10 community organizations to speak at staff meetings, by September 30, annually.
- Determine the feasibility of purchasing new case processing software for the Crime Victims Compensation Program, by September 30, 2008.

Division Restructuring or Work Process Redesign

The major activities of the Crime Victims Compensation Program are case processing, record management, outreach, and administrative functions. The activities associated with case processing account for almost all functions of the office and affect every position. The major tasks associated with case processing are victim interview, input in the case management software, verification, and investigation of the claim, recommendation, review, and approval.

This process is somewhat shortened for supplemental claims, (i.e., all additional payments made after the initial payment) because there is no need for an additional interview or input of information in the software system; however, verification of the additional payment must still take place to ensure that it is a crime-related expense.

Claims processing redesign. The Crime Victims Compensation Program has developed a classification plan to differentiate abandoned claims from active claims and either close the cases administratively or determine that the claimant is eligible, but there are no current payments to be made in the case. The Program Director aggressively reviews and reclassifies claims that have not had any activity in over 90 days. In FY 2006, 259 or 12% of the determinations were classified as “Eligible no payment,” where an application was filed by a claimant and no bills were ever submitted for payment, or “Administrative closures,” where the application is filed, however, insufficient information is provided to make a determination regarding eligibility. In FY 2006, 48 or 2% of cases were classified as “administrative closures.” In both categories, the claim may be reopened once the claimant provides additional information; however, it is no longer regarded as a pending case.

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

Outreach Protocols. To strengthen program outreach, the Crime Victims Compensation Program determined that resources would be best used to establish protocols with major agencies and organizations that have direct contact with victims, such as the District of Columbia’s Metropolitan Police Department (MPD), the Children’s Hospital Child and Adolescent Protection Center, U.S. Attorney’s Victim Witness Assistance Unit, the Office of the Attorney General for the District of Columbia, the D.C. Medical Examiner’s Office, and the Chinatown Service Center. These protocols enhance the ability of the Compensation Program to serve greater numbers of victims of violent crime and reach victims that are likely to be eligible for compensation, reducing staff time spent with victims that the Program cannot serve and the effort expended in the denial of a claim. Applications as well as informational brochures are provided to victims by these organizations. In addition to the traditional methods of outreach, the Crime Victims Compensation Program has established an “In-Service” Training Schedule which invites community organizations to attend our bi-weekly staff meetings and present information about their organizations and the services that they can offer crime victims, such as food, housing, legal services, and employment referrals to supplement the services provided by the Compensation Program. This has proven to be an invaluable outreach tool because it creates a new point of contact in the organization and leads to many new referrals.

Workload Data

Table 1
CRIME VICTIMS COMPENSATION PROGRAM
Caseload Overview

	Actual FY2006	FY 2007 Estimated	% Change
New Cases Filed	2,347	2,380	1%
Determinations Made	2,183	2,500	15%
Number of Cases Pending at End of Fiscal Year	616	496	-20%

Table 2
CRIME VICTIMS COMPENSATION PROGRAM
Performance Measurement Table

Type of Indicator	Performance Indicator	Data Source	FY 2006		FY 2007		Projection FY 2008	Projection FY 2009
			Goal	Actual	Goal	Estimated		
Input	# Of new claims filed	Case Management Software	2,315	2,347	2,380	2,380	2,450	2,520
Output	# Of claims processed	Case Management Software	2,400	2,183	2500	2,500	2,580	2,650
Output	# Of payments	Case Management Software	9,100	8,916	9,100	9,100	9,380	9,650
Outcome	Dollar amount of payments	Case Management Software	\$7,500,000	\$7,517,576	\$7,900,000	\$7,900,000	\$8,137,000	\$8,380,000
Outcome	Avg. claim processing time	Case Management Software	11 weeks	9 weeks	9 weeks	10 weeks	10weeks	10 weeks

FY 2009 Request

In FY 2009, the Courts request \$760,000 for the Crime Victims Compensation Program, an increase of \$43,000 (6%) above the FY 2008 Enacted Budget. The request consists of built-in cost increases.

Table 3
CRIME VICTIMS COMPENSATION PROGRAM
Budget Authority by Object Class

	FY 2007 Enacted	FY 2008 Enacted	FY 2009 Request	Difference FY 2008/2009
11 - Compensation	502,000	560,000	592,000	32,000
12 - Benefits	120,000	140,000	148,000	8,000
Subtotal Personnel Cost	622,000	700,000	740,000	40,000
21 - Travel, Transp. of Persons				
22 - Transportation of Things				
23 - Rent, Commun. & Utilities				
24 - Printing & Reproduction				
25 - Other Services	15,000	15,000	16,000	1,000
26 - Supplies & Materials	1,000	1,000	2,000	1,000
31 - Equipment	1,000	1,000	2,000	1,000
Subtotal Non Personnel Cost	17,000	17,000	20,000	3,000
TOTAL	639,000	717,000	760,000	43,000
FTE	7	7	7	0

Table 4
CRIME VICTIMS COMPENSATION PROGRAM
Detail Difference, FY 2008/2009

Object Class	Description of Request	FTE	Cost	Difference FY 2008/2009
11 - Compensation	Current Position WIG	7	8,000	
	Current Position COLA	7	24,000	
Subtotal				32,000
12 - Benefits	Current Position WIG	7	2,000	
	Current Position COLA	7	6,000	
Subtotal				8,000
21 - Travel, Transp. of Persons				
22 - Transportation of Things				
23 - Rent, Commun. & Utilities				
24 - Printing & Reproduction				
25 - Other Service	Built-in			1,000
26 - Supplies & Materials	Built-in			1,000
31 - Equipment	Built-in			1,000
Total				43,000

Table 5
CRIME VICTIMS COMPENSATION PROGRAM
Detail of Full-Time Equivalent Employment³

	FY 2007 Actual	FY 2008 Enacted	FY 2009 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	1	1	1
JS-14			
JS-15			
JS-16			
JS-17			
CES	1	1	1
Total Salary	502,000	560,000	592,000
Total	7	7	7

³ Only seven FTEs in the Compensation Program are supported by appropriated funds. Two Legal Claims Examiner positions are paid from administrative monies of the Crime Victims Fund as allowed by D.C. Code §4-515(e), and an Assistant Legal Claims Examiner position is supported by administrative funds from a VOCA Compensation grant.

**DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA SUPERIOR COURT
CRIMINAL DIVISION**

<u>FY 2007 Enacted</u>		<u>FY 2008 Enacted</u>		<u>FY 2009 Request</u>		<u>Difference</u>	
FTE	Obligations	FTE	Obligations	FTE	Obligations	FTE	Obligations
118	7,331,000	118	8,608,000	119	9,188,000	1	580,000

Mission

The mission of the Criminal Division is to ensure fairness, provide quality support services, ensure efficient and timely case processing, and provide information to Federal and District of Columbia law enforcement and criminal justice agencies and the public. The Criminal Division also promotes high standards of professional conduct, and promotes restorative and rehabilitative justice through its East of the River and District of Columbia Traffic and Misdemeanor community-based initiatives.

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

Organizational Background

The Criminal Division was created in accordance with the D.C. Code §11-902 which establishes court divisions and permits further division into branches by Rule of Court. The duties of the Division include the following: processing and trial of all criminal cases in the District of Columbia that are not exclusively Federal; analyzing and improving assignments; calendars and dockets; seeking improved services and new methods; recommending changes and improvements to rules and procedures; automating operations and services for increased and innovative uses; and compiling statistical and public information.

The Division provides quality administrative and supportive services for the Superior Court of the District of Columbia with direct courtroom support for judicial officers, uniform assignment of cases to judges, accurate daily calendars for courtroom operation, efficient case processing, and timely delivery of information regarding criminal cases to the Division’s many constituents.

The Criminal Division is currently comprised of four branches: (1) Case Management Branch; (2) Courtroom Support Branch; (3) Special Proceedings Branch; and (4) Quality Assurance Branch. The Division also operates two community courts: D.C. and Traffic Community Court and East of the River Community Court (ERCC).

The Case Management Branch currently consists of 22 FTEs. The branch processes and maintains all active felony, misdemeanor, traffic, and District of Columbia (D.C.) case files and processes motions and appeals for felony, US misdemeanor, traffic, and D.C. cases. The branch also provides judicial officers, the public, law enforcement officers, and court staff with access to accurate information regarding criminal cases before the Superior Court.

- The Courtroom Support Branch consists of 48 FTEs. The branch staffs the courtroom clerks for all the courtrooms within 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.
- The Special Proceedings Branch consists of 22 FTEs. The branch has two parts: the warrant office and the Criminal Information Center. The warrant office processes and maintains all bench warrants, search warrants, arrest warrants, subpoenas, habeas corpus writs, fugitive cases, out-of-state witness cases, grand jury directives, sex offender registration matters, mental competency cases, cases to be expunged or sealed, contempt of court/show cause orders; processes appeals for these cases; and maintains closed criminal case files. This branch also responds to inquiries from the general public, judicial staff and criminal justice agencies regarding criminal cases; enters and updates data in the Washington Area Law Enforcement System (WALEs) and the National Crime Information Center (NCIC); and coordinates the storage and retrieval of archived criminal cases.
- The Quality Assurance Branch consists of 19 FTEs. The branch is responsible for the proper and accurate commitment or release of persons as ordered by the Judges of Superior Court, and for the accuracy of the final disposition of cases in the court's database.
- The East of the River and D.C. and Traffic Community Courts consist of three FTEs and are responsible for addressing quality-of-life offenses (e.g. public drinking, panhandling, prostitution, 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 foster more serious crime. Unlike traditional courts, the Community Courts focus on therapeutic and restorative justice. As such they have a much broader array of responses (i.e. treatment, community service, etc.) at their disposal. Community Courts seek not only to hold offenders accountable for their actions, but also to repair the harm caused to the community by the offense. Community Courts frequently require offenders to "pay back" the community by performing court-supervised community service. They also seek to reduce the likelihood of future offending by linking offenders to needed services.

FY 2009 Criminal Division MAP Objectives

The Criminal Division's strategic objectives for FY 2009 are as follows:

- Improve court operations concerning the handling of cases involving defendants suffering from mental illness.
- Ensure accurate, timely, and complete information to judges, court personnel and other court participants by adhering to operating procedures and monitoring employee compliance.
- Ensure timely disposition of cases through case management plans, which include time standards, for all major case types.

- Ensure the enforcement of court orders related to fines, fees, costs, and other monetary standards.
- Ensure that Court participant waiting time and court delays are minimized in high volume courtrooms by utilizing staggered scheduling practices.
- Ensure that all judges and court staff maintain the highest standards of civility and public service by engaging in a joint judicial/bar training session dedicated to professionalism, ethical behavior, civility; and staff training dedicated to excellent public service.
- Ensure that the large number of quality of life crimes are addressed by providing community based justice initiatives as a problem-solving approach in the disposition of those cases.
- Ensure the targeted enforcement of bench warrants in alcohol related traffic offenses by working with the Office of the Attorney General and the Metropolitan Police Department.
- Ensure that emergency planning procedures are in place and that the criminal division is working in a paperless environment that will facilitate emergency operations at remote sites.

Division Restructuring or Work Process Redesign

The Criminal Division is in the process of moving to a paperless system. CourtView, the Court's database, allows the division to image all documents and to maintain computerized dockets. The Criminal Division is working with prosecutors, defense attorneys, and other law enforcement agencies to create an electronic filing system, and electronic exchange of vital court information. In addition the Criminal Division is developing procedures for the retrieval of vital archived information to make the information electronically accessible and to reduce records storage costs. Work processes are being restructured and redesigned to facilitate a change from paper records to electronic records.

Key Performance Indicators

Table 1
CRIMINAL DIVISION
 Case Filings in CY 2006

D.C. Misdemeanors	3,119
Felony	5,889
Traffic	9,317
U.S. Misdemeanors	10,878

Table 2
CRIMINAL DIVISION
Performance Indicators*

Felony I (Murder, Sexual Assault, etc.)	75% within 12 mos.
Other Felony	75% within 6 mos.
Misdemeanor/Traffic	75% within 3 mos.
Misdemeanor (Drugs)	75% within 4 mos.
* Because of the Court's conversion to a new database, 2006 statistics on performance are not available.	

FY 2009 Request

The Courts' request for the Criminal Division is \$9,188,000, an increase of \$580,000 (7%) above the FY 2008 Enacted Budget. The requested increase includes \$91,000 and 1 FTE for a Mental Health initiative and built-in cost increases.

Enhanced Services for Defendants with Mental Illness, \$91,000
FTE Request: One Mental Health Coordinator, JS-12, \$91,000

Problem Statement. Many defendants who come in contact with the criminal justice system suffer from mental illness. One of the goals of the criminal justice system should be to de-criminalize mental illness and to link defendants suffering from mental illness to mental health providers to ensure treatment for their mental illness, instead of incarceration. The needs of this population consist of mental health services, substance abuse services, homeless services, employment services, and other support services to divert them from the criminal justice system into the mental health system and to reduce the rate of recidivism in this population.

Over the past five years, the District of Columbia criminal justice system has experienced a substantial increase in the number of defendants exhibiting varying degrees of mental illness. Over a four-year period, from 2002 until 2006, the District of Columbia experienced a 65% increase in the number of defendants appearing before the Court who had to be examined by psychiatric professionals to determine mental competency before the legal process could begin. In FY 2002, 291 mental competency evaluations were performed at the request of Superior Court judges and in FY 2006, 449 mental competency exams were performed. During the second quarter of FY 2007, 157 persons were screened for mental competency, and, of those, 41% were found incompetent to participate in court proceedings and required further evaluation and inpatient or outpatient treatment.

As a result of decreasing bed space at the city's mental health hospital, Saint Elizabeth's, the D.C. jail has become one of the leading providers of mental health services in the District of Columbia. It was recently estimated that approximately 50% of the jail population was to some extent suffering from mental illness.

During FY 2009, the Court seeks to employ a mental health professional to work with judges, Court administrators, and other agencies to ensure that defendants suffering from mental illness receive appropriate mental health services, to enhance the safety of the community and reduce

recidivist behavior. The goal is to involve key stakeholders such as mental health, substance abuse, and social service providers, and criminal justice agencies to determine better approaches for dealing with non-violent offenders suffering from mental illness and ways to divert them from the criminal justice system to the mental health system.

Relationship to Courts Vision, Mission, and Strategic Goals. The Court’s goal of exploring a more effective way to address the needs of defendants suffering from mental illness is innovative and intended to address the growing problem of mentally ill defendants coming into the criminal justice system. This initiative falls within the Courts’ strategic goal of “access to justice”.

Relationship to Divisional Objectives. Improving services to defendants suffering from mental illness will allow the Court to become more efficient in processing cases that otherwise consume significant court and criminal justice resources. In addition, improving services to defendants suffering from mental illness will improve public safety and reduce recidivist behavior by ensuring mentally ill defendants who are in the community are receiving appropriate care and supervision.

Relationship to Existing Funding. The Criminal Division’s base funding is inadequate to fund this position. The need to improve services to defendants suffering from mental illness is based upon concern that the increasing numbers of mentally ill defendants who appear before the court are seriously impacting court services and public safety.

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

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

Performance Indicators. Performance of the Mental Health Coordinator would be measured by random supervisory reviews to ensure compliance with performance standards. Other performance indicators include a reduction in recidivism and the provision of needed mental health services.

Table 3
CRIMINAL DIVISION
New Positions Requested

Positions	Grade	Number	Salary	Benefits	Total Personnel Costs
Mental Health Coordinator	12	1	\$73,000	\$18,000	\$91,000

Table 4
CRIMINAL DIVISION
Budget Authority by Object Class

	FY 2007 Enacted	FY 2008 Enacted	FY 2009 Request	Difference FY 2008/2009
11 - Personnel Compensation	5,844,000	6,815,000	7,276,000	461,000
12 - Personnel Benefits	1,403,000	1,704,000	1,820,000	116,000
<i>Subtotal Personnel Cost</i>	<i>7,247,000</i>	<i>8,519,000</i>	<i>9,096,000</i>	<i>577,000</i>
21 - Travel, Transp. of Persons				
22 - Transportation of Things				
23 - Rent, Commun. & Utilities				
24 - Printing & Reproduction	42,000	44,000	45,000	1,000
25 - Contractual Services				
26 - Supplies & Materials	19,000	20,000	21,000	1,000
31 - Equipment	23,000	25,000	26,000	1,000
<i>Subtotal Non Personnel Cost</i>	<i>84,000</i>	<i>89,000</i>	<i>92,000</i>	<i>3,000</i>
TOTAL	7,331,000	8,608,000	9,188,000	580,000
FTE	118	118	119	1

Table 5
CRIMINAL DIVISION
Detail, Difference FY 2008/FY 2009

Object Class	Description of Request	FTE	Cost	Difference FY2008/FY 2009
11 - Personnel Compensation	Mental Health Coordinator	1	73,000	
	Current Position WIG	118	102,000	
	Current Position COLA	118	286,000	
Subtotal				461,000
12 - Personnel Benefits	Mental Health Coordinator	1	18,000	
	Current Position WIG	118	26,000	
	Current Position COLA	118	72,000	
Subtotal				116,000
21 - Travel, Transp. of Persons				
22 - Transportation of Things				
23 - Rent, Commun. & Utilities				
24 - Printing & Reproduction	Built-in			1,000
25 - Other Services				
26 - Supplies & Materials	Built-in			1,000
31 - Equipment	Built-in			1,000
Total				580,000

Table 6
CRIMINAL DIVISION
Detail of Full-Time Equivalent Employment

	FY 2007 Enacted	FY 2008 Enacted	FY 2009 Request
JS-3			
JS-4	1	1	1
JS-5			
JS-6	13	12	13
JS-7	7	7	7
JS-8	28	29	29
JS-9	39	38	38
JS-10	18	19	19
JS-11	1	1	1
JS-12	4	4	4
JS-13	5	5	6
JS-14	1	1	1
JS-15			
JS-16			
JS-17			
CES	1	1	1
Total Salary	5,844,000	6,815,000	7,276,000
Total	118	118	119

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

<u>FY 2007 Enacted</u>		<u>FY 2008 Enacted</u>		<u>FY 2009 Request</u>		<u>Difference FY 2006/2007</u>	
<u>FTE</u>	<u>Obligations</u>	<u>FTE</u>	<u>Obligations</u>	<u>FTE</u>	<u>Obligations</u>	<u>FTE</u>	<u>Obligations</u>
25	1,644,000	25	1,928,000	25	2,040,000	0	112,000

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.

Organizational Background

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

MAP Objectives

The program's main objective is to provide increased access, improved convenience and clear, concise understanding of the court process while maintaining efficiency and quality of court services.

Other objectives for the Domestic Violence Unit include to:

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

Restructuring or Work Process Redesign

The Domestic Violence Unit utilizes the Court's new case management system, the Integrated Justice Information System (IJIS) whereby court orders and papers are immediately scanned into a database system and are made available to law enforcement, prosecutors and advocates. This technology enhances enforcement of orders and greatly serves the victims of domestic violence. Cases involving domestic violence are among the most complex and volatile that the Court has to address. Judges and court personnel are tasked with handling cases that bring with them the complicated dynamics of abuse in interfamily relationships. The Unit, as well as the Southeast Center, specializes in addressing these challenging cases in ways that increase victim safety, perpetrator accountability, efficient and effective case adjudication, while assisting families affected by abuse and linking them to services and programs in the community that help victims of abuse and their families rebuild their lives free from violence.

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

Workload Data

In FY 2006, the Domestic Violence Unit processed 8,591 new filings and reinstated cases and disposed of 8,598 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 2006 through 2009.

Table 1
DOMESTIC VIOLENCE UNIT
Caseload and Efficiency Measures
 (Fiscal Year 2006 Data)

	Cases Filed	Cases Disposed	Clearance Rate*	Cases Pending		
				1-Oct	30-Sep	Change
Contempt Motions	230	227	99%	33	36	9%
Intrafamily (Protection Orders)	4,264	4,239	99%	203	228	12%
Paternity & Child Support	516	514	99%	63	65	3%
U.S. Misdemeanors	3,581	3,618	101%	687	650	-5%
Total	8,591	8,598	100%	986	979	-1%

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

Table 2
DOMESTIC VIOLENCE UNIT
Key Performance Measures

Type of Indicator	Key Performance Indicator	Data Source	FY 2006		FY 2007		Projection FY 2008	Projection FY 2009
			Goal	Actual	Goal	Estimated		
Output/Activity	Hearings scheduled	Yearly stats/ Random sample	27,000	28,372	27,500	28,000	28,200	28,500
Quality	% of cases reviewed and processed within 48 hours	Evaluation, survey, and random sample	92%	90%	92%	91%	93%	93%
End Outcome	Domestic Violence dispositions	Daily/Monthly Statistics	8,600	8,598	8,700	8,675	8,700	8,750
Productivity/Efficiency	Case clearance rates	Yearly statistics	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

FY 2009 Request

The Courts' FY 2009 request for the Domestic Violence Unit is \$2,040,000, an increase of \$112,000 (6%) above the FY 2008 Enacted Budget. The requested increase consists of built-in cost increases.

Table 3
DOMESTIC VIOLENCE UNIT
Budget Authority by Object Class

	FY 2007 Enacted	FY 2008 Enacted	FY 2009 Request	Difference FY 2008/2009
11 - Compensation	1,320,000	1,537,000	1,625,000	88,000
12 - Benefits	317,000	384,000	406,000	22,000
Subtotal Personnel Cost	<i>1,637,000</i>	<i>1,921,000</i>	<i>2,031,000</i>	<i>110,000</i>
21 - Travel, Transp. of Persons				
22 - Transportation of Things				
23 - Rent, Commun. & Utilities				
24 - Printing & Reproduction				
25 - Other Services				
26 - Supplies & Materials	3,000	3,000	4,000	1,000
31 - Equipment	4,000	4,000	5,000	1,000
Subtotal Non Personnel Cost	<i>7,000</i>	<i>7,000</i>	<i>9,000</i>	<i>2,000</i>
TOTAL	1,644,000	1,928,000	2,040,000	112,000
FTE	25	25	25	0

Table 4
DOMESTIC VIOLENCE UNIT
Detail Difference, FY 2008/2009

Object Class	Description of Request	FTE	Cost	Difference FY2008/FY2009
11 - Compensation	Current Position WIG	25	23,000	
	Current Position COLA	25	65,000	
Subtotal				88,000
12 - Benefits	Current Position WIG	25	6,000	
	Current Position COLA	25	16,000	
Subtotal				22,000
21 - Travel, Transp. of Persons				
22 - Transportation of Things				
23 - Rent, Commun. & Utilities				
24 - Printing & Reproduction				
25 - Other Services				
26 - Supplies & Materials	Built-in		1,000	1,000
31 - Equipment	Built-in		1,000	1,000
Total				\$112,000

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

	FY 2007 Actual	FY 2008 Enacted	FY 2009 Request
JS-3			
JS-4			
JS-5			
JS-6	3	1	1
JS-7	1	1	
JS-8	6	7	8
JS-9	8	9	9
JS-10	3	3	3
JS-11			
JS-12	1	1	1
JS-13	2	2	2
JS-14			
JS-15			
JS-16			
JS-17			
CES	1	1	1
Total salary	1,320,000	1,537,000	1,625,000
Total	25	25	25

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

<u>FY 2007 Enacted</u>		<u>FY 2008 Enacted</u>		<u>FY 2009 Request</u>		<u>Difference FY 2008/2009</u>	
<u>FTE</u>	<u>Obligations</u>	<u>FTE</u>	<u>Obligations</u>	<u>FTE</u>	<u>Obligations</u>	<u>FTE</u>	<u>Obligations</u>
180	12,369,000	180	13,883,000	182	15,507,000	2	1,624,000

Mission Statement

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

Organizational Background

The District of Columbia Family Court Act (“the Act”) resulted in significant reforms of what was formerly the Family Division of the Superior Court. The intent of the Act is to ensure the safety and well being of children and families in the District of Columbia. Specifically, the Act mandates the recruitment of specially trained and qualified judges to serve on the Family Court at least three or five years, depending on their date of appointment. It requires that all family cases remain assigned to judges serving on the Family Court bench. The Act also requires the implementation of a one judge/one family case management model to facilitate more informed decision making, improve the delivery of services to a family, avoid the risk of conflicting orders, and reduce the number of court appearances for a family.

The Family Court retains jurisdiction over all familial actions – child abuse and neglect, custody, adoption, paternity and support, mental health and mental retardation, juvenile delinquency, marriages, and divorce. The Office of the Director, six administrative branches, two support offices, the Family Court Self Help Center, and the Family Treatment Court make up the Family Court Operations Division.

1. The Domestic Relations Branch processes divorce, annulment, custody, and adoption cases. The branch, through its Marriage Section, also issues licenses and authorizations for marriages in the District of Columbia and maintains a list of officiates performing civil weddings in the court.
2. The Paternity and Child Support Branch processes all actions seeking to establish paternity and to establish and modify child support.
3. The Juvenile and Neglect Branch is responsible for cases involving children alleged to be delinquent, neglected, abused, or otherwise in need of supervision.
4. The Counsel for Child Abuse and Neglect (CCAN) Office recruits, trains, and assigns attorneys to provide representation for children, eligible parents, and caretakers in proceedings of child abuse and neglect.

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

The Family Court Operations Division Management Action Plan Objectives

- Enhance the administration of justice through increased monitoring and compliance with the Federal and D.C. Adoption and Safe Families Acts by reaching and maintaining 95% compliance with all hearing deadlines and content requirements.
- Enhance the timely processing of cases by ensuring that 95% of court information, including exhibits, is complete and available for courtroom proceedings.
- Increase the number of persons assisted by the Family Court Self Help Center by increasing the size and staffing of the Self Help Center.
- Enhance understanding of the court process by Spanish speaking persons by translating 100% of existing forms/orders identified suitable for translation.
- Promote a competent and well -trained Family Court CCAN Bar by ensuring compliance with Practice Standards and certification requirements and conducting annual training and monthly training sessions for attorneys.

Restructuring or Work Process Redesign

The Family Court Operations Division operates a Family Court Central Intake Center (CIC) for the purpose of consolidating all family case filing and fee collection functions in one location to enhance public access and customer service. The filings currently received and processed by the CIC were previously handled by four separate branches and involve seven substantive and very distinct areas of the law.

The Family Court continues to explore innovative and effective methods of improving and streamlining case processing. In furtherance of this goal, in March of 2007, the Family Court CIC began piloting 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.

The Family Court Operations Division began the process of researching and consolidating duplicate computer identities of parties that came with the conversion of our legacy data into the integrated justice information system (IJIS). In the beginning this initiative only addressed cases involving families and children. As the IJIS development moved to other divisions of the court, literally thousands of additional identity records were converted from legacy systems into the new system raising the identity consolidation effort to a higher priority. With the assistance of on-site contractors, Family Court Operations continues to lead the effort in researching and identifying individual identities that must be consolidated to ensure the integrity of the data in IJIS as well as to facilitate informed judicial decision-making in all cases that come before the court.

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

judges are able to hear all cases involving a family at one hearing, thus avoiding the entry of conflicting orders regarding that family.

Workload Data

Table 1
FAMILY COURT OPERATIONS
Caseload and Efficiency Measures
(Fiscal Year 2006 Data)

	Cases Filed	Cases Disposed	Clearance Rate*	Cases Pending		
				1-Oct	30-Sep	Change
Abuse & Neglect	676	1,063	157%	2,924	2,924	-13%
Adoption	319	340	107%	375	375	-6%
Divorce/Custody/Miscellaneous	4,029	4,282	106%	2,899	2,899	-9%
Family Special Proceedings	193	207	107%	200	200	-7%
Juvenile Delinquency	3,049	2,658	87%	2,011	2,011	19%
Mental Health/Mental Retardation	1,250	1,369	110%	4,522	4,522	-3%
Paternity & Child Support	4,406	1,063	24%	13,821	13,821	24%
Total	13,922	10,982	79%	26,752	26,752	10.99%
*Ratio of cases disposed to cases filed in a given year. Standard efficiency measure is 100%, meaning one case disposed for each case filed.						

Table 2
FAMILY COURT OPERATIONS
Key Performance Indicators

Performance Indicator	Data Source	FY 2006		FY 2007		Projection FY 2008	Projection FY 2009
		Goal	Actual	Goal	Actual		
Prisoner Transfers Processed	Monthly Statistics	2177	2256	2481	2247	2239	2230
Delinquency & Neglect Cases/Orders Reviewed	Monthly Statistics	21375	17546	19765	18932	20317	21703
Delinquency & Neglect Cases Corrected	Monthly Statistics	566	600	500	656	711	767
Applications for Marriage Licenses & Minister Authorizations	Computer Reports	8626	2982	2872	2799	2616	2433
Marriage Licenses & Authorizations Issued	Computer Reports	7986	2743	2733	2511	2279	2047
Petitions & Complaints Total Intake	Computer Reports	11900	12945	13000	13520	14100	14700
Domestic & Child Support Hearings Set	Computer Reports	30080	28335	29126	30092	31898	33665
Domestic Orders Issued	Computer Reports	8548	8259	8500	8428	8597	8766
Child Support Orders Issued	Computer Reports	4318	1074	2356	1072	1070	1068
MR Advocate Training Sessions *	Computer Log	200	95	275	120	118	85
New MR Advocates Recruited *	Computer Log	450	50	500	8	25	25
MR Advocates Trained *	Computer; Training Log	950	180	740	107	75	75
MR Cases with MR Advocates *	Computer Log	500	305	386	355	300	300
ASFA case reviews in initial, further initial, pretrial, stipulation, disposition and permanency hearings **	Monthly Statistics	2970	2951	5386	3334	3718	3745
CourtView data input and other error notifications drafted and distributed by attorney advisors	Monthly Statistics	825	462	880	616	770	911
CCAN Attorneys appointed to Adult Parties in Abuse & Neglect cases **	Monthly Statistics	2800	2093	3533	2139	2184	2184
Guardians <i>ad litem</i> Appointed **	Monthly Statistics	1450	1013	1393	1043	1073	1103
Trainings Offered to Attorneys	CCAN Records	23	19	33	16	16	16
Attorneys Meeting CLE Requirements	CCAN Records	170	157	159	150	142	140

*Critical staff shortages have affected performance and projections.

** Variations in new case filing levels affect performance and projections.

FY 2009 Request

In FY 2009 the Courts request \$15,507,000 for Family Court Operations, an increase of \$1,624,000 (12%) above the FY 2008 Enacted Budget. The requested increase includes 2 FTEs and \$872,000 to enhance services to persons with intellectual disabilities under court supervision in the Mental Health and Mental Retardation Branch and \$752,000 for built-in cost increases.

Enhancing Service to Persons with Intellectual Disabilities - \$872,000

Advocate Stipends, \$743,000

2 Advocate Case Monitors (JS-9), \$125,000

Advocate Program Operation, \$4,000

Problem Statement. To meet statutory requirements to provide advocates for persons with intellectual disabilities individuals who are committed to the District of Columbia for their care, but whose cases remain under court supervision, the Family Court must develop a substantial pool of advocates committed to ensuring the well-being and protecting the best interests of these intellectually disabled individuals. Advocates take on substantial responsibilities. As of April 2007, there were only 200 advocates for 1,248 of these persons with intellectual disabilities who are supervised through the Family Court's Mental Health and Mental Retardation Branch (fewer than 25% of these persons have advocates). This population is extremely dependent upon the advocates, as 80% are non-verbal and cannot easily communicate their needs and desires. Accordingly, the advocates' role is intense: they visit the client for two to three hours twice a month, filling out reports on these visits; they meet with service providers; they participate in court hearings; and they attend 60 hours of training each year.

Currently, the Mental Health and Mental Retardation Branch has a full-time Mental Retardation Volunteer Coordinator position and a small program budget. The Coordinator recruits advocates through print and audio mediums, advertisements on public transportation (metro and buses), community service programs for college and law students, and churches and civic associations. The Court is struggling to maintain its current number of advocates and believes that a greater number of advocates can be recruited and retained if a stipend is provided.

The Court has a statutory obligation to seek potential sources of funding at the federal and District levels and to provide the advocates with facilities, supplies, and secretarial and other support services sufficient to enable them to carry out their duties under the law. Despite the Courts' recruitment efforts, there have been longstanding concerns, most recently expressed during a visit by a federal "Evans" case monitor, that persons with intellectual disabilities who are committed or admitted to the District of Columbia for care have not received court appointed advocates as required by D.C. Code.

The law requires that advocates have training and experience in the field of intellectual disabilities, and delineates the powers and duties of the advocates. They include the following:

- Advocates guide and assist the individual with intellectual disabilities to encourage self-reliance and to enable the person to participate, to the greatest extent possible, in decisions concerning his or her habilitation plan.
- Advocates act as liaison between their clients and the Court and between the Court and the community. Advocates establish contact with the clients and their families, where possible. Advocates also assist in court proceedings, meetings, and conferences in relation to any matter concerning their clients.

- Advocates visit residences and program sites to monitor the client’s quality of life and to determine whether clients are benefiting from habilitative care. Advocates are required to visit a minimum of twice each month, typically for two to three hours each visit, and to complete a “Compliance Check List” on their findings.
- Advocates review reports, evaluations, and records relating to clients, and they have access to all personnel, facilities, and agency staff. Interviews with staff and review of records are important to assist advocates in assessing the appropriateness of programs, services, and care being received. Advocates are required to submit a Monthly Status Report to the Court.
- Advocates must be present at all court hearings for each client. Advocates are also required to be present at Individual Service Plan (ISP) meetings coordinated once per year by the Department of Disability Services as well as all meetings about the implementation of the Individual Service Plan.

To enhance recruitment and retention of advocates, the Court seeks to pay advocates a \$600 annual stipend for each client whose case they oversee. In addition, the Courts’ budget request includes funds to hire two additional staff persons to assist with the recruitment, training, and support of advocates. These two Advocate Case Monitors will expand the Court’s recruitment activities and serve the anticipated significantly larger pool of advocates.

Full program funding to provide additional administrative support, recruit and train advocates, and provide compensation or stipends to encourage advocate retention is critical. Stipends, Advocate Case Monitors, and technical support and assistance will permit the long-term success of the advocate program and ensure that the persons with intellectual disabilities cared for by the government receive appropriate care and necessary services. The civil rights of these very vulnerable members of society must be protected.

Proposed Resolution. The Courts seek funds to provide a \$600 annual stipend to advocates, to hire two advocate case monitors, and to provide operational support to the advocates. The annual stipend would provide modest compensation to advocates for their duties, written reports, and attendance at court hearings. The Advocate Case Monitors would help recruit, train, and provide support to the advocates, and operational support funds would provide recruitment and training materials and administrative support to the advocates.

Relationship to Court Mission, Vision and Strategic Goals. This request supports the Courts’ strategic goal of promoting access to justice for all persons.

Relationship to Divisional Objectives. The positions are crucial in ensuring the Family Court’s compliance with the legal mandate to provide well trained volunteer advocates to monitor the level of care received by the persons with intellectual disabilities and to assist in protecting the civil rights of these clients.

Relationship to Existing Funding. The program currently has one staff member and approximately \$1,000 for advocate recruitment, training, and support costs. As discussed above,

these resources have proven inadequate to meet the statutory requirements and the needs of persons with intellectual disabilities under the Court’s supervision.

Methodology. The positions are requested at a grade nine based on the Court’s classification policies. Stipends for the court-appointed advocates are based on an annual stipend of \$600 per client (two client visits per month @ \$25 per visit), for a total of 1,240 clients (a committed person typically remains under court supervision for his entire life, so the number of cases under the jurisdiction of the court is relatively stable). The operational expenses are estimated at an additional \$4,100 for printed materials, advocate recruitment and retention, training, equipment.

Expenditure Plan. The requested employees will be recruited and hired in accordance with the D.C. Courts’ Personnel Policies.

Performance Indicators. Success of the position will be measured through the Division’s ability to meet our goal of providing an advocate for every individual with intellectual disabilities under court supervision.

Table 3
FAMILY COURT OPERATIONS
New Positions Requested

Position	Grade	Number	Salary	Benefits	Total Personnel Cost
Case Advocate Monitor	JS-9	2	\$100,000	\$25,000	\$125,000

Table 4
FAMILY COURT OPERATIONS
Budget Authority by Object Class

	FY 2007 Enacted	FY 2008 Enacted	FY 2009 Request	Difference FY 2008/2009
11 – Compensation	9,078,000	10,170,000	10,850,000	680,000
12 – Benefits	2,180,000	2,543,000	2,713,000	170,000
Subtotal Personnel Cost	<i>11,258,000</i>	<i>12,713,000</i>	<i>13,563,000</i>	<i>850,000</i>
21 - Travel, Transp. of Persons				0
22 - Transportation of Things				0
23 - Rent, Commun. & Utilities	199,000	207,000	212,000	5,000
24 - Printing & Reproduction	11,000	25,000	26,000	1,000
25 - Other Services	572,000	595,000	1,351,000	756,000
26 - Supplies & Materials	27,000	29,000	34,000	5,000
31 – Equipment	302,000	314,000	321,000	7,000
Subtotal Non Personnel Cost	<i>1,111,000</i>	<i>1,170,000</i>	<i>1,944,000</i>	<i>774,000</i>
TOTAL	12,369,000	13,883,000	15,507,000	1,624,000
FTE	180	180	182	2

Table 5
FAMILY COURT OPERATIONS
Detail, Difference FY 2008/2009

Object Class	Description of Request	FTE	Cost	Difference FY 2008/2009
11 - Compensation	Advocate Case Monitor	2	100,000	
	Current Position WIGS	180	153,000	
	Current Positions COLA	180	427,000	
Subtotal				680,000
12 - Benefits	Advocate Case Monitor	2	25,000	
	Current Positions WIGS	180	38,000	
	Current Positions COLA	180	107,000	
Subtotal				170,000
21 - Travel, Transp. of Persons				
22 - Transportation of Things				
23 - Rent, Commun. & Utilities	Built-in			5,000
24 - Printing & Reproduction	Built-in			1,000
25 - Other Service	Built-in		13,000	
	Advocate Stipends		743,000	
Subtotal				756,000
26 - Supplies & Materials	Built-in		1,000	
	Advocate Supplies		4,000	
Subtotal				5,000
31 - Equipment	Built-in			7,000
Total				1,624,000

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

	FY 2007 Actual	FY 2008 Enacted	FY 2009 Request
JS-3			
JS-4	7	7	7
JS-5			
JS-6	21	21	22
JS-7	31	31	15
JS-8	40	40	50
JS-9	36	36	38
JS-10	9	9	12
JS-11	8	8	10
JS-12	11	11	11
JS-13	14	14	14
JS-14	2	2	2
JS-15			
JS-16			
JS-17			
CES	1	1	1
Total Salaries	9,078,000	10,170,000	10,850,000
Total	180	180	182

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

<u>FY 2007 Enacted</u>		<u>FY 2008 Enacted</u>		<u>FY 2009 Request</u>		<u>Difference</u>	
FTE	Obligations	FTE	Obligations	FTE	Obligations	FTE	Obligations
133	13,311,000	133	15,002,000	138	21,067,000	5	6,065,000

Mission Statement

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

Organizational Background

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

- The Director’s Office is responsible for management and oversight of all objectives, programs, and activities across the division. The office has 5 FTEs
- The Intake Services and Juvenile Drug Court Branch is comprised of three Units including two dedicated to day and evening Intake services and one dedicated to youth participating in the Juvenile Drug Court. Intake Units I and II are responsible for screening risk to public safety and conducting social assessments on all youth referred by other law enforcement entities and District of Columbia Public School (DCPS), presenting all referrals before a judicial officer (the juvenile equivalent of an arraignment), and pre-trial recommendations. The Juvenile Drug Court Unit is responsible for serving and supervising all youth participating in the Juvenile Drug Court diversion program. The branch consists of 26 FTEs.
- The Pre/Post Probation Supervision Branch Region I consist of three units encompassing: Leaders of Today in Solidarity (LOTS), the District of Columbia’s first ever gender-specific seamless set of pre-trial, pre-disposition and post-disposition adolescent girls’ probation initiative; the Division’s new Southwest Satellite Office (SWSO), created to address the needs of youth residing in the southwest quadrant of the city; and the newly created Balanced and Restorative Justice Drop-In Center in

Southeast, (which replaced the old Southeast Satellite Office). The branch consists of 34 FTEs.

- The Pre/Post Probation Supervision Branch Region II consist of the following four units: Northwest Satellite Office - NWSO responsible for serving and supervising the vast majority of youth residing in the Northwest quadrant of the city; the Northeast Satellite Office - NESO responsible for serving and supervising all youth residing in the northeast quadrant of the District; the intensive supervision unit—Ultimate Transitions Ultimate Responsibilities Now (UTURN) is responsible for supervising high-risk pre and post adjudicated youth throughout the city; and the Interstate Probation Supervision Office. This branch consists of 45 FTEs.
- The Child Guidance/Family Services Branch provides psychological, psycho-educational, neuro-psychological, competency, and public safety evaluations utilized to determine the needs of each youth and family and guide judicial decision-making. The branch also provides individual psychotherapy to youth. The unit has 7 FTEs.
- The Delinquency Prevention Unit supports the diversion of low-to-moderate risk youths from secure detention. The Unit is also responsible for coordinating and tracking all electronic monitoring compliance and assisting the Metropolitan Police Department (MPD) in the safe retrieval of youth in abscondence, subsequent to the issuance of a custody order. The unit has 8 FTEs.
- The Operations, Information and Contract Services Unit coordinates all court-ordered referrals for youth services and oversees the delivery of services and coordination of reimbursement for services provided by an array of contracted vendors. The unit has nine FTEs.

Division Management Action Plan (MAP) Objectives

The Social Services Division will:

- Enhance informed judicial decision-making in the Family Court by conducting detailed assessments and providing information to judges throughout adjudication.
- Provide high-quality juvenile probation services supporting the rehabilitation of youth, reduce positive drug test, increase completion of probation supervision, and reduce recidivism by 5% per year.
- Enhance proficiency and retention of highly skilled employees through the development and implementation of mandatory core competency-trainings.
- Develop and implement procedures ensuring all managers and supervisors conduct case reviews in compliance with Division procedures.

- Provide quality services and supervision to Juvenile Drug Court participants by way of a comprehensive services plan within 45 days upon entering treatment.
- Provide quality comprehensive status/progress reports and social studies for youth involved in juvenile delinquency cases by completing 90% or more of all status and progress reports three days prior to a scheduled court hearing and completing 90% or more of social studies within five weeks of the date of the court order.
- Provide quality services to youth under court supervision by conducting interviews and developing timely comprehensive service for 90% of juveniles referred.
- Ensure prompt handling of juveniles referred via Interstate Compact within five days of receiving case and complete reports within fifteen days of assignment.

Restructuring or Work Process Re-Design

In FY 2007 the SSD successfully restructured its Pre-Disposition Branch and Supervision Branch to achieve a seamless integrated probation case management system for adolescent males ensuring one probation officer of record for each youth/family. This measure resulted in the creation of two permanent Pre and Post Disposition Supervision Branches: Region I encompassing three units and Region II encompassing four units. Under the new case management and probation supervision model, probation officers (excluding those designated to Intake), are responsible for pre-trial, pre and post-disposition services and supervision monitoring to include, status reports, social studies, school and curfew monitoring.

To prepare probation officers to meet mandates required under the seamless case management model, extensive training in the areas of child development, investigative interviews, strengths-based adolescent and family approaches as well as restorative justice principles were facilitated during a six month period. The Division’s senior management team took the lead in guiding the training, and supervisory probation officers took on the responsibility of outlining the designation of cases specific to location consistent with Police Services Areas (PSAs) and quadrants of the city.

The SSD also leveraged training to utilize Family Group Conferencing (FGC), team oriented meetings including the youth, key family members, and others significant in the life of the youth to create the service plan.

Table 1
SOCIAL SERVICES DIVISION
 Caseload (Fiscal Year 2006 data)

Case Type	New Cases	Cases Closed	Cases Pending Beginning of Year	Cases Pending End of Year	Retention Rate	Increase Rate
Juvenile Intake	2,030	2,455	450	25	6%	-
Diagnostic	1,151	886	210	475	74%	-
Juvenile Drug Court	11	5	16	22	-	38%
Juvenile Supervision	1,588	1,415	950	1,123	-	18%
Child Guidance Clinic	519	519	7	7	-	0%
Family Counseling	224	252	77	48	-	-38%

Workload Data

Table 2
SOCIAL SERVICES DIVISION
Key Performance Indicators

Performance Indicator	Data Source	FY 2006		FY 2007		Projection	Projection
		Goal	Actual	Goal	Estimate	FY 2008	FY 2009
Juveniles under supervision and Domestic Relations (DR) cases	D.C. Superior Court Data	1,650	1,688	1,695	1,710	1,755	1,797
Juveniles under supervision and drug screening conducted	Pretrial Services Data	5,180	5,660	5,285	5,290	5,301	5,325
Juvenile probationers screening positive for drugs during probation	Pretrial Services Data	50%	49%	49%	48.5%	48.5%	47%
Percentage of juveniles successfully completing probation	SSD Statistical Reports	34%	33%	35%	34%	36%	37%
Juveniles committing new offenses during probation	D.C. Superior Court Data	27%	23%	25%	25%	24%	23%
Average pre and post-adjudicated supervision caseloads and national standards: 1:25 med and 1:15 max	SSD Statistical Reports	32	32	33	35	35	35
Decrease in average Intensive Supervision caseloads to national standards 1:25 (med)	SSD Statistical Reports	14	21	16	16	15	15
Increased curfew checks encompassing face-to-face contact	SSD Statistical Reports	13,008	16,457	15,600	16,750	16,350	17,200
Increased curfew checks encompassing telephone calls	SSD Statistical Reports	20,000	27,867	24,392	26,155	26,457	26,750
Increased compliance among youth with face-to-face and telephone call curfews checks	SSD Statistical Reports	80%	83.50%	82%	84%	83.00%	84.50%

Note: Fiscal years 2008 and 2009 projections based on average juvenile arrest and offense rate trends reported by the District of Columbia Metropolitan Police Department (MPD)

Division Outcomes in FY 2007

As indicated, in the fall of 2005, the Division began tracking the number of youth screened and assessed for risk to public safety, the number of youth detained, and the number of youth re-arrested. The SSD also continued tracking data relative to pre-trial and post-disposition reports “social studies;” and extensive clinical evaluations (e.g., psychological, psycho-educational and competency evaluations; school visits and curfew checks, home assessments, supervision office visits, and electronic monitoring compliance.) To assess adherence to statutory requirements and supervision of court ordered conditions for youth, the SSD continued tracking the correlation between completed reports sent to the judiciary and the number of disposition hearing continuances. The Division found that staff managing caseloads consistent with national standards were able to effectively fulfill their duties and complete virtually all court reports in a timely manner; however, probation officers staffing high caseloads were frequently unable to meet their demands in many areas at the expense of trying to ensure timely documentation of field activities and complete reports.

New referrals intake data gathered by the Division from the period of October 2006 through April 2007 show that on average, although the volume of youth referred by police officers remained virtually the same across fiscal years, the complexity of cases has increased dramatically (i.e., the case type or nature of offenses and needs of youth are far more violent and exhaustive). As a result, Intake probation officers are dedicating more time and attention to screening, assessing, and interviewing youth/families to ensure decisions made with respect to detention, release and recommendations for petitioning and/or diversion are consistent with best practices standards and maintaining public safety.

Among Pre and Post-Disposition Branches: Region I and Region II, an average of 1,351 adolescent males were under supervision from October 2006 through April 2007. Also, data gathered on youth supervised in community settings (e.g., pre or post-probation or court ordered Consent Decree) show that on average, approximately 531 or 41% were under court ordered curfews and/or other conditions. Additionally, 11,402 face-to-face curfew checks and 25,132 telephone curfew checks were conducted (See Table 3).

Table 3
Curfew Checks

Month/Year	Oct 06	Nov 06	Dec 06	Jan 07	Feb 07	Mar 07	Apr 07
Face-to-Face	1810	2262	1442	1573	1549	1388	1378
Telephone	3257	3967	3930	2483	4180	3620	3695
% Compliance among youth	82%	83%	86%	85%	83%	85%	84%

The data in Table 4 show that from October 2005 thru April 2006, an average of 83% of youth were in compliance with court ordered curfews, school attendance and stay away restrictions as a condition of pre and post-disposition probation. In addition, 97% of parents complied with court-ordered parent participation (See Table 4).

Table 4
Parent Participation

Month/Year	Oct 06	Nov 06	Dec 06	Jan 07	Feb 07	Mar 07	Apr 07
Parent Participation Orders	300	370	393	329	369	481	370
Compliance	295	362	385	312	355	459	363
% Compliance among parents	98%	98%	98%	95%	96%	95%	98%

From October 2006 through April 2007, the SSD's Child Guidance Clinic conducted a monthly average of 38 court-ordered psychological and psycho-educational evaluations. Contract vendors were also utilized to conduct psychiatric evaluations.

Referral Trends Analyzed

In FY 2007, the Contract Monitoring and Purchase of Services Unit continued to analyze referral trends. This analysis supports the Division's need for additional funds to facilitate timely case processing and ensure that court ordered conditions are met. Specifically, from FY 2002 thru FY 2008 the number of court-ordered referrals for services has steadily increased from 781 to 1,085 in FY 2003, to 1,172 in FY 2004, to 1,423 in FY 2005, and 1,495 in FY 2006. In FY 2007 it is projected that the number of court-ordered referrals will exceed the FY 2006 level.

FY 2009 Request

In FY 2009, the Courts request \$21,067,000 for the Family Court Social Services Division, an increase of \$6,065,000 (40 %) above the FY 2008 Enacted Budget. This increase includes \$782,000 for built-in cost increases. In addition, a request for \$5,283,000 and 5 FTEs to enhance juvenile probation services is described in the Initiatives section.

Table 5
FAMILY COURT SOCIAL SERVICES DIVISION
New Positions Requested

Position	Grade	Number	Annual Salary	Benefits	Total Personnel Costs
FGC Coordinator/Facilitators	CS 09	5	\$250,000	\$63,000	\$313,000

Table 6
FAMILY COURT SOCIAL SERVICES DIVISION
Budget Authority by Object Class

	FY 2007 Enacted	FY 2008 Enacted	FY 2009 Request	Difference FY 2008/2009
11 - Personnel Compensation	9,116,000	10,328,000	11,167,000	839,000
12 - Personnel Benefits	2,188,000	2,582,000	2,793,000	211,000
<i>Subtotal Personnel Cost</i>	<i>11,304,000</i>	<i>12,910,000</i>	<i>13,960,000</i>	<i>1,050,000</i>
21 - Travel, Transp. of Persons				
22 - Transportation of Things				
23 - Rent, Commun. & Utilities			720,000	720,000
24 - Printing & Reproduction				
25 - Other Services	1,949,000	2,030,000	6,323,000	4,293,000
26 - Supplies & Materials	28,000	30,000	31,000	1,000
31 - Equipment	30,000	32,000	33,000	1,000
<i>Subtotal Non Personnel Cost</i>	<i>2,007,000</i>	<i>2,092,000</i>	<i>7,107,000</i>	<i>5,015,000</i>
Total	13,311,000	15,002,000	21,067,000	6,065,000
FTE	133	133	138	5

Table 7
FAMILY COURT SOCIAL SERVICES DIVISION
Detail, Difference FY 2008/FY2009

Object Class	Description of Request	FTE	Cost	Difference FY 2008/FY2009
11 - Personnel Compensation	FGC Coordinators/Facilitators	5	250,000	
	Current Positions WIGS	133	155,000	
	Current Positions COLA	133	434,000	
Subtotal				\$839,000
12 - Personnel Benefits	FGC Coordinators/Facilitators	5	63,000	
	Current Positions WIGS	133	39,000	
	Current Positions COLA	133	109,000	
Subtotal				\$211,000
21 - Travel, Transp. Of Persons				
22 - Transportation of Things				
23 - Rent, Commun. & Utilities	Drop-In Centers			\$720,000
24 - Printing & Reproduction				
25 - Other Service	Built-in		43,000	
	Third Party Monitoring		470,000	
	Drop-In Centers Build-out Costs		3,200,000	
	Ongoing Services to Drop-In Centers		580,000	
Subtotal				\$4,293,000
26 - Supplies & Materials	Built-in			1,000
31 - Equipment	Built-in			1,000
Total				\$6,065,000

Table 8
FAMILY COURT SOCIAL SERVICES DIVISION
Detail of FTE Employment

	FY 2007 Enacted	FY 2008 Enacted	FY 2009 Request
JS-2			
JS-3			
JS-4			
JS-5			
JS-6	4	6	6
JS-7	6	6	3
JS-8	18	18	17
JS-9	6	5	10
JS-10	2	2	2
JS-11	1	1	2
JS-12	71	71	73
JS-13	20	19	20
JS-14	4	3	4
JS-15	1	1	1
CES	1	1	1
Total Salaries	9,116,000	10,328,000	11,167,000
TOTAL	133	133	138

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

<u>FY 2007 Enacted</u>		<u>FY 2008 Enacted</u>		<u>FY 2009 Request</u>		<u>Difference FY 2008/2009</u>	
<u>FTE</u>	<u>Obligations</u>	<u>FTE</u>	<u>Obligations</u>	<u>FTE</u>	<u>Obligations</u>	<u>FTE</u>	<u>Obligations</u>
20	2,280,000	20	2,457,000	21	2,668,000	1	211,000

Mission Statement

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

Organizational Background

The Multi-Door Dispute Resolution Division (“Multi-Door”) provides mediation and other ADR services to assist in the settlement of disputes brought to the D.C. Courts. The individual who serves as the mediator, arbitrator, evaluator, or conciliator is identified as a neutral. The neutral is responsible for facilitating agreement between parties or case resolution. The Division is comprised of the Director’s office and three branches, Civil ADR, Family ADR, and Program Assessment.

1. The Civil ADR Branch provides binding and non-binding arbitration and mediation for most of the Superior Court’s civil cases. Mediation is provided for small claims cases, landlord and tenant cases, complex civil matters, and probate and tax assessment cases.
2. The Family ADR Branch includes three programs: Child Protection Mediation, Community Information and Referral, and Family Mediation. Child Protection Mediation addresses service plans and legal issues in child neglect cases. The Community Information and Referral Program provides resource information, agency referrals, conciliation, and mediation to individuals and families. The program addresses landlord-tenant, consumer fraud, contract, domestic relations, and personal injury issues before a case is filed. The Family Mediation Program addresses domestic relations issues of custody, support, visitation, and property distribution. The Family Mediation Program also includes a Parent Education Seminar for contested custody disputes. The Parent Education Seminar provides parents with valuable information regarding the effects and potential consequences of a custody dispute on children, and allows them to quickly and efficiently mediate a resolution of the dispute in a manner that is in the best interest of the children.
3. The Program Assessment Branch provides quality assurance through the training, evaluation, and support of 400 community-based neutrals who are lawyers, social workers, government employees, retirees, and others providing ADR services to the

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

Table 1
MULTI-DOOR DISPUTE RESOLUTION DIVISION
Caseload Overview

	Mediation Sessions Scheduled	ADR Performed	Cases Closed	Cases Settled	Settlement Rate
FY 2006	7133	5025	6007	2417	42%
FY 2007*	8513	4587	**Not reported	2003	42%

*Projection

**In 2007 this number is captured in the category “ADR Performed.”

Division Objectives/MAP Objectives

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

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

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

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

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

Division Restructuring or Work Process Design

The Multi-Door Dispute Resolution Division continues to expand ADR services to litigants by increasing the number and type of cases where ADR services are provided. In the past year, Multi-Door has expanded services for Landlord/Tenant cases by providing legal representation for pro se litigants that enter ADR. Early Mediation for Medical Malpractice cases has also been added to the number of civil cases that enter mediation. Early intervention in these cases is an effort to dispense of smaller cases earlier in the litigation process, before resources have been expended on discovery and other legal procedures. ADR services have also been expanded to include mediation of contested custody disputes, where parents will have an opportunity to mediate their dispute following an education seminar on the harmful effects of contested custody disputes on children. In the near future, the Family Division will be moving toward a unified case management system where all pro se cases will be referred to ADR.

In order to support the immediate demand for ADR services, Multi-Door has implemented an open enrollment process to expedite recruitment of highly qualified mediators. The Multi-Door has developed Mediator Qualification Standards to select and qualify candidates for its Roster of Neutrals.

Workload Data

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

Type of Indicator	Performance Indicator	Data Source	FY 2006 Actual	FY 2007 Estimated	Projection FY 2008	Projection FY 2009
Input	Cases referred	CourtView	5224*	6500*	6500	6600
Output	ADR sessions held	CourtView	3992	3950	3950	4000
Outcome	Case settlement rate	CourtView	38%	42%	42%	43%
Outcome/Quality	Participant Satisfaction w/ ADR Process	SPSS database	91%	91%	91%	91%
Outcome/Quality	Participant Satisfaction w/ Outcome	SPSS database	90%	90%	90%	90%
Outcome/Quality	Neutral Performance Satisfaction	SPSS database	93%	95%	95%	95%

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

Type of Indicator	Performance Indicator	Data Source	FY 2006 Actual	FY 2007 Estimated	Projection FY 2008	Projection FY 2009
Input	Cases referred	Court view	1909	2013	2115	2047
Output	ADR sessions held	CourtView	1033	964	1200	1240
Outcome	Case settlement rate	CourtView	67%	70%	72%	74%
Outcome/Quality	Participant satisfaction w/ process	SPSS database	95%	96%	97%	98%
Outcome/Quality	Participant satisfaction w/outcome	SPSS database	92%	93%	94%	95%
Outcome/Quality	Neutral performance satisfaction	SPSS database	96%	98%	99%	99%

The quality performance elements reported in Tables 2 & 3 above are measured through participant surveys distributed to all ADR participants after the ADR session is held. The statistics report the “percentage of respondents” who report being either “satisfied” or “highly satisfied” with the overall ADR process, outcome, and neutral performance. Caseload projections are based on gradual increases in response to increased outreach efforts and long-term trend fluctuations. Settlement rate projections are based on a continuing upward trend and long-term trend fluctuations. Client satisfaction survey rate projections are based on a continuing upward trend that levels off at 95% and 98%.

Key Performance Indicators

Multi-Door will continue to exercise best efforts to achieve its objectives of quality, responsiveness, and settlement in ADR service delivery. The Division has identified performance goals to achieve these objectives. These performance goals are—1) to achieve settlement rates of at least 50% in every ADR program; and 2) to achieve ratings of “highly satisfied” from at least 30% of respondents in each of the three quality performance indicators (ADR process, ADR outcome, and neutral performance) and overall satisfaction rates (a combination of “satisfied” and “highly satisfied” responses) of at least 80%. Key performance indicators drawn from the Multi-Door MAP are as follows:

Table 4
MULTI-DOOR DISPUTE RESOLUTION DIVISION
Key Performance Indicators

Type of Indicator	Key Performance Indicator	Data Source	Actual FY 2006	Estimated FY 2007	Projection FY 2008	Projection FY 2009
Output	Achieve settlement of 50% of cases	IJIS database	42%	41%	41%	42%
Outcome	Achieve overall client satisfaction of 80%*	SPSS database	93%	93%	94%	94%
Output	Achieve 70%* compliance with case processing time standards	SPSS database	83%	83%	87%	88%

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

FY 2009 Request

In FY 2009, the D.C. Courts request \$2,668,000 for the Multi-Door Dispute Resolution Division, an increase of \$211,000 (8.6%) above the FY 2008 Enacted. The requested increase consists of one FTE and \$91,000 to enhance mediation for complex civil cases and built-in increases.

Special Civil Mediator, JS-12, \$91,000

Introduction. The Special Civil Mediator has been a full time temporary position supervised by the Multi-Door Division and supported by funds from the judicial budget since 2003. As of September 30, 2007, this position will be vacated and there are no plans for continued funding. Because of the consistently high demand for mediation services for complex civil cases, Multi-Door is requesting that a full time Special Civil Mediator position be created within the Multi-Door Division. The Special Civil Mediator has performed an essential function for the court, by

mediating complex, multi-party, civil disputes referred directly by the civil judges of the Superior Court and devoting more time to individual cases than would be possible for volunteer mediators who handle the majority of civil cases referred to mediation. The Special Civil Mediator performs duties that require a high level of expertise in mediation as applied to a variety of complex civil disputes.

Problem statement. A special civil mediator for the division's Civil ADR Branch is essential to ensure that the division continues to provide the highest quality dispute resolution services on complex, multi-party, multi-issue cases that come before the Superior Court's Civil Division. It is essential to the operation of the civil trial calendar to offer the services of a full time mediator to accept direct referrals from civil court judges and attorneys on complex civil matters. Mediation provides for fast and efficient disposal of civil cases that would otherwise require many hours of judicial time. The ability to provide consistent, high quality ADR services for these types of disputes will enhance public trust and confidence in the services provided by the Court. The resolution of complex civil matters assists the Court in removing hundreds of cases annually from the Court's docket and provides litigants with a fast and effective alternative to lengthy and costly litigation.

In 2006, 182 civil cases were mediated by the Special Civil Mediator. Of those cases, 66% were settled as a result of mediation. Employing a full-time Special Civil Mediator has the potential for cost avoidance, saving the Court tens of thousands of dollars in judicial and staff resources, by resolving these matters well before trial.

Relationship to Court Mission, Vision and Strategic Goals. The need for a full-time Special Civil Mediator relates directly to the court's goal of fair and timely case resolution. A highly qualified Special Civil Mediator has a direct impact on the resolution of civil disputes within the Superior Court. The Special Civil Mediator provides litigants with an alternative to trial and the opportunity to resolve their dispute earlier in the court process. A highly skilled mediator directly influences client satisfaction rates and overall settlement rates.

Relationship to Divisional Objectives. This position is crucial to the success of the division's strategic objective to provide efficient and effective alternative dispute resolution to a wide variety of complex civil disputes.

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

Methodology. The position is graded at a grade 12/13 based on the Courts' classification policies for comparable staff positions.

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

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

Table 6
MULTI-DOOR DISPUTE RESOLUTION DIVISION
New Positions Requested

Position	Grade	Number	Annual Salary	Benefits	Total Personnel Costs
Special Civil Mediator	CS-12	1	\$73,000	\$18,000	\$91,000

Table 7
MULTI-DOOR DISPUTE RESOLUTION DIVISION
Budget Authority by Object Class

	FY 2007 Enacted	FY 2008 Enacted	FY 2009 Request	Difference FY 2008/2009
11 - Personnel Compensation	1,350,000	1,459,000	1,615,000	156,000
12 - Personnel Benefits	324,000	365,000	404,000	39,000
Subtotal Personnel Cost	1,674,000	1,824,000	2,019,000	195,000
21 - Travel, Transp. of Persons				
22 - Transportation of Things				
23 - Rent, Commun. & Utilities				
24 - Printing & Reproduction				
25 - Other Services	596,000	623,000	637,000	14,000
26 - Supplies & Materials	6,000	6,000	7,000	1000
31 - Equipment	4,000	4,000	5,000	1000
Subtotal Non Personnel Cost	606,000	633,000	649,000	16,000
TOTAL	2,280,000	2,457,000	2,668,000	211,000
FTE	20	20	21	1

Table 8
MULTI-DOOR DISPUTE RESOLUTION DIVISION
Detail, Difference FY 2008/2009

Object Class	Description of Request	FTE	Cost	Difference FY 2008/2008
11 – Personnel Compensation	Special Civil Mediator	1	73,000	
	Current Position WIGS	20	22,000	
	Current Positions COLA	20	61,000	
Subtotal 11				156,000
12 – Personnel Benefits	Special Civil Mediator	1	18,000	
	Current Positions WIGS	20	6,000	
	Current Positions COLA	20	15,000	
Subtotal				39,000
21 - Travel, Transp. of Persons				
22 - Transportation of Things				
23 - Rent, Commun. & Utilities				
24 - Printing & Reproduction				
25 - Other Service	Built-in			14,000
26 - Supplies & Materials	Built-in			1000
31 - Equipment	Built-in			1000
Total				211,000

Table 9
MULTI-DOOR DISPUTE RESOLUTION DIVISION
Detail of Full-Time Equivalent Employment

	FY 2007 Enacted	FY 2008 Enacted	FY 2009 Request
JS-3			
JS-4			
JS-5			
JS-6			
JS-7			
JS-8	1	1	1
JS-9	2	2	2
JS-10	7	7	7
JS-11	4	4	4
JS-12	1	1	1
JS-13	4	4	5
JS-14			
JS-15			
JS-16			
JS-17			
CES	1	1	1
Total Salaries	1,350,000	1,459,000	1,615,000
Total	20	20	21

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

<u>FY 2007 Enacted</u>		<u>FY 2008 Enacted</u>		<u>FY 2009 Request</u>		<u>Difference</u> <u>FY2008/2009</u>	
<u>FTE</u>	<u>Obligations</u>	<u>FTE</u>	<u>Obligations</u>	<u>FTE</u>	<u>Obligations</u>	<u>FTE</u>	<u>Obligations</u>
45	3,662,000	45	4,476,000	50	5,042,000	5	566,000

Mission Statement

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

Introduction

The Probate Division/Office of the Register of Wills has jurisdiction over decedents' estates, trusts, guardianships of minors, guardianships of mentally challenged adults, and guardianship and conservatorships of adults otherwise incapacitated. The duties of the Division include processing requests to open a probate estate, requests to open a small estate when the assets are less than \$40,000, requests to establish a guardianship for a minor, mentally challenged adult or an adult otherwise incapacitated, requests to establish conservatorships to handle the financial affairs of incapacitated adults, requests to establish foreign estates and interventions and requests to establish trusts. Additional duties include reviewing and processing pleadings and accounts as required throughout the duration of the fiduciary case until the case is closed. Generally an estate administration is closed upon completion, and a proceeding for a disabled person is terminated when a minor reaches majority or upon the death or recovery of a disabled person. As a result, probate cases remain under the supervision of the Court and are processed and maintained by the Probate Division for many years and often decades. The Probate Division also provides direct courtroom support and maintains an extensive computerized system, available to provide public information and to ensure notice and timely disposition of these requests. The organizational components are the Office of the Register of Wills and two branches.

Organizational Background

The Probate Division is comprised of the Office of the Register of Wills and two branches.

- The Office of the Register of Wills consists of the Register of Wills, who is responsible for the management and supervision of the two branches, and four deputies, whose primary duties are to review pleadings and prepare recommendations to the judges on uncontested matters, advise attorneys and the general public on procedures, and appear at hearings to ensure fiduciaries comply with reporting requirements. The Office has one

technology support position and two administrative support positions for a total of 8 FTEs.

- The Probate Operations Branch is comprised of three sections, the Small Estates section, which processes petitions in decedents' estates having assets of \$40,000 or less; the Decedents' Estates & Guardianships of Minors section, which processes decedents' estates, whether large or small, and guardianships of minors' estates; and the Interventions & Trusts section, which processes guardianships and conservatorships of incapacitated adults and trusts. This branch has 21 FTEs.
- The Auditing and Appraisals Branch audits accounts of fiduciaries under court supervision, examines requests for compensation, prepares audit reports, advises attorneys and fiduciaries on accounting procedures, and conducts appraisals of tangible property. This branch has 17 FTEs.

Divisional MAP Objectives

The Probate Division 2009 Management Action Plan (MAP) includes the following objectives:

- Objective 1. Ensure timely case processing by performing 75% to 95% of case processing activities within established time standards, including new projects (1) a regular review of contested matters and appeals to ensure the prompt and efficient administration of justice; (2) a project to improve the accuracy of party records and streamline and improve party notification; and (3) a review of approximately 10,000 cases dating back prior to the introduction of the Integrated Justice Information System (IJIS), consisting of quality assurance review and conversion into the IJIS system.
- Objective 2. Render all Probate forms on the Web interactive and printable and expand the forms available to the public to provide greater access to justice.
- Objective 3. Publicize the recently approved Probate Division Practice Standards to continue to improve the level of performance of court appointed fiduciaries and continue to provide substantive fiduciary training.
- Objective 4. Enhance the efficient and paperless review of accounts.
- Objective 5. Enhance the provision of services to disabled adults through institution of a guardianship team pilot project.

Divisional Restructuring and/or Work Process Redesign

The Probate Division continues to seek ways to integrate case processing and management as part of the IJIS computerized case management system and to utilize the IJIS system to its fullest. The Probate Division plans to implement Visiflow, a paperless test system for court review of the more than 2,000 accounts filed annually. The Probate Division is also next in line

to permit e-filing of court pleadings. In FY 2006 and FY 2007, budgetary constraints necessitated realignment of a shrinking number of personnel to ensure coverage of essential operations and resulted in some decreases in efficiency.

Workload Data

As shown in Table 1, below, the Probate Division disposed of 4,079 cases during FY 2006, a 12.7% increase over the number of cases disposed of during FY 2005.

Table 1
**Caseload and Efficiency Measures
(Fiscal Year 2006 Data)**

	Cases Filed	Cases Disposed	Clearance Rate*	Cases Pending		
				1-Oct	30-Sept	Change
Old Law Conservatorship	0	22	**	221	199	-10%
Foreign Proceedings	140	140	100%	0	0	0
Decedent's Estate	1,473	2,860	195%	2,879	1,473	-49%
Guardianships of Minors	33	79	239%	185	139	-25%
Adult Guardianships/Conservatorships	388	180	-46%	1,995	2,203	9%
Small Estates	745	775	104%	109	79	-27%
Trusts	17	3	18%	302	316	4%
Total	2,796	4,079	146%	5,691	4,409	-22%
* 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 9/30/05 for this case type. There are no new cases of this type due to enactment of the Guardianship Protective Proceedings and Durable Power of Attorney Act of 1989. Disabled persons are now included in the Adult Guardianships/Conservatorships category.						

Key Performance Indicators

Table 2
**PROBATE DIVISION
Key Performance Indicators**

Performance Indicator	Data Source	FY 2005		FY 2006	
		Goal	Actual	Goal	Actual
Time Standard from Filing to Disposition					
Uncontested petitions: (except small estates) within 45 days	Random Case Review	93%	81%	95%	99%
Small estates: within 120 days	Random Case Review	75%	86%	95%	99%
Accounts absent objections: 75% within 90 days	Monthly Reports	50%	54%	85%	*
Requests for compensation from Guardianship Fund: within 30 days	Monthly Reports	98%	99%	95%	100%
Requests for compensation without account: within 45 days	Monthly Reports	92%	92%	95%	98%
Request for compensation with account: within 90 days	Monthly Reports	NA	NA	95%	95%

*Data not ascertainable

As part of a courtwide performance measurement effort, the Probate Division has recently established broader and more comprehensive time standards and goals for processing cases and reducing the time between filing and disposition as follows:

Table 3
**Additional Key Performance Indicators
 To Be Measured During FY 2007**

Performance Indicator	Data Source	Goal FY 2007	Goal FY 2008
Time Standard from Filing to Disposition			
Contested complaints: 95% within 24 months	Monthly Reports	90%	90%
Contested petitions: within 90 days	Random Case Review	95%	95%
Supervised decedents' estates: within 36 months	Monthly Reports	95%	95%
Guardianship of minors: within 180 days of a qualifying event (i.e. minor's attaining age of majority)	Monthly Reports	95%	95%
Intervention proceedings: within 180 days of a qualifying event (i.e. death or termination of proceeding)	Monthly Reports	95%	95%
Accounts with objections: 95% within 120 days	Monthly Reports	75%	75%
Verification and certificates of notice in unsupervised estates: 95% filed within 145 days of Personal Representative's appointment	Random Case Review	95%	95%

FY 2009 Request

In FY 2009, the Courts request \$5,042,000 for the Probate Division, an increase of \$566,000 (13%) above the FY 2008 Enacted Budget. The requested increase includes \$138,000 (3 FTEs) for deputy clerks to process and monitor the substantially increasing caseload of intervention and trust cases; \$151,000 (2 FTEs) for licensed clinical social workers to manage a pilot project coordinating the services of social work professionals and volunteer health care professionals with the services of court appointed guardians in the effort to ensure that incapacitated persons under court supervision are receiving adequate care and appropriate services; and built-in cost increases.

Expediting Processing and Monitoring of Adult Guardianship and Conservatorship Cases, \$151,000

FTE Request - Probate Operations Branch, Interventions & Trusts Section, 3 Deputy Clerks

Problem Statement. The Probate Division requests funds for three FTEs for its Interventions & Trusts Section, whose present, full staff of 2 deputy clerks is inadequate to process and monitor in a timely fashion cases involving mentally challenged or otherwise incapacitated adults. Delays in processing exist, which can place at risk the personal safety, health, and financial security of the District's population of vulnerable adults. Presently, the Interventions & Trusts Section has only two deputy clerks who are unable to handle the present workload of 2,718 cases and will not be expected to effectively process an estimated caseload totaling more than 3,500 cases as of the start of FY 2009, with an estimated 500 new case filings in FY 2009. Processing of each of these cases involves party maintenance, docketing and scanning pleadings, issuing orders, court notices, and letters of appointment, ensuring the filing and processing of bi-annual

guardianship reports and implementation of other Division quality controls until the guardianship is ended, which is typically when the ward dies or regains capacity. Additional deputy clerks are critical if the Probate Division is to meet its goal of ensuring timely and accurate processing of these cases. Present vacancies within the Probate Operations Branch, for which the Interventions & Trusts Section is a part, consist of a file room clerk position and a calendar coordinator position, whose functions are critical and do not include the clerical processing performed by deputy clerks.

Relationship to Strategic Issues, Goals or Strategies. The proposed addition of FTEs would assure compliance with operating standards and is aligned with the Courts' mission to protect the rights and liberties of incapacitated adults and the Courts' Strategic Issue of fair and timely case resolution, and that the D.C. Courts will resolve cases fairly and impartially without regard to race, age, sex, ethnicity, orientation, economic status or mental or physical disability.

Relationship to Existing Funding. The request would increase the number of deputy clerk FTEs from two to five based upon an internal needs assessment.

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

Key Performance Indicators. Although the Probate Division improved performance in FY 2006 over FY 2005, due to staffing constraints the Interventions & Trusts Section did not meet its performance goal of 95% timely and accurate processing in (1) case initiation and party maintenance (84%); (2) process subsequent pleadings (89%); (3) setting initial hearings within certain time frames (89%); (4) process letters of appointment (94%); (5) process guardianship report (94%); (6) issue delinquency notices (79%); (7) issue summary hearing notices (81%); (8) process suggestion of death (93%). Substantial additional case filings during FY 2007 and FY 2008 are expected to lead to further reductions in case processing times and other key performance measures; thereby increasing the need for additional clerks to meet the Division's performance goals.

Enhanced Monitoring of Incapacitated Adults, \$159,000
FTE Request: Two Licensed Clinical Social Workers, JS-11/12

Problem Statement. The Probate Division has identified the need to enhance monitoring of services provided to incapacitated adults through the institution of a Guardianship Team Pilot Project. The Guardianship Team Pilot Project grew out of the recommendations of the Probate Review Task Force, which was created by the Superior Court based on recommendations by the Council for Court Excellence and the Bar Association of the District of Columbia. Working together with professionals and advocates, the Probate Division is in the process of developing a pilot project linking social workers pursuing advanced degrees and certain other health care professionals with court-appointed guardians as a team to improve guardianship performance, to provide competent and comprehensive evaluation of the needs of disabled persons who are wards of the court, and also to provide the Probate Division with staff who have the requisite expertise and training to review the more than 4,000 guardianship reports filed annually concerning the health and health care provided to disabled adults. It is envisioned that, under the

project managed by the two clinical social workers, each and every ward will be visited by a guardian/professional team on a monthly basis as required by statute in order to assess the needs of the ward and improve future guardianship services. As of the close of FY 2006, there are 2,203 intervention cases in the Probate Division providing guardianship and/or conservatorship services to disabled adults. Until recently, District of Columbia regulations required that graduate level social work students engaged in providing the services required for this project be supervised by licensed clinical social workers. Although this requirement has been repealed, given the vulnerability of the population that would be served during the project and the nature of the assessments the graduate students would be required to perform, the Probate Division believes that it would be appropriate to have licensed clinical social workers supervising the graduate students participating in this project.

Relationship to Strategic Issues, Goals or Strategies. The Probate Division is responsible for reviewing guardianship reports and notifying the assigned judges of procedural irregularities. More in-depth review of these reports and the development of guardian professional teams would better protect the health and welfare of adult wards, promote public confidence in the courts, and assist court appointees in resolving issues without judicial intervention. This initiative supports the D.C. Court’s vision to be open to all, trusted by all and provide justice for all, and is in keeping with the strategic goal of fair and timely case resolution.

Relationship to Existing Funding. Currently, the Probate Division does not provide these enhanced services and there is no base funding for these two additional positions.

Methodology. The grade level for the licensed clinical social workers is in accordance with the Court’s classification policies.

Expenditure Plan. The licensed clinical social workers would be recruited and hired in accordance with the Courts’ personnel policies and practices.

Key Performance Indicators: The Probate Division and the Research and Development Division, in conjunction with professional social workers, health care professionals and advocates, will be developing the evaluation design for this pilot project. The results of this effort will guide the performance measures for the Guardianship Team Pilot Project after the pilot period.

Table 4
PROBATE DIVISION
New Positions Requested

Positions	Grade	Number	Annual Salary	Benefits	Total Personnel Costs
Social Workers	JS 11/12	2	\$121,000	\$30,000	\$151,000
Deputy Clerks	JS 6	3	\$110,000	\$28,000	\$138,000
Total		5	\$231,000	\$58,000	\$289,000

Table 5
PROBATE DIVISION
Budget Authority by Object Class

	FY 2007 Enacted	FY 2008 Enacted	FY 2009 Request	Difference FY 2008/2009
11 - Personnel Compensation	2,939,000	3,565,000	3,999,000	434,000
12 - Personnel Benefits	705,000	891,000	1,000,000	109,000
Subtotal Personnel Cost	<i>3,644,000</i>	<i>4,456,000</i>	<i>4,999,000</i>	<i>543,000</i>
21 - Travel, Transp. of Persons				
22 - Transportation of Things				
23 - Rent, Commun. & Utilities				
24 - Printing & Reproduction				
25 - Other Services				
26 - Supplies & Materials	10,000	11,000	19,000	8,000
31 - Equipment	8,000	9,000	24,000	15,000
Subtotal Non Personnel Cost	<i>18,000</i>	<i>20,000</i>	<i>43,000</i>	<i>23,000</i>
TOTAL	3,662,000	4,476,000	5,042,000	566,000
FTE	45	45	50	5

Table 6
PROBATE DIVISION
Detail, Difference FY 2008/FY2009

Object Class	Description of Request	FTE	Cost	Difference FY 2008/FY2009
11 - Personnel Compensation	Deputy Clerks/Social Workers	5	231,000	
	Current Positions WIGS	45	53,000	
	Current Positions COLA	45	150,000	
Subtotal				434,000
12 - Personnel Benefits	Deputy Clerks/Social Workers	5	58,000	
	Current Positions WIGS	45	13,000	
	Current Positions COLA	45	38,000	
Subtotal				109,000
21 - Travel, Transp. of Persons				
22 - Transportation of Things				
23 - Rent, Commun. & Utilities				
24 - Printing & Reproduction				
25 - Other Service				
26 - Supplies & Materials	Built-in		1,000	
	Deputy Clerks/Social Workers		7,000	
Subtotal				8,000
31 - Equipment	Built-in		1,000	
	Deputy Clerks/Social Workers		14,000	
Subtotal				15,000
Total				566,000

Table 7
PROBATE DIVISION
Detail of Full Time Equivalent Employment

	FY 2007 Enacted	FY 2008 Enacted	FY 2009 Request
JS-3			
JS-4	2	2	2
JS-5	1	1	1
JS-6	1	1	4
JS-7	6	6	6
JS-8	5	5	5
JS-9	1	1	1
JS-10	3	3	3
JS-11	3	5	5
JS-12	16	16	16
JS-13	5	5	5
JS-14	1	1	1
JS-15	1	1	1
JS-16			
JS-17			
CES	1	1	1
JS Salaries	2,939,000	3,565,000	3,999,000
TOTAL	45	45	50

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

<u>FY 2007 Enacted</u>		<u>FY 2008 Enacted</u>		<u>FY 2009 Request</u>		<u>Difference</u> <u>FY 2008/2009</u>	
<u>FTE</u>	<u>Obligations</u>	<u>FTE</u>	<u>Obligations</u>	<u>FTE</u>	<u>Obligations</u>	<u>FTE</u>	<u>Obligations</u>
27	2,820,000	27	3,189,000	29	3,538,000	2	349,000

The Special Operations Division has administrative oversight for the Tax Division, and provides specialized services within its seven units to litigants, the general public, and court operations.

Organizational Background

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

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

Division MAP Objectives

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

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

Restructuring and Work Process Redesign

Several restructuring efforts are underway in the Special Operations Division. The Jurors’ Office has continued with its show cause hearings for jurors who do not report for service on their designated dates. Procedures are also being developed to bring in citizens who do not respond to the juror summons. These procedures will help to increase the number of jurors reporting for service (i.e., juror yield). The Court is also continuing with its annual dialogue between jurors and judges that allows for feedback on how the Court can improve jury service. The Jurors’ Office is continuously redesigning the content of its website to include more information on the jury service experience. Also, the interactive section of the website allows jurors to complete a juror qualification form, obtain their last date of service, or defer their date of service online. The response to the latter from the public continues to be tremendous. Efforts are also being initiated to include a virtual tour of the Jurors’ Office on the website.

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

The Appeals Coordinators’ Office (ACO) is improving customer service and reducing the appeal process time by establishing a “Single Point of Filing”. This procedure will provide “one stop shopping” by allowing the customer to file and pay for the Notice of Appeal in one place, the Appeal Coordinators’ Office. This process will also allow the customer to receive more pertinent and accurate information about the appeal process from the staff in the ACO, who are knowledgeable and are appeal subject matter experts.

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

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

Workload Data

In FY 2006, the Special Operations Division's Jurors' Office sent over 252,000 summonses to District of Columbia citizens to appear on juries; the Office of Court Interpreting Services received and fulfilled over 8,006 requests for courtroom interpreting services; the Tax Division heard and disposed of 173 tax petitions; and the Appeals Coordinators' Office received 1,259 new appeals that were filed in various division offices. This office also certified approximately 2,600 appeal records and supplemental records that were forwarded to the Court of Appeals as detailed in Table 4. In 2006, 725 children used the child-care center. Tables 1 through 6 provide performance data for the Jurors' Office, the Office of Court Interpreting Services, the Tax Division, the Appeals Coordinators Office, the library, and the child care center, respectively.

Table 1
SPECIAL OPERATIONS DIVISION
Jurors' Office
Performance Measurement Table

Type of Indicator	Key Performance Indicator	Data Source	FY 2006		FY 2007		Projection FY 2008	Projection FY 2009
			Goal	Actual	Goal	Estimate		
Output/Activity	# of summons sent to jurors to serve on jury duty	Courts' Information Technology (IT) Division	252,898	313,193	250,370	264,532	248,000	246,000
Output/Activity	Jurors qualified to serve on voir dire panels	IT Division	45,913	70,548	44,915	47,600	44,017	43,137
End Outcome	Judicial requests for voir dire panels met	Court's Research and Development Division	80%	55%	80%	60%	82%	85%
End Outcome	Jury Yield	IT Division	30%	20.96%	30%	23%	25%	27%

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

Type of Indicator	Performance Indicator	Data Source	FY 2006		FY 2007		Projection FY 2008	Projection FY 2009
			Goal	Actual	Goal	Estimate		
Input	Requests for interpreters	OCIS statistics	7304	8015	7450	7550	7599	7751
Output/Activity	Interpreting services provided (cases called within 10 minutes of a "ready call" and within one hour for last minute requests)	OCIS statistics	7454	8006	7077	7512	7219	7363
End Outcome	Requests for interpreters met	OCIS statistics	95%	99.9%	95%	99.5%	95%	95%

Table 3
SPECIAL OPERATIONS DIVISION
Tax Division
Performance Measurement Table

Type of Indicator	Performance Indicator	Data Source	FY 2006		FY 2007		Projection FY 2008	Projection FY 2009
			Goal	Actual	Goal	Estimate		
Input	Number of tax petitions filed	Court data	300	211	219	175	211	300
Output/Activity	Number of cases prepared for hearing	Court data	650	680	720	750	750	760
End Outcome	Cases disposed	Court data	160	215	179	200	185	200
Productivity/Efficiency	Cases disposed/cases file	Court data	53%	82%	67%	68%	70%	72%

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

Type of Indicator	Key Performance Indicator	Data Source	FY 2006		FY 2007		Projection FY 2008	Projection FY 2009
			Goal	Actual	Goal	Estimate		
Input	Appeals filed	Annual Report & office monthly statistical reports	1,500	1,259	1,250	1,225	1,225	1,200
Output/Activity	Percentage of appeal records and supplemental records certified by staff weekly	Weekly worksheets from staff, team lists and civil and criminal come-up lists	80%	96%	98%	98%	98%	98%
End Outcome	Percentage of appeal records and supplemental records picked-up by the Court of Appeals	Court of Appeals pick-up log	98%	98%	98%	98%	98%	98%

Table 5
SPECIAL OPERATIONS DIVISION
Library
Performance Measurement Table

Type of Indicator	Performance Indicator	Data Source	FY 2006		FY 2007		Projection FY 2008	Projection FY 2009
			Goal	Actual	Goal	Estimate		
Output	Volumes available	Library Staff Data	23,500	23,200	23,500	23,200	23,200	23,200
Outcome	Users	Library Staff Data	9,000	9,500	9,600	10,500	11,340	12,247
Outcome	Queries answered	Library Staff Data	N/A	N/A	2,000	2,000	2,200	2,420

Table 6
SPECIAL OPERATIONS DIVISION
Child Care Center
Performance Measurement Table

Type of Indicators	Performance Indicator	Data Source	FY 2006		FY 2007		Projection FY 2008	Projection FY 2009
			Goal	Actual	Goal	Estimate		
Input	Number of children visiting the center	Staff statistics	421	725	882	732	739	746
Output/Activity	Number of caretakers available	Staff statistics	2	2	2	2	2	2
End Outcome	Average number of children cared for daily	Staff statistics	2	2.8	3.42	2.8	2.81	2.84
Productivity/Efficiency	Percentage of requests for care met (eligible children*)	Staff statistics	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

* Eligibility is based on the age of the child, toilet training status, and whether a current health certificate is on file by the child's second visit.

FY 2009 Request

In FY 2009, the Courts request \$3,538,000 for the Special Operations Division, an increase of \$349,000 (11%) above the FY 2008 Enacted Budget. The requested increase includes \$93,000 for 2 FTEs to increase the percentage of residents who serve as jurors; \$105,000 for a rate increase for interpreters; and built-in increases.

Increasing Juror Service: Two Juror Clerks (JS-6, \$93,000)

Problem Statement. For most law abiding residents of the District of Columbia, a summons for jury duty is the only reason they will ever have contact with the Superior Court. In many instances, the Jurors' Office will serve as a first point of contact for residents reporting to the Courthouse in response to a jury summons. How residents are treated from the time they first receive the summons through the completion of their service is a direct reflection on the D.C. Courts. Accordingly, it is in the Courts' best interest to provide adequate staffing to provide prompt telephone call handling, quick responses to electronic mail inquiries, accessibility to the Courts informational and interactive Online Jury Services Website, and overall excellent customer service. The provision of excellent customer service will encourage residents to respond to future jury summons.

The Court also needs to address the issue of residents of the District who fail to respond to jury summons. Only about 21% of residents summoned for jury service in fiscal 2006 came to the court to serve. The current eligibility cycle for jury service in the Court is approximately twenty-four months. This is cause for concern for many District residents who willingly serve when they are summoned. If more residents of the District responded when called to serve, the eligibility cycle could be increased to 2.5 or perhaps every three years. In order to increase the eligibility cycle for jury service, the jury yield must increase. The Jurors' Office has adopted procedures to improve the master jury list, thereby reducing the amount of returned and undeliverable summons. What is still needed is a means to reach the individuals who fail to respond when summoned. By actively pursuing these individuals, the jury yield will increase.

This will enable more District residents to participate in the jury system, but with longer intervals in between. Two additional juror clerk positions are required to enhance services to the large number of jurors, as well as perform activities that are critical to increasing the jury yield, such as providing reminder notices and calls to scheduled jurors. The juror clerks will also research bad/undeliverable addresses on returned mail to determine if that juror still resides in the District of Columbia so that the summons can be re-issued, and contact individuals who fail to report on the summons date.

Relationship to the Courts’ Strategic Issues, Goals or Strategies Jury yield is a performance measure of the PART assessment for OMB. Increasing the yield will enable the Court to conform to national trial court performance standards (currently 40%) as set by the National Center for State Courts. By increasing the jury yield, we seek to enhance the administration of justice by meeting the Strategic Goal of fair and timely case resolution by ensuring that jury pools reflect the characteristics of the D.C. community.

Relationship to Division MAP Objectives Increasing the juror yield will enable us to meet judicial requests for voir dire panels.

Relationship to Existing Funding. This is a new budget initiative.

Methodology. The Division has determined that the two positions should be graded at JS-6/7/8 based on Court classification policies.

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

Performance Indicators. 1) Jury yield. 2) Eligibility cycle for potential jurors. 3) Judicial requests for voir dire panels. 4) Juror satisfaction.

Rate Increase for Court Interpreters - \$105,000

Problem Statement. At present, the D.C. Courts compensate interpreters at the lowest rate among all courts in the region.

Organization	Full Day Compensation	Half Day Compensation (4 hours)
D.C. Courts	\$329	\$178
Federal Courts	\$364	\$197
Virginia Courts (nearby jurisdictions)	\$420 ⁴	\$240
Maryland Courts	\$440	\$220
U.S. State Department	\$412	\$223

To meet the increasing demand for interpreters to serve hearing-impaired and non-English-speaking persons with court cases, a sufficient number of federally certified foreign-language

⁴ Seven hour day

court interpreters are needed. Providing the lowest rate of compensation in the Washington metro area, the D.C. Courts are at a competitive disadvantage for interpreters. Therefore, the Courts request funding to increase the rate of payment.

If the D.C. Courts continue to pay the lowest rate of compensation in the area, free-lance interpreters will return to contracting through the Department of State, as they have in the past. This practice allows the contractor to work at a higher level of compensation, and costs the D.C. Courts considerably more money than if the rates were raised to current federal rates. For example, of the \$412 that the State Department currently charges the Court for interpreters, the interpreter receives \$355 (\$26 more than the Court pays) and \$57 is a fee to the State Department for providing the interpreter. When the State Department fees increase in October 2007, the interpreter will receive \$364 per day and the Courts will pay a fee of \$57 to the State Department for a full day. In effect, the Courts will waste money by not increasing the rate of compensation paid to interpreters to the projected amount they will be paid by the Federal Courts.

Number of Spanish language interpreters hired in 2006:

FULL DAY: 1,173

HALF DAY: 68

Number of American Sign Language (ASL) and non-Spanish interpreters hired:

FULL DAY: 408

HALF DAY: 351

How the need for interpreters is determined:

Factors:

- 1) One interpreter dedicated daily for Landlord & Tenant and Small Claims branches;
- 2) Regularly, in order to satisfy the demands of courtrooms, a complement of five interpreters at a minimum is needed. This practice in large part assists in fulfilling the MAP requirement of dispatching an interpreter within 10 minutes of a “ready call”.
- 3) With regard to languages other than Spanish, an interpreter is hired for either a half or full day. Seldom is the interpreter here for more than one assignment. The determination to hire for either half or full day is based on the nature and length of the assignment.

Relationship to Court Mission and Strategic Goals. By increasing compensation to ensure that the Courts provide adequate, high-quality interpreting services for non-English-speaking, deaf and hard-of-hearing persons interacting in the court system, this initiative would support the Courts’ Strategic Goal: The D.C. Courts will promote access to justice for all persons.

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

Proposed solution. The proposed rate structure for the D.C. Courts for FY 2009 reflects estimated Federal rate increases of 2.5% per year (based on historical increases) over the FY 2007 rate:

\$382 per 8 hours
\$207 per 4 hours
\$55 per hour for each hour over 8 hours

Methodology. The proposed rate structure is based on an analysis of local market rates for interpreter services.

	Current D.C. Courts Rates	Estimated Federal Rates FY 2009	Increase	Projected Interpreter Days FY 2009	Projected Increase FY 2009
Full Day	\$329	\$382	\$53	1,743	\$92,000
Half Day	\$178	\$207	\$29	462	\$13,000
Total					\$105,000

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

Performance Indicators. The Division is currently meeting its goal of providing an interpreter within ten minutes of receipt of a "ready" request from a courtroom 95% of the time. The requested funds will enable the Division to maintain this level of performance. Without the rate increase, the Division projects a decline in performance, as fewer interpreters will be willing to work at a lower rate than they can command elsewhere in the local area.

Table 7
SPECIAL OPERATIONS DIVISION
New Positions Requested

Positions	Grade	Number	Salary	Benefits	Total Personnel Cost
Deputy Clerk	6	2	\$74,000	\$19,000	\$93,000

Table 8
SPECIAL OPERATIONS DIVISION
Budget Authority by Object Class

	FY 2007 Enacted	FY 2008 Enacted	FY 2009 Request	Difference FY 2008/2009
11 - Personnel Compensation	1,551,000	1,800,000	1,977,000	177,000
12 - Personnel Benefits	372,000	450,000	495,000	45,000
Subtotal Personnel Cost	1,923,000	2,250,000	2,472,000	222,000
21 - Travel, Transp. of Persons				
22 - Transportation of Things				
23 - Rent, Commun. & Utilities				
24 - Printing & Reproduction	133,000	139,000	142,000	3,000
25 - Other Services	547,000	572,000	690,000	118,000
26 - Supplies & Materials	212,000	222,000	227,000	5,000
31 - Equipment	5,000	6,000	7,000	1,000
Subtotal Non Personnel Cost	897,000	939,000	1,066,000	127,000
TOTAL	2,820,000	3,189,000	3,538,000	349,000
FTE	27	27	29	2

Table 9
SPECIAL OPERATIONS DIVISION
Detail, Difference FY 2008/ 2009

Object Class	Description of Request	FTE	Cost	Difference FY 2007/2008
11 – Personnel Compensation	Deputy Clerks	2	74,000	
	Current Positions WIGS	27	27,000	
	Current Positions COLA	27	76,000	
Subtotal				177,000
12 - Benefits	Deputy Clerks	2	19,000	
	Current Positions WIGS	27	7,000	
	Current Positions COLA	27	19,000	
Subtotal				45,000
21 - Travel, Transp. of Persons				
22 - Transportation of Things				
24-Printing and Reproduction	Built-in			3,000
25-Other Services	Interpreter Fee Increases		105,000	
	Built-in		13,000	
Subtotal				118,000
26-Supplies & Materials	Built-in			5,000
31 – Equipment	Built-in			1,000
Total				349,000

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

	FY 2007 Enacted	FY 2008 Enacted	FY 2009 Request
JS-1			
JS-4			
JS-5			
JS-6	1	1	3
JS-7	5	5	3
JS-8	6	6	7
JS-9	5	4	4
JS-10			1
JS-11	2	2	2
JS-12	4	6	6
JS-13	2	2	2
JS-14			
JS-15			
JS-16			
CES	1	1	1
JS Salaries	1,551,000	1,800,000	1,977,000
TOTAL	27	27	29

**DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA SUPERIOR COURT
MANAGEMENT ACCOUNT**

<u>FY 2007 Enacted</u>		<u>FY 2008 Enacted</u>		<u>FY 2009 Request</u>		<u>Difference</u> <u>FY 2008/2009</u>	
FTE	Obligations	FTE	Obligations	FTE	Obligations	FTE	Obligations
-	9,447,000	-	9,864,000	-	10,212,000	-	348,000

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.

FY2009 Request

In FY 2009, the Courts request \$10,212,000 for the Management Account, an increase of \$348,000 or 3.5%, above the FY 2008 Enacted Budget. The requested increase includes \$129,000 for the Transit Subsidy Increase for Superior Court employees and \$219,000 for built-in cost increases. (For further details regarding the Transit Subsidy Increase, please see the Human Resources Division in the Court System section.)

Table 1
MANAGEMENT ACCOUNT
Budget Authority by Object Class

	FY 2007 Enacted	FY 2008 Enacted	FY 2009 Request	Difference FY 2008/2009
11 - Compensation	300,000	346,000	361,000	15,000
12 - Benefits			129,000	129,000
Subtotal Personnel Cost	<i>300,000</i>	<i>346,000</i>	<i>490,000</i>	<i>144,000</i>
21 - Travel, Transp. of Persons	284,000	296,000	303,000	7,000
22 - Transportation of Things	9,000	9,000	10,000	1,000
23 - Rent, Commun. & Utilities	4,337,000	4,541,000	4,637,000	96,000
24 - Printing & Reproduction	281,000	293,000	300,000	7,000
25 - Other Services	3,626,000	3,775,000	3,855,000	80,000
26 - Supplies & Materials	415,000	419,000	428,000	9,000
31 - Equipment	195,000	185,000	189,000	4,000
Subtotal Non Personnel Cost	<i>9,147,000</i>	<i>9,518,000</i>	<i>9,722,000</i>	<i>204,000</i>
TOTAL	9,447,000	9,864,000	10,212,000	348,000
FTE	0	0	0	0

Table 2
MANAGEMENT ACCOUNT
Detail, Difference FY 2008/2009

Object Class	Description of Request	FTE	Cost	Difference FY2008/2009
11 - Compensation	Built-in			15,000
12 - Benefits	Transit Subsidy Increase			129,000
<i>Personnel Subtotal</i>				<i>144,000</i>
21 - Travel, Transp. of Persons	Built-in			7,000
22 - Transportation of Things	Built-in			1,000
23 - Rent, Commun. & Utilities	Built-in			96,000
24 - Printing & Reproduction	Built-in			7,000
25 - Other Service	Built-in			80,000
26 - Supplies & Materials	Built-in			9,000
31 - Equipment	Built-in			4,000
<i>Non-Personnel Subtotal</i>				<i>204,000</i>
Total				348,000