

STRATEGIC PLANNING AND MANAGEMENT

Initiative Element	Requested Increase	Requested FTE
Personnel - (2) Strategic Management Analysts	\$ 215,000	2
Training and Travel	16,000	
Contractual Services	60,000	
Performance Measurement Software	600,000	
TOTAL	\$ 891,000	2

Problem Statement. In 2004, the Courts established an Office of Strategic Management to lead courtwide strategic planning, performance measurement and assessment, and related initiatives and expand the Courts’ use of strategic management practices. Presently staffed only by a Director and Strategic Program Analyst, this office requires dedicated resources to meet its performance objectives.

The Office of Strategic Management works closely with the Strategic Planning Leadership Council, which is a standing committee of judges from the Court of Appeals and Superior Court, the Executive Officer, Clerks of Court, and Division Directors that meets regularly to promote strategic management at the Courts. The Office of Strategic Management plans and implements the work of the Strategic Planning Leadership Council and related subcommittees. The Office also works with the Courts’ Fiscal Officer, Director of Human Resources and Director of Education and Training to align the Courts’ budgeting and performance management processes, and training program, with the strategic management function.

In the Courts’ 2006 Performance Assessment Rating Tool (PART) evaluation, the Office of Management and Budget stated, “While the Courts have a robust strategic planning process, more work is needed on providing specific and ambitious goals and time frames.” The Office of Strategic Management is presently coordinating the implementation of courtwide performance measures approved by the Joint Committee in 2005. In various working group meetings attended by the Chief Judge and Presiding Judges of Superior Court, operating division directors, the Chief Information Officer and the Director of the Research and Development Division, the Office is refining definitions of these measures appropriate to each case type, determining data collection methods, and developing reporting templates. This initiative is directly responsive to OMB’s “Improvement Plan” for the Courts, which states in the PART assessment that the Courts should be: “Developing ambitious targets and time frames for the Courts’ performance measures.”

The Office also plans and carries out, in conjunction with the Strategic Planning Leadership Council, the stakeholder outreach effort to develop the Courts’ Strategic Plan. Through surveys, focus groups, and other events, the Office gathers input from individuals and organizations that interface with the judicial branch. This information is compiled and analyzed by the Council to develop the Strategic Plan and, in interim years, to assess the effectiveness of the Courts’ implementation of the Plan. The Courts have a goal to significantly expand the outreach program but require additional resources to do so.

Throughout the year, the Office of Strategic Management provides expertise and support to 18 court divisions and units in developing Management Action Plans, or MAPs, which detail how the divisions will assist in achieving the goals of the Courts' Strategic Plan. MAPs contain a set of objectives linked to courtwide goals, measurable performance indicators and targets, and key action steps with time frames. Divisions are required to link their budget requests and expenditures to their MAPs, and to update their MAPs every year to inform the budget development process. The Office of Strategic Management monitors MAP implementation for court executive management and the Strategic Planning Leadership Council.

The Office of Strategic Management has the following objectives:

Office of Strategic Management MAP Objectives:

1. Promote the Courts' achievement of strategic goals by working with the Strategic Planning Leadership Council to develop a long-range Strategic Plan for 2008-2012.
2. Promote strategic management of the Courts by monitoring the implementation of division MAPs and preparing quarterly reports for Court Executive Management and the Strategic Planning Leadership Council.
3. Foster the Courts' achievement of strategic goals by planning regular meetings of the Strategic Planning Leadership Council to assess the effectiveness of actions taken to implement the Strategic Plan, to identify emerging trends and opportunities, to determine where gaps exist between strategy formulation and execution, and to recommend options to the Joint Committee and/or Court Executive Management.
4. Enhance public accountability by developing and implementing a Performance Assessment Program that enables the Courts to regularly assess organizational performance.
5. Enhance public accountability by preparing courtwide performance reports annually or upon request of the Joint Committee or Executive Officer.
6. Enhance effective and efficient court operations by collaborating with the Fiscal Officer, Human Resources Director, Chief Information Officer and Director of Research and Development to ensure that the Courts' budgeting, performance management, information management and statistical reporting processes are aligned with and support with the Courts' enterprise strategic planning and management function.
7. Enhance the Courts' ability to be responsive to the community by implementing a program to seek feedback on a regular basis from court participants, the public, judges and court personnel about the effectiveness of the Courts.
8. Ensure that judges, court employees and external stakeholders have access to information about the Courts' strategic management process and results by developing and maintaining current information on the Courts' website and Intranet.

Achievement of these and future objectives cannot be efficiently accomplished with existing resources. Accordingly, funds are requested for additional FTEs, training and travel for staff, expert consulting services, and performance measurement software.

The Courts are requesting two additional FTEs, Management Analysts, to assist the Office of Strategic Management in implementing courtwide performance measures, conducting outreach to seek input on the Courts' Strategic Plan and implementation, working with court divisions to develop MAPs, monitoring MAP implementation and cross-divisional strategic initiatives, and preparing performance reports and the like. Training and travel funds are requested to enable staff to attend professional training on topics such as strategic planning, project management, performance measurement, budget and performance integration, and strategic management of human capital, as well as to conduct site visits to observe and learn about innovative practices and court improvement projects in other jurisdictions. Funding for contractual services is requested to retain an expert consultant to assist with the implementation of performance measures, to facilitate outreach sessions, and related initiatives. Funding is also requested to purchase performance measurement analysis and reporting software compatible with the Courts' computer system.

Relationship to Court Mission and Goals. The Office of Strategic Management supports the strategy of the Courts' Strategic Plan to implement courtwide performance measures and regularly issue reports on how the court is performing. The requested funding for personnel, performance measurement software, training and travel, and expert services for the Office of Strategic Management will enhance the Courts' ability to implement the Strategic Plan throughout all divisions and units of the organization, and build the Courts' capacity to undertake effective strategic planning and performance assessment.

Methodology. The cost estimate for the Office of Strategic Management would provide staff, performance measurement software, expert services, and travel and training for staff.

Expenditure Plan. The new FTEs would be recruited and hired in accordance with the Courts' personnel policies and procedures.

Performance Indicators. Performance indicators include: (1) timeliness and quality of the Courts' Strategic Plan, (2) currency and alignment of division MAPs with Strategic Plan, (3) timeliness and quality of court performance reports, (4) customer/stakeholder assessment of impact of enterprise strategic planning and management function on organizational effectiveness.

ENHANCING JUVENILE PROBATION SERVICES

Initiative Element	Requested Increase	Requested FTE
Probation Officers (JS-9)	\$ 313,000	5
Third Party Monitoring Services	470,000	
Creation of Two BARJ Drop-In Centers	4,500,000	
TOTAL	\$ 5,283,000	5

Problem Statement. To enhance the rehabilitation of court-involved juveniles, the Courts seek additional resources—staff, services, and facilities—to more closely supervise youth.

Probation Officers and Services. To enhance public safety through the development of comprehensive individual service and supervision plans for juveniles (involving immediate family and other necessary support members), probation officers must begin utilizing Family Group Conferencing (FGC), consistent with best practices in juvenile justice systems. As indicated in the *Restructuring or Work Process Re-Design* section, the SSD began training all probation officers in the FGC model for service plan development in 2007; however, in analyzing the extensive time required to coordinate appropriate individuals for participation and facilitate each family group conference, the Division determined probation officers cannot coordinate and facilitate family group conferences and also case manage and supervise youth. Thus, additional staffing is necessary.

This determination is also consistent with the internationally renowned FGC model (originating in New Zealand in 1989) which requires FGC facilitation of by a highly-trained person independent of case management. The use of FGCs will foster greater participation among families, enhance awareness among juveniles of the impact of their actions and redress some of the harm to victims impacted by juvenile crime. The expansion of staff will permit the SSD to facilitate family group conferences prior to disposition, thereby increasing the likelihood of expedited adjudication.

The additional five FTEs will enable the Division to engage immediate and extended family members as well as others significant in the life of the youth and to develop comprehensive service and supervision plans for youth and families. Because many of the services will begin during the trial, the Division envisions that the duration of probation sentences may be reduced, as many of the service and supervision objectives will have been met prior to sentencing.

In FY 2006, the SSD expanded its community supervision to include a Third-Party Monitoring pilot. The measure involved the use of a vendor providing up to ten face-to-face monitoring contacts to fifty youth, in addition to contacts made by probation officers. Contacts were made at various times during weekdays and weekends to ensure youth adhere court-ordered conditions. The objective of the measure was to supervise high-risk youth in community settings without increasing recidivism or compromising public safety.

Statistical data gathered over the past year, since the inception of Third-Party Monitoring and our expansion of pro-social services (e.g., mentoring, tutoring, and counseling) reveal that targeted

high-risk adolescent females and males have successfully remained in the community during and subsequent to the trial with virtually no increase in recidivism rates. In fact, a 2007 report released by the Annie E. Casey Foundation showed that the creation of the Division's adolescent girls unit and use of Third-Party Monitoring and enhanced services has led to an aggregate 74% reduction in pre-trial detention and an aggregate 75% reduction in pre-trial shelter placement among adolescent girls.

The requested funds will enable the Division to use Third-Party Monitoring at schools to ensure truants are consistently attending and performing academically in school and to make home visits to reduce habitual running away among persons in need of supervision (PINS). These resources will permit the Division to double the number of high-risk youth targeted by Third-Party Monitoring.

Drop-In Centers. To reduce reliance on secure detention and shelter home placement while preserving public safety, the Division must maximize its satellite probation offices in each quadrant of the city. In 2007, following an award of federal Violent Offender Truth in Sentencing (VOTIS) funds, the SSD, in collaboration with other court divisions, opened in Southeast the nation's first-ever Balanced and Restorative Justice (BARJ) Drop-In Center. The spacious new facility, twice the size of the prior Satellite Office, is in leased space and has offices for probation officers and clinical staff, a large recreation room, and a satellite courtroom. On average, 230 youth living in Southeast are supervised by probation officers assigned to the Drop-In Center. In addition, the Center permits approximately thirty-five youth who would otherwise be detained during trial to be supervised in the community. They report to the Drop-In Center 4:00 p.m. - 8:30 p.m., Mondays through Fridays and 10:00 a.m. - 2:00 p.m. Saturdays.

To replicate this center in other areas of the city, the Courts need resources to lease and build the space. One BARJ Drop-In Center will be in the Northeast quadrant of the city to serve the current northeast juvenile population, on average 375 youth at any one time. Another BARJ Drop-In Center will be centrally located and house our nationally-recognized adolescent female LOTS Unit created to serve our female juvenile population, on average 250 girls residing across the city. The array of pro-social services¹ will be expanded at the new locations.

Relationship to Court Vision, Mission and Goals. The funding requested to permit the Division to offer enhanced services for youths under probation supervision supports the Courts' strategic goal that the D.C. Courts will be accountable to the public.

Relationship to Division Objectives. This request supports several Division MAP Objectives:

- Objective 1) Ensure informed judicial decision-making in the Family Court by conducting detailed assessments and providing information to judges throughout adjudication;
- Objective 7) Provide quality, comprehensive status/progress reports, social studies for youth involved in juvenile delinquency cases by completing 90% or more of all status/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;

¹ "Pro-social services" refers to a variety of non-clinical services such as mentoring, tutoring, conflict resolution, field trips, life skills, parent skills, etc.

- Objective 8) Provide high quality services to youth under court supervision by conducting interviews and developing comprehensive treatment plans within 15 days for at least 90% of juveniles referred to the division;

Relationship to Existing Funding. As detailed, the SSD has conducted major reengineering and restructuring in its system design and case management logic-model. Despite these efforts, existing resources do not support the additional staff, services, and facilities required.

Methodology. Additional full-time staffing positions are requested at a grade nine based on the Court’s classification system. The number of positions requested is calculated to support the facilitation of Family Group Conferences for all youth prior to disposition sentencing. The requested \$313,000 will permit the Division to hire five FTEs to facilitate Family Group Conferences.

With respect to Third-Party Monitoring and enhanced services, the Division has assessed the volume and scope of services required effectively to augment current efforts. The requested \$470,000 would secure the following services for youths under court ordered probation supervision:

Services Costs

Service	# of Youth Served	Average Unit Cost	# of Service Sessions	Total Cost
Third Party Monitoring	100 youth	\$11.21	3-6 face-to-face contacts per week	\$350,000
Self Esteem Mentoring	31 youth	38.00	20 sessions per youth	24,000
Individual Counseling	20 youth	65.00	10 sessions per youth	13,000
Family Counseling	8 families	100.00	9 sessions per family	8,800
Tutoring Individual Services	56 youth	40.00	10 sessions per youth	33,750
Life skills & Parent Skills	9 youth & 9 families	40.00	7 sessions per youth and parent(s)	3,150
Educational Support/Advocacy	9 youth	38.00	4 sessions per youth	1,800
Psychiatric Evaluations (Detained)	10 youth	850.00	10 evaluations	8,500
Psychiatric Evaluations (Community)	10 youth	750.00	20 evaluations	7,500
Psychological Evaluations	8 youth	750.00	8 evaluations	6,000
Neurological Evaluations	15 youth	650.00	15 evaluations	9,750
Educational Assessments	4 youth	750.00	4 assessments	3,000
Medication Consultation/Management	3 youth	180.00	3 consultations	540
Total	215 youth & families			\$469,790

The estimate for the Drop-In Centers is based on the annual lease and services costs as well as one-time build out costs.

Drop-In Center Cost Estimates

	Annual Lease	One Time Build-Out	Services	Total
Northeast (Male) Drop-In Center	\$360,000	\$1,600,000	\$290,000	\$2,250,000
LOTS (Female) Drop-In Center	\$360,000	\$1,600,000	\$290,000	\$2,250,000
Total	\$720,000	\$3,200,000	\$580,000	\$4,500,000

Expenditure Plan. The requested FTEs would be recruited consistent with the Courts' personnel policies. The Request for Proposals (RFP) necessary to procure Third Party Monitoring and other services for status offenders will also be developed, released, and reviewed according to the Courts' procurement policies to select a vendor. The lease, build-out, and services for the Drop-In centers would be procured according to court policies.

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

- Decrease in average caseloads to an acceptable national level
- Increased curfew monitoring and face-to-face community contacts
- Reduction in the number of curfew violations and reports filed
- Decrease in failure to appear rate among youth appearing for court hearings
- Increased academic performance
- Reduction in number of youths remanded to detention facility
- Reduction in the number of youth rearrested during court involvement
- Increase in youths successfully completing probation
- Reduction in number of youths testing positive for drugs
- Reduction in the loss of contact with youths
- Increase in the number of POS units for youths referred for service

The Division will measure outcomes for proposed measures based on resources requested by tracking recidivism, truancy, duration of probation supervision, or Consent Decrees, and increased compliance with drug screening test results. The Division will also track the volume of youth successfully completing probation supervision, or Consent Decrees, timely case closures and trends in recidivism regarding types of juvenile offenses.

INTERNAL AUDIT TEAM

Initiative Element	Requested Increase	Requested FTE
Personnel--Senior Auditor (JS-13/14)	\$ 108,000	1
Personnel-- Auditor(JS-11/12)	75,000	1
TOTAL	183,000	2

Problem Statement. To ensure that public resources are used appropriately and as intended, and that operational or program goals are met, the D.C. Courts seek to implement an internal audit function similar to the Inspector General function in other government entities. All public agencies are responsible and accountable for their operations and the effectiveness of management controls. Agency performance in meeting these expectations should be continuously monitored and assessed. Internal audits can assist in this responsibility by ascertaining conformance with laws and regulations and accounting principles and standards; assessing the adequacy of policies, procedures, and internal controls; evaluating the validity and timeliness of financial information and reports; and detecting any instances of fraud, waste, and mismanagement in programs and operations. Without a mechanism to periodically monitor the economy, efficiency, and effectiveness of operations and the achievement of program objectives, the risk that limited resources are misused or that program goals go unmet is significantly increased. The Courts do not have staff with the requisite skills or expertise to perform this program and financial audit function on an enterprise-wide basis.

Relationship to Court Mission and Goals. The internal audit function supports the D.C. Courts' objective of enhancing public accountability by seeking independent assessments of court operations, programs, and services.

Proposed Solutions. The D.C. Courts plan to hire one senior auditor and one auditor to conduct financial and performance audits and investigations. The audits and investigations would be based on statutory and regulatory requirements and requests from Congress, the general public, and D.C. Courts officials.

Methodology. D.C. Official Code 11-1701(b)(2) and 1703 assign responsibility for matters relating to auditing to the Joint Committee and the Executive Officer, respectively. In addition, the need for an internal auditing capability is based on Federal legislation and regulations, such as the Inspector Generals Act and Office of Management and Budget Circular A-123 "Management Accountability and Control", which recognize the need for the performance of independent, objective, and timely reviews as a key component of assessing the adequacy of management/internal controls in programs and operations.

Expenditure Plan. The recruitment and selection process will be conducted in accordance with the D.C. Courts' personnel policies.

Performance Indicators. The D.C. Courts will measure performance by the percentage of recommendations accepted and implemented by management officials, and enhanced effectiveness and efficiency of program operations.

SECURITY OPERATIONS MANAGER

Initiative Element	Requested Increase	Requested FTE
Personnel-- Security Operations Manager (JS-15)	\$ 150,000	1

Problem Statement. The September 11th terrorist attacks provided the impetus for a long overdue review of security at the D.C. Courts. The resulting studies conducted by the U.S. Marshals Service identified a number of deficiencies and significant risks. In addition, the recent rash of violence in courthouses throughout the country, including Chicago, Atlanta, and Middleton, Connecticut has made the enhancement of courthouse security a top priority for the Courts. A survey by the American Bar Association found that 60% of judges have been threatened in cases. The U.S. Marshals Service has experienced an increase in threats against judicial officers at the District of Columbia Courts. Further compounding the security risks at the court complex are the shortage of Deputy U.S. Marshals to provide protection in the courtroom, the shortage of Special Security Officers who ensure safety and security in our facilities, and the number of potentially volatile incidents, particularly in Family Court and domestic violence courtrooms, which are not covered by Deputy U.S. Marshals. Across the nation these courts are the ones in which judges and members of the public are most often injured or killed.

The District of Columbia Courts are housed in one of the busiest courthouses in the country. On a daily basis, approximately 10,000 persons visit the Courts, and between 250 and 550 prisoners are transported to the Court. With progress being made on the Master Plan for the D.C. Court facilities, new space in other court buildings within the Judiciary Square complex is coming on line and court proceedings are now occurring in Buildings A, B, and soon the renovated Court of Appeals (the Old Courthouse project), in addition to the Moultrie Courthouse. In the past, the United States Marshals Service for the District of Columbia handled many of the administrative security functions, including oversight of the Special Security Officer (SSO) contract, conduct of the SSO background investigations, and arrangement of SSO medical examinations. However, due to shrinking U.S. Marshals Service resources, in FY 2007 the Courts were informed that the U.S. Marshals Service would no longer be able to cover many of the administrative security functions for the Courts. Given the new responsibilities, and the attention and expertise that should be exercised to perform them ably, as well as the increased security needs of the D.C. Courts, a full-time person devoted to court security is essential to ensuring and enhancing the safety and security of our judges, staff, the criminal justice community and the public who seek justice in the District of Columbia. The Courts do not have staff with the requisite skills or expertise to perform this security function.

Relationship to the Courts' vision, mission, and goals. The hiring of a security operations manager would support the Courts' goal of enhancing of security and emergency preparedness. A secure environment is essential to the Courts' mission of protecting rights and liberties and upholding the law.

Proposed Solution. The Courts plan to hire one Security Operations Manager that would focus on physical security, as well as security staffing.

Methodology. Currently, the Executive Officer and Executive Office staff, along with the Security Committee, work with the U.S. Marshals Service on court security issues. There is a need to centralize these duties and responsibilities in one position which should result in a more comprehensive and coordinated approach when addressing court security issues.

Expenditure Plan. The recruitment and selection process will be conducted in accordance with the D.C. Courts' personnel policies.

Performance Indicators. Performance indicators would include a reduction in the incident reports, and an increase in the compliance rate with federal courthouse security standards.