# Data Exchange/E-Filing Grant Meeting

MINUTES          OCTOBER 18, 2006          2:00- 4:00 P.M.          DHS: 1575 SHERMAN STREET, DENVER

| TYPE OF MEETING | Steering Committee Kick Off Meeting |
|---|---|
| FACILITATOR | Maureen Leif |
| NOTE TAKER | Alicia Davis |
| ATTENDEES | Maureen Leif, Alicia Davis, Diana Coffey, Danielle Stecco, John Bernhart, Craig Goellner, Curtis Rose, Richard Moore, Nancy Lawson, Debbie Moss, Ron Ozga, Chris Kain, Tracy Harbo, Larry Desbien, Sandy Pratt, Diane Degenhart, Bob Roper, |

## Agenda topics

### OPENING REMARKS                                                                                        JOHN

| DISCUSSION | John welcomed the Steering Committee and expressed how excited the State CSE Unit is to be involved with this Grant and to be collaborating with the State Judicial Department.  He mentioned that Colorado CSE is also currently involved with four other grants, and that the reputation at the Federal level is very good and that we must continue our excellent reputation with completing this Grant in order to be awarded future grants.  The goals of the grant are to effectively and efficiently speed up information transfer. |
|---|---|
| CONCLUSIONS | It is very important for this grant to be successful to ensure that Colorado CSE continues their excellent reputation on a national basis. |

| ACTION ITEMS | PERSON RESPONSIBLE | DEADLINE |
|---|---|---|
| None | | |

### SUCCESSES AND LESSONS LEARNED FROM SANCA                                            DIANA, RON & BOB

| DISCUSSION | A brief overview was given of the SANCA project, that it is a data exchange project in the D&N world.  Colorado is one of six sites, and are showing some of the best outcomes thus far.  They attribute the success of SANCA on the great partnership between DHS and State Judicial.  It was explained that the grant was awarded to the Colorado Judicial Department and Judicial teamed up with the Department of Human Services.  Some of the lessons learned |
|---|---|
| | were that it is important to be clear on the what terminology/language each of the Departments were using, because the word "Order", for example, does not always mean the same thing to each side.  It is important to keep good communication channels open between both sides.  There were no uniform national data standards and for this project the teams had to do their own data modeling and schemas.  Training was also an important piece of SANCA and continues today as the project is rolled out state-wide on a staggered time line. |

| ACTION ITEMS | PERSON RESPONSIBLE | DEADLINE |
|---|---|---|
| None | | |

### SUCCESSES AND LESSONS LEARNED FROM CSE                                            CRAIG AND CURTIS

| DISCUSSION | Craig gave a brief history of the partnership between State Judicial and State CSE and that our history together goes back before the FSR in 1993.  There was the state registry project and the state and county alimony and support system.  Craig agrees with the idea of Forum, and that not all ideas can be implemented, some ideas should be kept for future |
|---|---|

| | use. Craig indicated that they have used XML technologies before. They have implemented a project for Income Withholdings to be sent electronically which has sped up implementation. |
| --- | --- |
| | Curtis gave the group a description of Agile Project Management. Including an overview of a chartering session, and explained what that process entails, and hopes that we may be able to use some of those concepts in this grant. It's important to have a kick off chartering/vision setting session in the beginning, so that everyone involved can easily explain the project and have a clear vision about what it is going to entail and what the goals of the project are. It also logically breaks the project into chunks, and implement slowly which allows workers to gain benefit of the project earlier rather than waiting till the end. |
| | Bob explained that when the Judicial Dept. wrote it's Case Management software, they brought in 140 people in the beginning to get buy-off and input on the project. There were two groups, (1) Judges/Magistrates and (2) users. They participated in 4-5 consecutive all day meetings. |

| ACTION ITEMS | PERSON RESPONSIBLE | DEADLINE |
| --- | --- | --- |
| None | | |

## UPDATE ON SB 06-63                                        RON

| DISCUSSION | Ron gave the group an idea of what SB 06-63 is, and that is that it may entail the project if it meets certain criteria, having to have a certified project manager out of the Governor's Office of IT. Bob indicated that they have contracted with a group to come in and do training to certify people as PM's, Ron expressed some interest in having some of his people attend. |
| --- | --- |

| CONCLUSIONS | Not an issue to worry about at this point. |
| --- | --- |

| ACTION ITEMS | PERSON RESPONSIBLE | DEADLINE |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Will keep updated on an as-needed basis | Ron | none |

## ACTION PLAN                                        GROUP

| DISCUSSION | **Review of Steering Committee:** It was suggested that in addition to Judge Peter Weir, that a Magistrate be added to the Committee and Betty Strobel was mentioned. She is a magistrate in Weld County. It was also suggested that a magistrate from Jefferson County be added. We also need to add Chris Kain, from DHS to the group. |
| --- | --- |
| | **Workgroups**: It was discussed how SANCA was set up and how DHS set up their workgroups. It was suggested by Bob and others that the two sides initially meet together and then break out and do work separately with a liaison in between There were two groups, in addition to the Steering Committee, that were determined to be needed in this project. (1) CSE User Group and (2) Judicial User group. Both sides agreed that the technical groups somewhat form naturally. |
| | It was suggested by Bob that when forming these workgroups, to fully inform the members of the expected time commitment and to have them promise that they will make all or most of the meetings, because if they send substitutes to the meetings, they are not as productive. |
| | Also Bob suggested developing a brochure so that we can hand out to people who we are trying to recruit. Bob had people go around the room and throw out what we hope to get out of the grant for use in the brochure:<br>• Data exchange of court order information<br>• Documents transfer |

- Verification of data fields
- Some processes like LEXIS- get docket number, do e-filing processes in
- Adjudication in APA
- Employment of current technologies: XML, national standards, schemas of data transfers
- Paperless data transfer with electronic signatures
- Assign docket number electronically
- Automatic routing
- Eliminate redundant data entry
- Establish uniform support order terms/obligations
- Enter once, replicate everywhere
- Real time
- History/integration screen
- Connecting people/cases
- Interstate compatible
- Develop and implement best business practices for CSE and COURTS

**Each side needs to start forming their user groups so that these groups are ready for their chartering session in January 2007. There is no Steering Committee Meeting set for November to accomplish this first important goal.**

**Name of grant:** we need a name of the grant – everyone to think about and submit ideas

**Update on RFP for evaluator:** Group was informed that Dan Welch contemplated breaking out the needs assessment piece with the actual evaluation. Group liked the idea. He does have a draft of the RFP for the evaluation. Sandy Pratt indicated that if the amount allotted for the evaluation does not exceed $150K, we may not need an RFP.

**Brainstorm on Needs Assessment Survey:** DHS looking at on-line surveys, would be low-cost/no cost. Would be great to get the needs assessment done prior to the chartering session in January. It was suggested that the needs assessment be sent to the group for input.

**Brainstorm on Planning Conference:** Group likes the idea of the charter session. One full day conference set out for January 11, 2007. Maureen will work with Dan to figure out a location, and will e-mail the group with the details. The Steering Committee will not meet that day, we will meet the following week and can hopefully be updated with outcomes from the chartering session at that meeting.

| CONCLUSIONS | We have a lot of work to do. |
| --- | --- |

| ACTION ITEMS | PERSON RESPONSIBLE | DEADLINE |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Need snazzy new name for grant | Group | ASAP |
| Form Workgroups | Dan for DHS and Maureen & Alicia for Judicial | November 14th |
| Brochure | Maureen & Group as needed | Mid November |
| Invite Magistrate from Weld County & Magistrate from Jeff Co | Maureen & Alicia | ASAP |
| Update on RRP/Needs Assessment | Dan Welch | December 14th |
| Meeting location for Chartering Session on January 11th, 2007 | Maureen & Dan | ASAP |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Meeting room for January 18th Steering Committee Meeting | Dan | |
| | | |

| | |
|---|---|
| **OTHER** | Maureen will send out copies of the minutes along with the Final Proposal |
| **NEXT MEETING** | No November meeting, so that the groups can form their users workgroups<br>December Meeting set for December 14, 2006 from 2:00- 4:00 p.m. at Denver West location: 1726 Cole Blvd. Bldg. 22, Suite 300, Golden, CO 80401<br>January Charter Session: January 11, 2007 from 9:00 a.m. – 4:00 p.m.<br>January Steering Committee Meeting: January 18, 2007 2:00- 4:00 p.m. at DHS |
| **SPECIAL NOTES** | |