Office of the Attorney General
OAG (CB)

MISSION
The mission of the Office of the Attorney General (OAG) is to enforce the laws of the District of Columbia and to provide legal services to the District of Columbia government.

SUMMARY OF SERVICES
OAG is charged with conducting the District’s legal business. To discharge these duties, OAG is divided into ten Divisions: the Office of the Solicitor General; Child Support Services; Civil Litigation; Commercial; Family Services; Health and Human Services; Legal Counsel; Public Safety; Personnel, Labor and Employment; and Agency Management. OAG represents the District in virtually all civil litigation, prosecutes certain criminal offenses on the District’s behalf and represents the District in a variety of administrative hearings and other proceedings. In addition, OAG is responsible for advising the Executive Office of the Mayor, the D.C. Council, the D.C. Courts, various Boards and Commissions, for reviewing legislation and regulations, and for supervising lawyers working in the general counsel offices of 28 agencies. All told, the Attorney General supervises the legal work of about 350 attorneys and an additional 350 administrative/professional staff.

ACCOMPLISHMENTS
✓ In September, 2011, The Honorable Judge Thomas Hogan preliminarily approved a settlement between the District of Columbia and Plaintiff’s counsel in the case of Dixon v. District of Columbia. The final fairness hearing is scheduled for February 16, 2010. The settlement, when finally approved by the Court, will end 37 years of litigation and Court oversight of the District of Columbia’s public Mental Health system. Self Determination

✓ During the fiscal year the OAG was extremely successful in litigating to recoup funds on behalf of the District of Columbia. For example, In Dynamic Construction v. District of Columbia the litigation was resolved with a payment of $6M returned to the District’s coffers. In the District of Columbia v. Harry Thomas, Jr., the District entered into a settlement agreement which requires repayment to the District of return over $300,000 taken by the former City Councilman. Fiscal Stability

✓ During FY 2011, the OAG led the way in ethics reform. During this year the OAG developed the pledge, conducted extensive training of all personnel on government ethics, and wrote and distributed an ethics training manual. Self Determination
OVERVIEW OF AGENCY PERFORMANCE
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- **Measures**: 14 Number Fully Achieved, 11 Number Partially Achieved, 3 Number Not Achieved, 5 Number Where Data Not Available
- **Initiatives**: 18 Number Fully Achieved, 5 Number Partially Achieved, 1 Number Not Achieved, 1 Number Where Data Not Available
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**Child Support Services Division**

**OBJECTIVE 1: Provide child support enforcement services for children so that they can receive the financial and medical support required by law from their parents.**

- **INITIATIVE 1.1: Increase Arrears Collection.**

  CSSD was able to set up an automated program to suspension the professional licenses of non-custodial parents who are delinquent in paying child support. CSSD sent requests for matches between the list of our delinquent non-custodial parents with the license databases held by Department of Consumer and Regulatory Affairs and the Department of Health and got 438 hits. CSSD focused on 73 cases that had not made a payment for more than a year. Of the 73, 44 came into compliance. We recommended that 29 licenses be suspended. It is our understanding that no licenses were suspended. CSSD hopes to use the new program in FY 2012 to collect more child support through matches with the Department of Consumer and Regulatory Affairs and the Department of Health.

  CSSD also stepped up other existing current enforcement tools, including seizing bank accounts of delinquent non-custodial parents, as a way to increase collections on arrearages. As a result of these efforts, CSSD collected arrears on 52% of cases where arrears were owed in FY 2011, a full 2 percentage point increase over the previous year.

- **INITIATIVE 1.2: Expand Medical Coverage.**

  CSSD was more aggressive in ensuring that orders for medical support were included in court orders. In addition, its enforcement unit took steps to make sure that those who had were ordered to provide medical support in fact did so. Recent legislation related to medical support has given CSSD greater flexibility in getting the non-custodial parent to provide some kind of medical support even as his or her coverage changes.

  CSSD has set up a process so that National Medical Support Notices, the documents used to enroll a child to a parent’s health insurance plan, will be generated automatically on all cases where CSSD knows who the parent’s employer is and the court has ordered the parent to provide medical coverage to the child. However, getting employers to respond timely to these notices (or at all) remains challenging.

  At the end of FY 2011, 30% of all cases had medical support ordered, a 2 percentage point increase over the previous year. And 13% of all cases had medical support ordered and provided, a 1 percentage point increase over the previous year. Although this number is not high, it has increased three-fold from five years before. (In FY 2006, only 4% of cases had medical support ordered and provided.)
INITIATIVE 1.3: Increase Collections and Parental Participation.

CSSD was successful in this initiative in FY 2011 in that it increased collections and parental participation, but not using the method proposed in last year’s performance plan.

As noted in #1 accomplishment section above, CSSD collected $57,513,319 in IV-D child support collections in FY 2011 which was an increase over the FY 2010 total of $57,067,790. It did this by establishing new orders and vigorously enforcing existing ones.

CSSD had mixed results in increasing participation, as reflected in KPI measures. CSSD assisted unemployed non-custodial parents to 241 in FY 2011. This exceeded the goal of 200 but did not match the FY 2010 level of 263. The Department of Employment Services (DOES) terminated its Memorandum of Understanding with CSSD, so there was no longer a DOES employee located near the CSSD waiting room who provided job placement services. The provision of job placement referrals was absorbed within the agency.

However CSSD was able to increase new registrants to the on-line case lookup system. This system allows customers to access information on payments, hearings, order levels, etc. A total of 1,655 customers newly registered in FY 2011, an increase over the 1,240 customers who registered in FY 2010.

CSSD released a much-improved Interactive Voice Response (IVR) system that allows customers to obtain information on their cases more easily. In a typical month, the new received about 21,000 calls, including about 500 from Spanish speakers. The most popular option selected by customers was information on payments, but customers also requested other information including hearing dates and what actions had been taken on their case. CSSD does not have data on whether more calls were made to it than the older system yet because at the end its life, the old system was unable to report total calls made to it. It is likely to increase parental participation because it provides much better data more easily than the old, problematic system did.

CSSD was also able use the Fresh Start program to draw in non-custodial parents who had long been ignoring their child support obligations. Fresh Start allows non-custodial parents to sign an agreement to make regular child support payments. Upon holding up their share of the bargain and making payments regularly, some of the arrears owed to the government are forgiven. A total of 212 people were enrolled and 131 successfully completed the program. Child support collected through Fresh Start totaled $219,249.

Due to the attrition of staff with limited ability to replace them due to budget constraints and loss of TANF funds, CSSD did not have the ability to organize and put on an amnesty event of the same size and scope as in years past. This year’s efforts included sending out approximately 5,000 letters to non-custodial parents offering ways of how to come into compliance with their child support, such as participating in Fresh Start, Job Readiness, Job Placement Assistant, etc. There were no weekends or late night hours during which customers could come in, and publicity for the event was limited, so the program did not generate the participation it had previously.

Civil Litigation Division

OBJECTIVE: Defend the legitimate interests of the District of Columbia government and to protect and enforce the rights of residents in the areas of consumer protection and anti-trust.

INITIATIVE 1.1: Improve Document Management.

CLD has successfully expanded the cases submitted to the contractor for inclusion in the agency’s litigation document management system. The document management system was designed to comply with the court ordered requirements for a document management system to be set up at OAG in the settlement of the Barham class action lawsuit. Initially, the division submitted three
MPD mass demonstration cases to the contractor. Over the past fiscal year, the division has sent a number of tort, employment and equity cases to the contractor for inclusion in the document management system.

**INITIATIVE 1.2: Expand Consumer Protection Activities.**
Since the closure of DCRA’s Office of Consumer Protection in 2010, the Public Advocacy Section’s responsibilities have extended to all types of consumer complaints directed to the District Government. The Section’s consumer protection specialist and investigators, with substantial assistance from the Section’s paralegal and a volunteer complaint handle, ensured coverage of the consumer hotline during normal business hours, provided consumers with helpful information responsive to their inquiries, triaged incoming complaints requiring mediation or investigation, resolved disputes between consumers and merchants, kept consumers updated as to the status of their complaints, and closed out and documented their matters in a timely manner. They have consistently and efficiently provided useful information and/or effective mediation services to the overwhelming majority of consumers who have brought their inquiries or complaints to OAG’s attention. As a result, the public has had a very favorable impression of the District Government’s consumer protection program, notwithstanding the substantial reduction in available resources that resulted from the termination of DCRA’s Office of Consumer Protection.

However, OAG was not able to expand its investigation functions during FY 2011 to include the consumer protection investigation work previously handled by DCRA. One of the Section’s three investigators resigned at the end of October 2010, and OAG was not permitted to fill the resulting vacancy during FY 2011. A second investigator resigned in early August 2011, forcing the Section to work with only one investigator until early FY 2012. While the Section continued throughout FY 2011 to provide the consumer assistance services previously handled by DCRA, the Section was unable to expand the scope of its investigation work during FY 2011.

**INITIATIVE 1.3: Expand Litigation Assistance.**
CLD was successful in expanding its efforts to recruit more pro bono attorneys to assist with its litigation. CLD increased the number of pro bono attorneys who already are admitted to practice law in the District, enhancing their utility as they are able to appear in court with limited supervision. CLD was successful in obtaining the pro bono services of a private firm partner who served as a writing coach for several attorneys. Finally, CLD increased the number of law school graduates who came to CLD to serve as Fellows for 3 to 6 month assignments during FY 11.

### Commercial Division
**OBJECTIVE 1: Provide legal advice and litigation support to the District of Columbia government in the areas of tax collection, real property, and other commercial transactions, economic development and municipal finance.**

- **INITIATIVE 1.1: Develop a D.C. Bar Training**

  One D.C. Bar session was conducted by the Tax & Finance Section, with the assistance of the Land Acquisition & Bankruptcy Section, to explain and discuss in great detail the Office of Tax & Revenue’s (OTR) tax sale process and the litigation involved in foreclosing the right of redemption following the purchase of property at OTR’s annual tax sale. The session was very well received, and included many members of the tax sale purchasers bar, as well as several Superior Court judges who handle the tax sale calendar. While the Procurement Section and Real Estate Transactions Sections were in discussions and planning with the D.C. Bar, due to scheduling...
conflicts and pressing OCP million dollar contract reviews and DMPED multi-million dollar real estate development transactions, no mutually agreeable times could be accommodated for presentations.

**INITIATIVE 1.2: Standardize Discovery Documents in Real Property Tax Appeal Cases**

This initiative was largely accomplished. The Tax & Finance Section developed standard sets of interrogatories and requests for production of documents applicable to virtually all tax assessment cases thereby enabling the expeditious establishment of uncontroverted facts. The Section also began intensively depoising Petitioners’ fact witnesses to challenge property income, expense, and condition assertions. Petitioners were also required to submit their settlement offers electronically well in advance of the mediation dates. The Tax Division recently adopted e-filing for all pleadings and the Section fully complied with all e-filing requirements.

**INITIATIVE 1.3: Develop a Real Property Disposition Guide**

While development of this initiative commenced with great enthusiasm, it was unable to be completed due primarily to the fact that the various real estate holding component agencies of the District Government were consolidated and subsumed by the newly created Department of General Services (“DGS”). The Real Estate Transactions Section, however, continues to work closely with DGS in developing and implementing its policies regarding land disposition. It is hoped that work on this initiative will resume once the new agency has a Director and has its mission more fully articulated.

**Family Services Division**

**OBJECTIVE 1: Provide court supervision and protection to children in abused or neglected homes or to persons with mental retardation.**

**INITIATIVE 1.1: Increase Case Monitoring to Improve Permanency Outcomes.**

This initiative was successfully achieved in FY 2011 and made possible the attainment of KPI 1.2 - percentage of children whose first permanency hearing is held within 12 months of the child’s entry into foster care. In order to meet this outcome Child Protection Section Chiefs reviewed cases due for the first permanency hearing to ensure timely scheduling of hearing and to ensure appropriate issues related to permanency are addressed at hearing (e.g., whether compelling reasons exist regarding filing of motions to terminate parental rights.) This includes the cases for all families that are due for the first permanency hearing. This initiative helped to ensure that AAGs are doing all that is legally necessary to move cases more timely to permanency. The case monitoring by Section Chiefs greatly contributed to 90.83% of cases holding the first permanency hearing within 12 months of the child’s entry into care. The supervisory review of AAGs compliance with this standard helped to ensure the section remained on target during the fiscal year.

**INITIATIVE 1.2: Provide Permanency Planning Training.**

The permanency planning training initiative was successful in FY 2011 and is related to the partial success of KPI 1.3 - percentage of cases filed for termination of parental rights by the Child Protection Section (CPS) within 45 days of the child's goal changing to adoption. A total of 88.63% of termination of parental rights cases were filed within the requisite timeframe. This year the Family Services Division coordinated with the Child and Family Services Agency (CFSA) and private child welfare agencies to provide interdisciplinary training to social workers to support the agencies in improving collaboration and teaming in their work to support safety, permanency, and well-being for children served by CFSA. The idea behind this initiative is that as social workers
become more knowledgeable about permanency planning then the agency will better comply with timelines and procedures associated with permanency outcomes. In FY 2011 the Child Protection Section established an ongoing working relationship with CFSA’s Child Welfare Training Academy to implement training to social workers surrounding the roles and responsibilities of parties involved in child welfare cases; testifying and preparing for Court; and permanency planning from the legal perspective. The series of Teaming with Legal trainings specifically includes: 3 hours of Roles and Responsibilities of Participants in a Child Welfare Case; and two full day-trainings which include Legal Underpinnings of Child Welfare, Tracking the Life of a Child Welfare Case, Testifying and Preparing for Court, and Child Welfare Jeopardy. The trainings are provided to both CFSA social workers and those social workers employed by outside providers. The trainings provide the opportunity to emphasize the importance of collaboration and communication between CPS and CFSA and provides a fundamental understanding of the legal process and the importance of permanency planning to secure better outcomes for children in foster care.

**INITIATIVE 1.3: Provide Representation to Victims of Stalking.**
The Family Services Division (FSD) successfully achieved this initiative. The domestic violence section of the FSD effectively offered legal representation to at least 77% of all cases screened for OAG representation involving stalking victims. The DC Superior Court Domestic Violence Intake Center screens cases to identify stalking victims in need of legal representation. Accomplishing this initiative helped effectuate the District’s newly enacted stalking law by ensuring that intake staff specifically flag stalking cases for attorney attention. The domestic violence section was also responsible for the achievement of KPI 1.44 - ratio of substantive motions for criminal contempt referred to the domestic violence section for representation accepted for representation per attorney FTE. The section had a ratio of 4.24 criminal contempt motions referred for representation. The section meeting its goals is a notable task when taking into consideration the loss of an FTE during the fiscal year.

**Health and Human Services Division**

**OBJECTIVE 1: Provide quality legal representation and advice to its client agencies that supports each agency’s mission to deliver statutorily mandated social services to residents.**

**INITIATIVE 1.1: Resolution of Mental Health Cases.**
The Mental Health Section was successful in accomplishing this initiative in FY 2011. The attorneys collaborated with the treatment team at least a week in advance of the Commission hearing and at least thirty days before a trial. This collaboration enabled the Department of Mental Health to consider and implement alternative resolutions in cases that posed unique circumstances. The treatment team adequately reviewed medical records, and obtained additional information and documentation in order to present compelling testimony before the Tribunal. Collaboration enabled consumers of mental health services to obtain additional supportive services from other community agencies in cases where additional options for care and treatment made a difference for the consumer in maintaining compliance with treatment. The Section successfully litigated over 90% of its cases. This initiative was achieved during a time when the two senior attorneys in the Section resigned, the support staffer was on extended leave for over a year, and the remaining staff was under a great degree of stress to maintain the mission and success of the Section while functioning with the assistance of interns, Department of Employment Services employees, and volunteer attorneys.
**Legal Counsel Division**

**OBJECTIVE 1:** Provide legal guidance, counseling and legal sufficiency certification services to the government of the District of Columbia and its employees so they can legally and efficiently accomplish the government’s mission while minimizing the risk of adverse legal consequences.

- **INITIATIVE 1.1: Rulemaking**
  LCD not only partnered with the Office of Documents and Administrative Issuance (ODAI) but also the Office of Policy and Legislative Affairs (OPLA) two modernization efforts that advance this initiative. One was a major revision of the procedures for obtaining legal and policy approvals prior to publication of proposed and final rulemakings. The second was consistent coordination with ODAI to provide advice to assist their efforts in developing uniform interpretations of the laws governing publication and promulgation of rulemakings. The success of these two efforts has produced a clearer and less time consuming process for executive agencies to follow, thereby conserving valuable legal and administrative resources. The KPI measure for completed rulemakings does not directly related to this initiative but it indicates significant success (36 rulemakings completed versus a goal of 40) given the change in the executive and legislative branch created a nearly 4 month period of rulemaking inactivity (October until Mid January).

- **INITIATIVE 1.2: Legislation.**
  In coordination with OPLA, LCD was able to monitor all introduced legislation by the Council and thereafter assist the Attorney General and the Executive Office of the Mayor (EOM) with legal advice for proposed legislation that raised charter authority, statutory, or constitutional issues. Successfully performing this function in fact indentified these issues at an early stage so the executive policy makers could prepare suggested changes and engage in necessary legislative negotiations in a timely and effective manner. These efforts provided necessary revisions to proposed legislation that removed offending provisions that otherwise may have subjected the District to costly legal challenges. The KPI measure for completed written assignments demonstrates the timeliness of LCD’s advice. The written assignments per FTE KPI measure indicates the great number of matters that LCD’s staff addressed. As with the rulemaking rulemakings completed measure, the 2011 goal was not attained primarily due to the change in the executive and legislative branch created a nearly 4 month period of rulemaking inactivity (October until Mid January).

- **INITIATIVE 1.3: Litigation**
  In coordination with the Office of the Solicitor General (OSG) and the Civil Litigation Division, LCD exceeded its FY 2011 goal by providing litigation assistance for 15 matters. Some of the areas of assistance included child support litigation, affirmative litigation for false claims and regulatory enforcement, commercial litigation, and general civil litigation concerning claims against the District. Additionally LCD provided direct support to the OSG by briefing and arguing two cases on appeal. These efforts are an example of OAG’s efforts to leverage the knowledge and experience of LCD’s attorneys in the most effective way possible.

**Office of the Solicitor General**

**OBJECTIVE 1:** To provide affirmative and defensive appellate litigation services to the District of Columbia government so that its legal rights are protected and enforced.

- **INITIATIVE 1.1: Videotape moot courts.**
  This initiative was partially accomplished and was successful. Every Assistant Attorney General who was employed with the Office of the Solicitor General videotaped at least one moot court for review and critique, and some more than one. Although the initiative as written called for the
videotaping of at least two moot courts, the Solicitor General determined that it would be more
effective to lower this minimum number while requiring every Assistant Attorney General to
review recordings of actual arguments presented. Both efforts have improved overall
performance at oral argument. These efforts contribute to the success of the Office of the Solicitor
General in meeting its key performance indicators, and in particular its 94.5% rate of favorable
resolution of defensive appeals (which exceeds the 91% goal).

- **INITIATIVE 1.2: Staff moot courts.**
  This initiative was fully accomplished and was successful. Every Assistant Attorney General who
  was employed with the Office of the Solicitor General acted as a moot court judge at least four
times during the year. This improved the performance of the person mooted as well as the moot
court judge by exposing them to other skill sets and better preparing them for oral arguments. In
addition, of course, one colleague’s willingness to volunteer to be a moot court judge encourages
the other colleague to reciprocate, which contributed to the achievement of another key
performance indicator, as moot courts were held in 100% of cases with regular calendar
arguments (which exceeds the 95% goal).

- **INITIATIVE 1.3: Conduct seminars on critical appellate practices or issues.**
  This initiative was fully accomplished and was successful. During the fiscal year, the Solicitor
  General and/or his staff conducted seminars on critical appellate practices or issues, including:
general appellate practice; making appellate records; cases prosecutors should know;
prosecutorial ethics; and drafting administrative decisions. Such seminars alert staff in the
remainder of the agency to issues on appeal of which they might not otherwise be aware. This
also assists the Office of the Solicitor General in that cases are better situated for appellate review,
and so contributes to another key performance indicator, the 8.16 motions for summary
disposition filed per full-time employee (which exceeds the goal of 2 per full-time employee).

### Personnel, Labor, and Employment Division

**OBJECTIVE 1: Attract, retain and develop highly qualified and productive workforce that supports
optimum labor-management relations.**

- **INITIATIVE 1.1: Expand Internship and Professional Development Opportunities.**
  OAG exceeded this initiative by recruiting 256 interns and pro bono lawyers and provided 33 hours
  of professional development per legal FTE. OAG not only enhanced its pro-bono partnerships with
top local law firms during Fiscal year 2011, but also partnered with various top law schools to
recruit volunteer attorneys. In addition, OAG partnered with several top law schools that offered
student paid stipends to do volunteer work within various divisions in OAG.
In addition, OAG held numerous profession development and diversity programs. OAG continues
to have an excellent diversity program in which all OAG employees are invited to participate in
various multicultural celebrations. During Fiscal year 2011, OAG celebrated Black History Month,
Women’s History Month, Asian American Heritage Month, Gay Pride Month and Hispanic Heritage
Month by inviting speakers to present on topics of interest.

- **INITIATIVE 1.2: Defend Personnel Actions.**
  The Personnel Labor and Employment Division defends agencies against administrative challenges
to: 1) suspensions, terminations for employee misconduct and reductions-in-force before the
Office of Employee Appeals (OEA) and Police Adverse Action Panels and Fire Trial Boards; 2)
challenges to the denial to termination of disability compensation benefits before the Office of
Hearings and Adjudication of the Department of Employment Services; and 3) claims of
discrimination filed before the Office of Human Rights and the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission. In FY 11, PLED closed over 200 employment matters and assisted five agencies with internal equal employment investigations. These efforts assisted agencies with maintaining an efficient workforce because RIFs and adverse actions were upheld, which enabled agencies to focus on its program functions rather than litigation.

**INITIATIVE 1.3 Implement an Employee Recognition Program.**

While PLED has not designed or implemented a new employment recognition program for FY11, on January 31, 2012, OAG will once again recognize deserving employees through a variety of non monetary awards (distinguished service, extra mile, team spirit, etc.) for excellent work and service to the District of Columbia. Currently, over 200 individuals were nominated for various awards. Staff resources and the need to focus on other tasks delayed the design of a new non monetary employment recognition program.

**Public Safety Division**

**Objective 1:** To provide criminal prosecution, neighborhood services and victims’ services for the government of the District of Columbia and its residents to enhance public protection and safety.

**INITIATIVE 1.1: Expand Pre-Arrest Mediation Program:**

The Juvenile Section of the Public Safety Division utilizes diversion in low level cases where the juvenile respondent would benefit from receiving rehabilitation through mediation or other social services that do not result in formal criminal charges. The Juvenile Section successfully diverted 125 cases in FY11.

**INITIATIVE 1.2: Prosecute Nuisance Cases**

Neighborhood and Victim Services (NVS) has accomplished abating prosecutions against landowners, tenants and business owners who allow their property to be nuisances. Throughout the 2011 Fiscal Year, NVS has developed relationships with its partners to engage in training, outreach, abatement of nuisances, and making communities safer. Specifically, during this period as it relates to drug nuisance matters, there were over 500 cases closed due to the abatement of nuisances.

In addition, there were also numerous cases filed by landlords against offending tenants. This resulted in offending individuals being evicted from their properties, tenant settlement agreements reached, and OAG working with the landlord/property owner community to ensure that they were responsible for their properties. PSD did not file as many cases as projected against property owners, in part, because property owners have been more responsive in quickly filing matters in Landlord/Tenant Court to abate nuisances. NVS also lost an attorney and a paralegal during FY 2011.
### Key Performance Indicators – Details

**Performance Assessment Key:**
- ✨ Fully achieved
- 🌻 Partially achieved
- 🔴 Not achieved
- 🔄 Data not reported

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure Name</th>
<th>FY2010 YE Actual</th>
<th>FY2011 YE Target</th>
<th>FY2011 YE Revised Target</th>
<th>FY2011 YE Actual</th>
<th>FY2011 YE Rating</th>
<th>Budget Program</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Child Support Service Division</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1 Paternity Establishment Percentage</td>
<td>88.13%</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>80.05%</td>
<td>93.09%</td>
<td></td>
<td>CHILD SUPPORT SERVICES DIVISION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2 # of Child Support Orders Established</td>
<td>2347</td>
<td>2679</td>
<td>2254</td>
<td>84.14%</td>
<td></td>
<td>CHILD SUPPORT SERVICES DIVISION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3 Assist non-custodial parent job applicants</td>
<td>263</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>251</td>
<td>125.50%</td>
<td></td>
<td>CHILD SUPPORT SERVICES DIVISION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4 # of parents newly registered to access on-line records</td>
<td>1240</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>1708</td>
<td>170.80%</td>
<td></td>
<td>CHILD SUPPORT SERVICES DIVISION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Civil Litigation Division</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1 # of Civil Litigation Closed Cases</td>
<td>289</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>304</td>
<td>101.33%</td>
<td></td>
<td>CIVIL LITIGATION DIVISION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2 $ Collected by the Civil Enforcement Section per Attorney FTE</td>
<td>$101,413</td>
<td>$103,000</td>
<td>144,267.11</td>
<td>84.14%</td>
<td></td>
<td>CIVIL LITIGATION DIVISION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3 $ Collected by the Public Advocacy Section excluding Tobacco Settlement</td>
<td>$2,418,052</td>
<td>$2,700,000</td>
<td>$2,611,640.60</td>
<td>96.73%</td>
<td></td>
<td>CIVIL LITIGATION DIVISION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure Name</td>
<td>FY2010 YE Actual</td>
<td>FY2011 YE Target</td>
<td>FY2011 YE Revised Target</td>
<td>FY2011 YE Actual</td>
<td>FY2011 YE Rating</td>
<td>Budget Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of Closed Cases in the Equity Sections</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>76</td>
<td></td>
<td>89.41%</td>
<td>CIVIL LITIGATION DIVISION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Economic Development Section transactional documents prepared and/or reviewed for legal sufficiency within 60 days.</td>
<td>81.2</td>
<td>90</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>101.33%</td>
<td>COMMERCIAL DIVISION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Legal sufficiency reviews performed by Land and Public Works Section timely completed.</td>
<td>73.05</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td></td>
<td>105.88%</td>
<td>COMMERCIAL DIVISION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Real Estate Transactions Section transactional documents prepared and/or reviewed for legal sufficiency within 60 days.</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>93.84%</td>
<td></td>
<td>98.78%</td>
<td>COMMERCIAL DIVISION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of litigation success by the Tax and Finance Section per FTE</td>
<td>14.4</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>6.81</td>
<td></td>
<td>89.41%</td>
<td>COMMERCIAL DIVISION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure Name</td>
<td>FY2010 YE Actual</td>
<td>FY2010 YE Target</td>
<td>FY2011 YE Revised Target</td>
<td>FY2011 YE Actual</td>
<td>FY2011 YE Rating</td>
<td>Budget Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Family Services Division</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1 % of favorable resolution in all cases which reach adjudication in the division.</td>
<td>99.23</td>
<td>97.5</td>
<td>98.36%</td>
<td>100.89%</td>
<td>FAMILY SERVICES DIVISION</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2 % of children whose first permanency hearing is held within 12 months of the child’s entry into foster care.</td>
<td>88.57</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>90.83%</td>
<td>100.93%</td>
<td>FAMILY SERVICES DIVISION</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3 % of cases filed for termination of parental rights by the Child Protection Section within 45 days of the child’s goal changing to adoption</td>
<td>92.5</td>
<td>92.5</td>
<td>88.64%</td>
<td>95.82%</td>
<td>FAMILY SERVICES DIVISION</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4 Ratio of substantive motions for criminal contempt referred to section for representation accepted for representation per attorney FTE.</td>
<td>4.38</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>4.24</td>
<td>89.41%</td>
<td>FAMILY SERVICES DIVISION</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Health and Human Service Division</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1 % of Written Responses to Client Agencies Completed by Deadlines.</td>
<td>99.1</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>101.01%</td>
<td>HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES DIVISION</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure Name</td>
<td>FY2010 YE Actual</td>
<td>FY2011 YE Target</td>
<td>FY2011 YE Revised Target</td>
<td>FY2011 YE Actual</td>
<td>FY2011 YE Rating</td>
<td>Budget Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2 % of Successfully Resolved Mental Health Cases.</td>
<td>94.85</td>
<td>95</td>
<td></td>
<td>95.62%</td>
<td>100.65%</td>
<td>HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES DIVISION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3 Successful Resolution of Mental Health cases per FTE.</td>
<td>32.1</td>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
<td>63.67</td>
<td></td>
<td>HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES DIVISION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Legal Counsel Division</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1 # of rulemaking projects completed for client agencies.</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
<td>36</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>LEGAL COUNSEL DIVISION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2 % written assignments completed by deadline given by client agency, or</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>99</td>
<td></td>
<td>99.06%</td>
<td>100.06%</td>
<td>LEGAL COUNSEL DIVISION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 days if no deadline given.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3 # completed written assignment per FTE.</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>215</td>
<td></td>
<td>44.9</td>
<td></td>
<td>LEGAL COUNSEL DIVISION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4 # of high-profile lawsuits directly assisted</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>LEGAL COUNSEL DIVISION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5 # of written opinions issued to ANCs</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>LEGAL COUNSEL DIVISION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Office of the Solicitor</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1 % of favorable resolution in defensive appeals cases.</td>
<td>90.13</td>
<td>91</td>
<td></td>
<td>94.55%</td>
<td>103.90%</td>
<td>SOLICITOR GENERAL DIVISION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2 % of regular calendar arguments in which a moot court was held.</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>95</td>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>105.26%</td>
<td>SOLICITOR GENERAL DIVISION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure Name</td>
<td>FY2010 YE Actual</td>
<td>FY2011 YE Target</td>
<td>FY2011 YE Revised Target</td>
<td>FY2011 YE Actual</td>
<td>FY2011 YE Revised Target</td>
<td>FY2011 YE Rating</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3 Motions for summary disposition filed per FTE</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.07</td>
<td>SOLICITOR GENERAL DIVISION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personnel, Labor and Employment Division</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1 # of attorneys who left the agency.</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>172.41%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2 # of interns assisting attorneys and staff on an annual basis</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>113.78%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3 # of in-house training hours taken per legal FTE</td>
<td>16.35</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>33.55</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Safety Division</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1 # of Nuisance Property Prosecutions</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2 Juveniles referred for rehabilitation</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>89.03%</td>
<td>97.84%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3 Successful Criminal Cases per FTE</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>72.14</td>
<td>PUBLIC SAFETY DIVISION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>