

**STATEMENT OF INTEREST OF THE HONORABLE LEE F. SATTERFIELD  
IN SUPPORT OF REQUEST FOR RE-DESIGNATION AS CHIEF JUDGE OF  
THE SUPERIOR COURT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA**

**SUBMITTED TO  
THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA JUDICIAL NOMINATION COMMISSION  
ON  
MAY 2, 2016**

**LEE F. SATTERFIELD  
CHIEF JUDGE**

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

**I. INTRODUCTION ..... 3**

**II. INTEREST IN COURT ADMINISTRATION ..... 5**

**III. ADMINISTRATIVE AND MANAGEMENT ABILITY AND EXPERIENCE..... 6**

Judicial Leadership Team ..... 6

Construction..... 7

Security Operations..... 10

Judicial Support Services ..... 11

Technology Upgrades ..... 12

Evaluation of Judicial Resources ..... 12

**IV. LEADING THE COURT AND PROMOTING A SENSE OF COOPERATION AND COLLEGIALITY AMONG THE JUDGES, THE COURT STAFF, AND OTHER GOVERNMENTAL AND NON-GOVERNMENTAL ENTITIES ..... 13**

Collaborative Leadership Meeting..... 13

Kent Island Meeting..... 14

Court Employee Engagement ..... 15

Legislative Experience..... 16

**V. PROMOTING CONFIDENCE IN THE COURT AND THE JUDICIAL SYSTEM..... 17**

Access to Justice.. ..... 17

Improvements to Jury Service ..... 18

Case Management Plans ..... 19

Performance Measures..... 19

Balanced and Restorative Justice Drop-in Centers..... 20

Judge in Chambers Reform..... 21

**VI. INTELLECTUAL LEADERSHIP ..... 21**

Judicial Coaching Program..... 21

**VII. VISION FOR THE NEXT FOUR YEARS..... 22**

**VIII. CONCLUSION..... 25**

**IX. APPENDICES ..... 27**

## **I. INTRODUCTION**

During the past eight years, it has been an honor to serve the District of Columbia community as the Chief Judge of the Superior Court of the District of Columbia. In this statement, I set forth a summary of programs and initiatives the Court accomplished during my tenure as Chief Judge and my vision for the Superior Court during the next four years, if I am fortunate to be re-designated as Chief Judge.

All of the programs and initiatives the Court accomplished during the past eight years were co-created with the members of the Judicial Leadership Teams during my first and second terms: Judge Judith Bartnoff, Magistrate Judge Joseph E. Beshouri, Judge Zoe Bush, Judge John N. Campbell, Judge Russell F. Canan, Judge Erik Christian, Judge Laura A. Cordero, Judge Carol A. Dalton, Judge Gerald I. Fisher, Magistrate Judge Pamela S. Gray, Judge John Ramsey Johnson, Judge Milton C. Lee, Judge Lynn Leibovitz, Judge José M. López, Judge John McCabe, Judge Robert E. Morin, Judge William Nooter, Judge Hiram E. Puig-Lugo, Judge Rhonda Reid Winston, and Judge Melvin R. Wright. I am very grateful for their leadership, dedication, commitment and creativeness. Any success I have had must be shared with them.

I would also like to thank Judge Frederick H. Weisberg and Judge Rhonda Reid Winston for their service to the Court as members of the Joint Committee on Judicial Administration in the District of Columbia. In addition to Judge Weisberg's service on the Joint Committee, he served as Acting Chief Judge during my two extended medical absences. From June to September 2013, Judge Weisberg served as Acting Chief Judge when I had open heart surgery to have a Left Ventricular Assist Device (LVAD) implanted as a bridge to transplant, allowing me to continue serving the residents of the

District until my successful heart transplant surgery on October 29, 2015. From October 29, 2015 to January 19, 2016, Judge Weisberg again served as Acting Chief Judge while I recovered from a successful heart transplant. His leadership was so instrumental in maintaining Court operations that as a surprise at the January 2016 Board of Judges meeting, I made a motion by telephone for the Board of Judges to adopt a resolution recognizing Judge Weisberg's dedication to Superior Court. (See Appendix A, Resolution to Thank the Honorable Frederick H. Weisberg, January 13, 2016). Judge Morin read the resolution to the Board, and it was unanimously adopted. I was told that Judge Weisberg received a well-deserved standing ovation.

I have enjoyed working with my colleagues the past eight years. During this time, the Senate confirmed 20 associate judges, and the Board of Judges approved the appointment of 13 magistrate judges. It has been an honor to swear in these judges prior to their public investiture or installation. It gives me the chance to meet their families and learn more about the people serving the residents of the District of Columbia. (See Appendix B, letters from new judicial officers and their family members). I have also worked closely with judges who chair or are members of the Court's committees. These committees work across the Court to implement initiatives that support the Court's goals.

On the administrative side of the Court, I have been fortunate to work alongside Anne B. Wicks, the District of Columbia Courts' Executive Officer, James D. McGinley, the Superior Court Clerk of the Court, and managers and division directors across the Court to improve the services the Court provides to the residents of the District of Columbia.

Finally, the heart of Superior Court is its employees. I have enjoyed meeting with new hires every month during their swearing in ceremony and learning about the diverse group of people who support the work of the Court.

Without dedication at all levels of the Court and the assistance of the D.C. Bar and Superior Court partners and stakeholders, we would not have been able to make the significant contributions detailed below that have improved the administration of justice. I am grateful to be in a position to request that the Judicial Nomination Commission re-designate me as Chief Judge of the Superior Court of the District of Columbia. I am committed to continuing the great work the Court has undertaken over the past eight years.

The following sections set forth in detail my: (1) interest in Court administration; (2) administrative and management ability and experience; (3) ability to lead the Court and to promote a sense of cooperation and collegiality among the judges, the Court staff, and other governmental and non-governmental entities; (4) ability to promote confidence in the Court and the judicial system; (5) ability to provide intellectual leadership; and (6) vision for the next four years.

## **II. INTEREST IN COURT ADMINISTRATION**

Since 2013, I have served on the Board of Directors of the National Center of State Courts. In my 2008 Statement of Interest in Support of Candidacy for Chief Judge of the Superior Court of the District of Columbia, submitted to the Judicial Nomination Commission on June 18, 2008 (“2008 Statement of Interest”), I detailed my background, legal experience and interest in court administration. (See Appendix C at 1-5). In addition to the experience outlined in my 2008 Statement of Interest, I have served as Chief Judge

for almost eight years. (See Appendix D for my 2012 Statement of Interest in Support of Re-designation as Chief Judge, submitted to the Judicial Nomination Commission on May 23, 2012 (“2012 Statement of Interest”).

### **III. ADMINISTRATIVE AND MANAGEMENT ABILITY AND EXPERIENCE**

Over the 40 year history of Superior Court, the judicial bench has grown from 43 associate judges and just a few magistrate judges in 1976 to 62 associate judges and 24 magistrate judges in 2016. In addition, the Court now has 33 senior judges. The role of a magistrate judge has expanded over the years especially since the implementation of the District of Columbia Family Court Act of 2001. As a result of the significant growth of the judiciary, I have sought to create and maintain a dynamic judicial leadership culture that has helped improve many areas of the Court.

#### **Judicial Leadership Team**

It is my continued belief that when the Superior Court judicial officers and Court executives perform as a team, the Court is able to provide better services to the public. In my 2008 Statement of Interest, I stated that “I believe a team effort is required” to carry out my vision for Superior Court. (Appendix C at 5). Furthermore, I promised to “set expectations for the presiding and deputy presiding judges and meet with them regularly to ensure that they have the support to lead their divisions and that they are carrying out the Court’s vision.” (Appendix C at 5). I accomplished this goal by creating a Judicial Leadership Team, which was formalized in an administrative order. (See Appendix E, Administrative Order 15-09: Creation of the Judicial Leadership Team, May 7, 2015). The Judicial Leadership Team, which consists of the presiding and deputy presiding

judge of each division and the presiding and deputy presiding magistrate judge, meets monthly to discuss issues that impact the entire Court and engage in collaborative problem solving. The Judicial Leadership Team and I have also convened for multiple all-day meetings to build relationships and strengthen our work as a team. At these leadership team meetings, we enhanced our leadership skills by working on issues such as communication, team dynamics and culture, and values-based management. We also focused on areas such as employee engagement and discussed the judicial and employee viewpoint surveys, which gather feedback from Court employees as part of the Court's mission to be a great place to work.

In addition to discussing the business of the Superior Court, this model of leadership has provided a platform for the Judicial Leadership Team to adopt the Resolution on Court Values (See Appendix F, Memorandum to Superior Court Judicial Officers, Managers and Employees, November 7, 2014), which connected Superior Court judicial officers to the values set forth in Courts' 2013-2017 Strategic Plan, *Open to All, Trusted by All, Justice for All: Strategic Plan of the District of Columbia Courts* ("2013-2017 Strategic Plan") (See Appendix G). This Resolution was important for the Court community because it officially united the judiciary with all Superior Court employees in our commitment to live the Court's values in the workplace: accountability, excellence, fairness, integrity, respect and transparency.

## **Construction**

One of the Court's goals is to provide a sound infrastructure ensuring that "facilities are accessible and support efficient and effective operations." (Appendix G, 2013-2017 Strategic Plan at 23). Since being elected by my colleagues to the Joint

Committee in 2004, I have been very familiar with the Court's master building plan, relating to the expansion of the Moultrie Courthouse on C Street and numerous other ongoing construction projects. A great deal of my time is devoted to ensuring that during the C Street construction, Court operations and services continue at a high level. I receive a monthly briefing with the Executive Officer, Deputy Executive Officer, Clerk of the Court, Chief Security Officer, Capital Projects Division Director and Judge Weisberg on the C Street construction. This six-month look ahead allows me to review the progress that has been made since the last meeting and look to the future at any possible issues that need to be addressed with partner agencies who utilize space in the courthouse. For example, some Court divisions and partners that utilize space in the Moultrie Courthouse have been moved out of the building or relocated as a result of the construction, including the U.S. Attorney's Office's papering section. I worked with these partners to ensure the services provided to residents are not interrupted.

The Court's C Street construction has also impacted the Court internally because during the first phase of the expansion, associate judges whose chambers were in the zone of construction had to be relocated. To solve this problem and accommodate the growing number of judges taking senior status, I implemented a new program in 2014 for the use of senior judge office space. After reviewing the number of senior judges who currently serve the Court, the amount of time they use space in the courthouse, the projected number of senior judges in the next 10 to 15 years, and the space needed for associate judges who had to be relocated from chambers on the C Street side of the Moultrie Courthouse, I made the decision to implement a "chambering" program. (See Appendix H, Presentation on Chambering Program, April 29, 2014). Under the

chambering model, senior judges utilize office space in two suites rather than occupying their own office. This structure allowed the Court to maintain the senior judge program, which includes 33 senior judges (with two more expected in 2016), seven judicial administrative assistants and seven law clerks. Although this transition was a challenge for the judges, it was essential for the Court to continue providing adequate space for associate judges and the growing senior judge group during the construction period. This progressive concept, which is moving through the legal community in the private sector as well, was profiled in a recent National Law Journal article. (See Appendix I, Katelyn Polantz, *The Law Offices of the Future Are Here, and Your Name Might Not Be On the Door*, National Law Journal, March 23, 2016).

The C Street addition is just one example of the Court's many ongoing construction projects. In 2008, I told the Judicial Nomination Commission, "it is essential that Building C [be] renovated for the future home of the Information Technology and Multi-Door Divisions." (Appendix C, 2008 Statement of Interest at 12). I am pleased to report that this space was renovated in 2012 to include a training room that provides more space for on-campus judicial trainings. The Court has also renovated four courtrooms and six hearing rooms during my two terms as Chief Judge. In May 2011, the Court opened C-10, a newly renovated arraignment courtroom, which is large enough that the Court also uses it as a ceremonial courtroom during Drug Court graduations. Three courtrooms in the Moultrie Courthouse – 415, 215 and 201 – are now equipped with enhanced technology, including screens for showing evidence and power point presentations, digital displays, and a high definition document camera to help jurors better understand the evidence and their obligations under the law. These improvements to the Court's

facilities are the result of collaboration between the judiciary, Court executives and our partner agencies to ensure that the Court is operating efficiently and effectively.

If I am fortunate enough to be re-designated as Chief Judge, continuing to ensure the Court's operations function at the highest level during this construction period will be a top priority.

### **Security Operations**

On average, 10,000 – 15,000 people enter Superior Court each day. Although the security of the Court is the responsibility of the United States Marshals Service, in 2008, when I first appeared before the Judicial Nomination Commission seeking designation as Chief Judge, I noted that improvements could be made to enhance security. Specifically, I stated that a deputy marshal or equivalent security personnel should be present in courtrooms in the Domestic Violence Unit, Civil Division, and Probate and Tax Divisions. I also suggested that the Court “work to develop its own security program to complement the existing program.” (Appendix C, 2008 Statement of Interest at 10). In 2010, the Joint Committee approved the hiring of the D.C. Courts’ first Chief Security Officer to work closely with the U.S. Marshal and court security officers to provide comprehensive security to the entire D.C. Court campus. I meet with him to discuss areas of concern, and I work with the Executive Officer and Clerk of the Court to continue enhancing the security of the Superior Court and the people that occupy and visit our buildings. In a 2015 employee viewpoint survey, Court employees indicated that they feel more prepared for potential security threats than they did in 2009 before the Chief Security Officer joined the Court. Our Chief Security Officer was recognized at the

annual Employee Awards Ceremony in 2015 and honored with the 2015 Enterprise Service Award.

When I became Chief Judge in 2008, the Court's cellblock needed to be updated to meet the needs of the courthouse. Over the past eight years, I have worked with the Executive Officer, the U.S. Marshal, the Chief Security Officer and the Capital Projects Division Director to enhance the substandard cellblock. These changes have improved the safety of all who come into buildings on the Superior Court campus.

### **Judicial Support Services**

The chambers of the chief judge is responsible for providing judicial support services and assisting in the transition of new judges to the Court and associate judges to senior status. During my second term, I created a judicial support officer position in my chambers to support the judiciary in areas such as chambers relocation, associate judge investitures and magistrate judge installation planning, and supplies and furniture procurement. This position facilitated the implementation of a chambers allowance program to support all judicial officers. The judicial support officer also meets with new judges and helps transition them to the Court – managing everything from chambers set up to the coordination of their investiture or installation – and helps associate judges transition to senior status. This position is essential given the number of new judges that have joined the Court and number of chambers relocated due to the C Street construction.

Additionally, in 2013, I developed an orientation packet to welcome new judicial officers and assist them in their transition to Superior Court. To date, 13 associate and magistrate judges have received the welcome packet. I provide similar orientation packets to assist associate judges transitioning to senior status. I believe these resources help

welcome new judges to Superior Court, help introduce incoming senior judges to their new duties, and provide them with a point of direct contact in my chambers when they have questions.

### **Technology Upgrades**

In the past eight years, the Court implemented numerous initiatives to upgrade and employ technology, which is vital to accomplishing the Court's goals of providing a sound infrastructure and expanding access to Court information and services. (See Appendix G, 2013-2017 Strategic Plan at 22-23). The Court has continued the Integrated Justice Information System ("IJIS") initiative and expanded the divisions that utilize e-Filing to include the Probate Division, Civil Division, and most Family Court cases. (See Appendix J, Administrative Orders 12-10, 13-15, 15-03, and 15-24). Additionally, all judicial officers have been issued iPads to increase their productivity and access to files away from their chambers. The Court's Information Technology Division has uploaded the Superior Court Rules to these devices for daily use by judges and uploads additional materials at judicial training meetings. The use of technology is an initiative that I will continue to expand if re-designated for a third term.

### **Evaluation of Judicial Resources**

The Court has many programs and initiatives across divisions aimed at improving the services provided to the community. In order to gauge their effectiveness, we must evaluate them. In 2008, I promised to "evaluate the distribution of associate judges to each division and review the use of magistrate and senior judges in order to ensure these resources are used most effectively." (See Appendix C, 2008 Statement of Interest at 7).

During my first term as Chief Judge, additional judicial resources were assigned to handle landlord and tenant matters. In 2012, I indicated a need for more resources in the Domestic Violence Unit and Probate and Tax Divisions. (See Appendix D, 2012 Statement of Interest at 8). During my second term, I approved the use of senior judges to cover Domestic Violence calendars when judicial officers were on leave, reducing calendar down time and delays. The Probate Division continues to be the Court's fastest growing division given the city's aging population. In addition to adding judicial resources to this division during my first term, I recently added another associate judge to this division permanently. If re-designated as Chief Judge, I will continue working with the Joint Committee, the Probate Division leadership judges, and the division director on congressional legislation to authorize use of a magistrate judge in the Probate Division.

#### **IV. LEADING THE COURT AND PROMOTING A SENSE OF COOPERATION AND COLLEGIALLY AMONG THE JUDGES, THE COURT STAFF, AND OTHER GOVERNMENTAL AND NON-GOVERNMENTAL ENTITIES**

I am a Principal member of the Criminal Justice Coordinating Council, which is chaired by the Mayor or her designee, and pursuant to its bylaws, I was voted by the Principals to serve as its co-chair during my first term as Chief Judge. As Chief Judge, I am also a member of the Executive Committee of the Pretrial Services Agency.

#### **Collaborative Leadership Meeting**

In my second term as Chief Judge, I strived to bring together leadership judges and Court managers to work more collaboratively towards the shared goal of providing justice for all. In 2013, I started working with Anne Wicks, the Court's Executive Officer on the Court's first collaborative leadership meeting, which brought together the

presiding and deputy presiding judges, division directors and deputy directors, the Clerk of the Court, and the Executive Officer and Deputy Executive Officer. Mary McQueen, President of the National Center for State Courts, describes this progressive collaboration between the “robes and the suits” in her article *Two Sides of the Gavel, or Court Leaders as Productive Pairs*. (See Appendix K). I think that is a very fitting analogy.

The February 2014 collaborative leadership meeting connected the judges, who are only ten percent of the Court’s employees and responsible for applying the law in individual cases and making important decisions that affect people’s lives, with the Court managers, who represent the remaining 90 percent of Court employees and are responsible and accountable for accomplishing the administrative mission of the Superior Court. By creating strong collaboration within this group, the Court is more productive in meeting its strategic goal to improve the Court services provided to the community. This meeting was a successful first start. The group recommended it meet quarterly to continue to define the roles of the judges and Court managers, build a team environment, promote collegiality and work through issues as a group. This group will reconvene for a second full-day meeting in May 2016. I am confident that this group will continue working as a team to further the Court’s values and goals.

### **Kent Island Meeting**

In addition to working with the Court’s Judicial Leadership Team and bringing together Court administrators and judges for a collaborative leadership meeting, I asked a group of former leadership judges with a wealth of knowledge and experience, to join my 2015 Judicial Leadership Team at our annual two-day meeting. Before my heart transplant surgery, I asked Judge Weisberg, who was the Acting Chief Judge at the time,

to facilitate the meeting. I also asked Judges Reid Winston, Russell Canan, Melvin Wright, and John Campbell to participate. Each judge brings years of leadership experience that is valuable to the Court and the current leadership team. The goals of this meeting were to review three areas: (1) the structure of the Judicial Leadership Team – how can we ensure it continues its work as leaders in the Court; (2) the judicial career path of Superior Court associate and magistrate judges – what can we do to foster growth in young judges; and (3) the role of the Chief Judge – statutory and administrative responsibilities of the office. The judges were divided into workgroups, which met prior to the meeting and presented on their assigned topic to the larger group to generate discussion. Once the deliverables of the workgroups are finalized, I plan to share them with the Board of Judges and the Judicial Nomination Commission. Although this meeting occurred while I was recovering from heart transplant surgery, I am proud of the work the group completed during my absence and while Judge Weisberg was the Acting Chief Judge. It showed that the model of teamwork created by formalizing the Judicial Leadership Teams maintains consistency and continuity of leadership when a Chief Judge is absent. As a leader, I believe it is important to show by example that none of us are indispensable.

### **Court Employee Engagement**

As Chief Judge, I never stop listening and learning from my colleagues and court employees. Court employees are a valuable resource for new ideas and feedback on what the Court could do better, so I made it a goal in 2008 to hold monthly “group lunch meeting[s] with at least five different Court employees who are involved in different work areas” to learn about the Court from their perspective. (See Appendix C, 2008

Statement of Interest at 6). I have enjoyed these meetings not only for the information about the Court that employees have provided, but because they have given me an opportunity to talk to people who do so much to provide Court services to the residents of the District of Columbia. I will continue these lunch meetings if I am re-designated as Chief Judge.

### **Legislative Experience**

In addition to working extensively in the transition to and implementation of the District of Columbia Family Court Act of 2001 as the Presiding Judge of the Family Court, which is detailed in my 2008 Statement of Interest, as Chief Judge I have continued to work with Court division directors, Court partners, stakeholders, the Executive Branch and the City Council on pieces of legislation that affect Superior Court. (See Appendix C, 2008 Statement of Interest at 17-27). During my second term as chief judge, I worked with the Court's Register of Wills, leadership judges in the Probate Division and D.C. Councilmembers Tommy Wells and Anita Bonds on the Limitations of Guardianship Amendment Act of 2014.

I have also collaborated with lawmakers to develop creative, administrative solutions to issues impacting the Court. In early 2015, for example, I convened a group of partners in my chambers, including the U.S. Marshals Service, the D.C. Public Defender Service, the Office of the D.C. Attorney General, Councilmember David Grosso and Councilmember Kenyan McDuffie, Chair of the Committee on the Judiciary, to discuss the use of restraints in the Court's juvenile courtrooms. Although a wide range of suggestions were offered including introducing legislation to solve the issue, the group came to a consensus that an administrative order was the most appropriate remedy to

ensure the safety of our youth, their attorneys, Court staff, judicial officers, and family members in the courtroom. (See Appendix L, Administrative Order 15-07: Individual Determinations for the Use of Restraints on Respondents, April 3, 2015). I continue to see great value in working with both the executive and legislative branches on issues that affect the Court and the administration of justice.

## **V. PROMOTING CONFIDENCE IN THE COURT AND THE JUDICIAL SYSTEM**

### **Access to Justice**

As noted in the Courts' 2013-2017 Strategic Plan, the Courts must be open and accessible. In 2008, I stated that the "Court must expand its efforts to assist self-represented individuals by enhancing judges' skills in presiding over their cases and increasing the number of programs that help them to understand the Court better." (See Appendix C, 2008 Statement of Interest at 11). To help accomplish this goal and eliminate unnecessary barriers to the Court for self-represented parties, I issued three administrative orders allowing attorneys to make limited appearances in the Civil Division, Probate Division, Tax Division, Family Court, and Domestic Violence Unit. (See Appendix M, Administrative Orders 11-07, 12-08, and 14-10). Now, low-income litigants can receive temporary or limited-scope representation, providing them with better access to the Court. In 2009 and 2012, the Court conducted training sessions to enhance judicial officers' abilities to handle cases involving self represented individuals. Not only does this improve access to justice, but it also advances the Court's value of judicial excellence.

In addition, I am pleased to report that the Probate Division instituted the Guardianship Assistance Program, an innovative program that links the Court with students enrolled in masters in social work programs at our local universities. Each year the students participating in the program are trained and conduct in-depth reviews of the services provided to incapacitated adults under Court supervision and assist in developing an annual guardianship conference on best practices. In turn, the program manager and deputy program manager, who are Court employees, serve as field instructors, and the students receive credit from their universities for their volunteer work. The creation of this program marked the achievement of a goal set forth in my 2008 Statement of Interest. (See Appendix C, 2008 Statement of Interest at 12).

### **Improvements to Jury Service**

When I meet with residents of the District of Columbia, one of the most frequent topics of discussion is jury duty. Making improvements to jury service has been a priority throughout my tenure as Chief Judge and is discussed in both my 2008 and 2012 Statements of Interest. In the fall of 2008, the Court implemented a new jury management system, which contributed to an increase in juror yield and utilization. The Chief Judge's and Clerk of the Court's Performance Measures Committee, which includes the Judicial Leadership Team, Clerk of the Court, and division directors, reviews juror yield and utilization numbers monthly and often goes back to specific dates to look into what contributed to unusual results. Under the direction of the Clerk of the Court and the Director of Special Operations, the Court will implement a juror call-in system in June 2016, which will enable prospective jurors to call the Court the night before scheduled

service and see if they are still needed. The Court hopes this will improve juror experience and result in increased juror utilization.

### **Case Management Plans**

In a continued effort to promote the fair and efficient administration of justice, the Performance Measures Committee has undertaken an effort to create case management plans, which detail the actions that a court takes to monitor and control the progress of a case, from initiation through final disposition, to ensure prompt resolution consistent with the individual circumstances of the case. These plans help ensure that every litigant receives procedural due process and equal protection. To date, I have published case management plans for Domestic Relations, Probate, Traffic and Misdemeanor Community Courts and Domestic Violence cases. (See Appendix N, Administrative Orders 14-13, 14-23, 15-12, and 15-13). A case management plan for Mental Health Court cases will be issued by the end of May 2016. These case management plans reflect the Court's values of accountability and transparency.

### **Performance Measures**

In addition to issuing case management plans, I have advanced the Court's values of accountability and transparency by adopting performance measures for timely case dispositions and instituting procedures to hold judges accountable to those standards. With the support of the Performance Measures Committee, I issued Administrative Order 12-04 "Performance Measure – Time to Disposition, with Excludable Time." (See Appendix O). This administrative order was the response to a need for a system-wide approach to successfully implement time to disposition standards. The committee staff

consulted many different institutions, agencies, and individuals having key roles in case processing to develop time standards. To improve judges' timeliness in resolving motions, I issued five administrative orders requiring the Clerk of Court through each division to provide notice to judges after a motion is pending for a certain time period and eventually notify the Chief Judge. (See Appendix P, Administrative Orders 10-04, 14-07, 14-20, 15-04 and 15-08).

### **Balanced and Restorative Justice Drop-in Centers**

During my tenure as Chief Judge, the Court has not only renovated the Court campus, but it has impacted the residents of the District of Columbia by building directly in the community. One of the goals I set forth in 2008 was to strengthen the Family Court Social Services Division to ensure it continued its important work with our youth. (See Appendix C, 2008 Statement of Interest at 14). With generous support from Congress to improve our facilities and services to young people, we have built five Balanced and Restorative Justice Drop-in Centers, known as the BARJ Centers, with a sixth under construction. The BARJ Centers serve as both a satellite probation office and a center where youth can participate in activities such as tutoring, mentoring, counseling, community service, prevention classes, and vocational training. They provide youth with opportunities to engage in productive activities and learn valuable life skills to reduce the chances of recidivism. In addition, the Court continues to operate the Domestic Violence Southeast Intake Center.

## **Judge in Chambers Reform**

The first goal in the Court's Strategic Plan is fair and timely case resolution. To meet this goal, the Court must work to resolve disputes expeditiously, and if possible, on the day that the dispute is before the Court. In 2014, I worked with the Director of the Special Operations Division to implement two changes to the handling of Judge in Chambers cases. The first change provided that the judicial officer in Judge in Chambers must hear all matters on that calendar. The second issue occurred when a judicial officer was asked to leave the building to conduct an off-site hearing, which created a burden on the other divisions to cover Judge in Chambers' matters. After discussing this with the Judicial Leadership Team and the Director of the Special Operations Division, I issued a memorandum stating that requests to conduct off-site hearings must be forwarded to the presiding judge of the Probate Division for consideration and review. (See Appendix Q, Memoranda on Judge in Chambers' Policies).

## **VI. INTELLECTUAL LEADERSHIP**

I serve on the Board of Directors of the newly formed National Association of Presiding Judges and Court Executives ("NAPCO"). NAPCO will conduct its first Leadership Academy with the National Center of State Courts in September 2016.

### **Judicial Coaching Program**

Throughout my eight years as Chief Judge, I have looked for ways to strengthen the judiciary and create a culture of judicial excellence, which are among the goals and values outlined in the Court's Strategic Plan. (See Appendix G, 2013-2017 Strategic Plan). In 2013, my colleague Judge Lynn Leibovitz, then-Chair of the Judicial Education

Committee, proposed developing a Judicial Coaching Program, which I implemented in March 2014. The program is a professional development resource that provides a collaborative system of support among judicial colleagues – associate, magistrate and senior judges. (See Appendix R, Administrative Order 15-10: Creation of the Judicial Coaching Program, May 14, 2015). Participation is mandatory for new judicial officers, but voluntary for seasoned judicial officers. The Court continues to train new judges and provide refresher seminars for judicial coaches at least twice a year, most recently in March 2016. To date, 52 Superior Court judicial officers have participated in the Judicial Coaching Program as either a coach or coachee. It has become a highly effective way of enhancing the professional development of judges at every stage of their judicial career, while supporting the Court’s value of judicial excellence and goal of a strong judiciary.

## **VII. VISION FOR THE NEXT FOUR YEARS**

I am excited about the future of Superior Court – especially the next four years. Due to my successful heart transplant, I am now healthy and feeling just as good as I did during my first term as Chief Judge. I am motivated to continue moving Superior Court into the future as an innovative Court while maintaining focus on what is most important – serving the residents of the District of Columbia.

The D.C. Courts’ Strategic Plan is my framework for establishing priorities and performance goals for the Superior Court. My vision for the next four years aligns with the Court’s vision – *Open to All, Trusted by All, Justice for All*. My specific goals for the Superior Court are listed below, in no particular order, along with the Court value or goal that each supports:

- Expand e-filing across the Court – *Access to Justice*.

- Continue to enhance juror utilization, which will help increase the time a resident has between jury duties, and continue to explore ways to increase juror yield – *Access to Justice and Public Trust and Confidence.*
- Expand time certain calendars throughout every Court division – *Access to Justice and Public Trust and Confidence.*
- Develop case management plans for Civil, Felony and Tax cases – *Access to Justice and Transparency.*
- Continue focus on timeliness of judicial resolution of motions – *Accountability and Public Trust and Confidence.*
- Expand the number of judges who participate in the Judicial Coaching Program – *Judicial Excellence and Strong Judiciary.*
- Provide more judicial resources to the Probate Division by working with Congress to pass legislation authorizing the use of magistrate judges in that division – *Strong Judiciary and Workforce.*
- Reform the Superior Court committee structure and operations to define the purpose and authority of each committee, which other than the standing committees have no defined written purpose, method of operation or authority – *Strong Judiciary and Workforce.*
- Provide training to chairs of standing committees on how to conduct a productive meeting and continue creating deputy chair positions for midterm judicial officers in order to develop future judicial leaders. This will provide these judges with experience working with Court managers, employees, partners and stakeholders – *Strong Judiciary and Workforce.*

- Maintain Court operations as the Court progresses to the next phases of the C street construction – *Sound Infrastructure*.
- Expand use of technology by enabling electronic completion of judicial orders in paternity and support courtrooms, electronic alerts or notifications in domestic relations cases, electronic initiation of juvenile cases, and the development of a voucher program for Probate fee petitions – *Sound Infrastructure and Transparency*.
- Enhance language access through video conference interpreting and other recommendations anticipated from the newly created Language Access Committee – *Excellence and Access to Justice*.
- Expand services provided to individuals who appear in community courts in partnership with the executive branch of the District of Columbia government – *Public Trust and Confidence*.
- Continue creating and sustaining a durable and adaptable judicial leadership structure that supports Court operations and leads judicial activities – *Excellence and a Strong Judiciary and Workforce*.
- Continue to strengthen the connection and collaboration between Court managers and judicial officers, also known as “the suits and robes” – *Excellence and a Strong Judiciary and Workforce*.
- Evaluate the Superior Court Drug Court, Civil Mediation and Child Protection Mediation – *Transparency, and Public Trust and Confidence*.
- Create a Superior Court leadership bench book for use by future Superior Court judicial leaders. It will contain the role of the chief judge, the role

and operation of the Judicial Leadership Team, and a recommended career path for judicial officers as jurists and judicial leaders. The chief judge, with the assistance of the Judicial Leadership Team, has an affirmative responsibility to develop judges beginning at their initial appointment both as jurists and as judicial leaders – *Excellence and a Strong Judiciary and Workforce*.

### **VIII. CONCLUSION**

My accomplishments as Chief Judge have been due to hard work and collaboration with the Judicial Leadership Team, the Board of Judges, Court managers and employees, and members of the community. Continuing this success will require the same dedication, commitment, teamwork, and shared vision for success of the judiciary and Court managers and employees, which I have been honored and fortunate to have during the past eight years. It would be an honor to continue to lead the Superior Court team into the future and serve the District of Columbia community as the Superior Court's Chief Judge. I am excited and motivated to continue in this role. Therefore, I respectfully request that the Judicial Nomination Commission re-designate me for another four-year term as Chief Judge of the Superior Court of the District of Columbia. Thank you for your consideration.



Judicial Leadership Team and invited judges who participated in the Kent Island Meeting (Section IV, *supra*, at 14).

## IX. APPENDICES

- Appendix A Resolution to Thank the Honorable Frederick H. Weisberg, January 13, 2016
- Appendix B.1 Letter from Family of Magistrate Judge Diane Lepley, February 16, 2016
- Appendix B.2 Letter from the Honorable Darlene Soltys, March 23, 2016
- Appendix C Statement of Interest of Judge Lee F. Satterfield in Support of Candidacy for Chief Judge, June 18, 2008
- Appendix D Statement of Interest of the Honorable Lee F. Satterfield in Support of Request for Re-Designation as Chief Judge of the Superior Court of the District of Columbia, May 23, 2012
- Appendix E Administrative Order 15-09: Creation of the Judicial Leadership Team, May 7, 2015
- Appendix F Memorandum from Chief Judge Lee F. Satterfield to Superior Court Judicial Officers, Managers and Employees, Superior Court of the District of Columbia Judicial Leadership Team's Resolution on Court Values, November 7, 2014
- Appendix G Strategic Plan of the District of Columbia Courts, *Open to All, Trusted by All, Justice for All*, 2013-2017
- Appendix H Presentation of Chief Judge Lee F. Satterfield on Chambering Program at Judicial Meeting, April 29, 2014
- Appendix I Katelyn Polantz, *The Law Offices of the Future Are Here, and Your Name Might Not Be On the Door*, National Law Journal, March 23, 2016
- Appendix J.1 Administrative Order 12-10: eFiling in the Neglect and Abuse, Juvenile and Domestic Relations Branches of the Family Court, September 20, 2012
- Appendix J.2 Administrative Order 13-15: eFiling in the Probate Division, September 16, 2013

- Appendix J.3      Administrative Order 15-03: Mandatory eFiling of Complaints in the Civil Division, February 13, 2015
- Appendix J.4      Administrative Order 15-24: eFiling in the Paternity and Support and Mental Health and Habilitation Branches of the Family Court, December 2, 2015
- Appendix K        Mary Campbell McQueen, President, National Center for State Courts, *Two Sides of the Gavel, or Court Leaders as Productive Pairs*, Keynote in Trends in State Courts, 2015
- Appendix L        Administrative Order 15-07: Individual Determinations for the Use of Restraints on Respondents, April 3, 2015
- Appendix M.1     Administrative Order 11-07: Temporary Appearances for the Paternity and Child Support Branch, May 27, 2011
- Appendix M.2     Administrative Order 12-08: Temporary Appearances in the Small Claims and Conciliation Branch and the Civil Actions Branch Collections Calendar, July 9, 2012
- Appendix M.3     Administrative Order 14-10: Limited Appearances in the Civil Division, Probate Division, Tax Division, Family Court, and Domestic Violence Unit, June 16, 2014
- Appendix N.1     Administrative Order 14-13: Case Management Plan for Probate Division, August 5, 2014
- Appendix N.2     Administrative Order 14-23: Revised Case Management Plan for the Domestic Relations Branch, December 31, 2014
- Appendix N.3     Administrative Order 15-12: Case Management Plan for Traffic and D.C. Misdemeanor Cases, July 1, 2015
- Appendix N.4     Administrative Order 15-13: Case Management Plan for Domestic Violence Unit, August 3, 2015
- Appendix O        Administrative Order 12-04: Performance Measure – Time to Disposition, with Excludable Time, March 23, 2012

Appendix P.1	Administrative Order 10-04: Timeline for Resolution of Motions to Review Magistrate Judges' Decisions in Neglect, Guardianship, Adoption and Termination of Parental Rights Matters, March 9, 2010
Appendix P.2	Administrative Order 14-07: Timeline for Resolution of Post-Disposition Motions in Criminal Cases, April 30, 2014
Appendix P.3	Administrative Order 14-20: Timeline for Resolution of Motions and Entry of Written Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law in Neglect, Adoption, and Termination of Parental Rights Cases, November 21, 2014
Appendix P.4	Administrative Order 15-04: Timeline for Resolution of Motions and Entry of Written Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law in Domestic Relations Branch, February 18, 2015
Appendix P.5	Administrative Order 15-08: Timely Resolution of Matters Under Advisement in the Civil Actions Branch, April 9, 2015
Appendix Q.1	Memorandum from Chief Judge Lee F. Satterfield to Senior Judges, Judge in Chambers' Policy Regarding Off-Site Hearings, March 20, 2014
Appendix Q.2	Memorandum from Chief Judge Lee F. Satterfield to Senior Judges, Judge in Chambers' Policy Regarding Warrants, March 31, 2014
Appendix R	Administrative Order 15-10: Creation of the Judicial Coaching Program, May 14, 2015