



# DISH

## Data Information SHaring

### User Group Meeting Minutes: 5/23/2007

#### I. Introductions:

II. **Purpose of Meeting:** To review the current APA case flow as prepared from the last meeting and develop a proposal of an improved case flow process highlighting opportunities for data exchanged and standardized or streamlined processes.

#### III. Examples of current Data Exchange Projects

Danielle Stecco explained what data exchange currently looks like. CSE- accept data from the DA's Office in criminal cases- (screen shot from presentation)- Case Information Screen-(ECF Screen). She further explained the difference between E-Filing vs. Data Exchange- E-filing is the current Lexis-Nexis E-File which is the process of exchanging images of documents and entails storing documents/images. A data exchange will store specific data fields, not a document or a picture of a document.

Questions arose from Users- related to are we headed in the direction of E-Filing and storing of images/documents? Chris and Danielle explained that we are going to be looking on the horizon and keeping that in mind while we work on this particular project, however the storing of images/documents is not in the scope of DISH.

Question arose from User regarding - linking ACSES and Eclipse/jPOD?- Some data exchanges will automatically populate fields, and some fields will require review by the User and acceptance. Chris explained that data exchange will be a direct link – between the two systems, not a third platform that the users would need access.

Jefferson county said that this meeting has already helped processing – just meeting and talking between CSE and the Courts they have tweaked their process to make it easier for both sides.

#### IV. Objectives of Project

**A. Elevator Statement-** For families who depend on timely execution of APA child support orders, the DISH project is an electronic case filing and information exchange program allowing CSE and the Courts to exchange data electronically. Unlike the current paper dependent systems, the solution will expedite child support orders, reduce redundant data entry, and improve data accuracy.

**B. Project Objectives**

1. Improve the speed of APA case initiation and the execution of the corresponding child support order
2. Produce processes which save time for judicial & CS Staff
3. Produce processes that standardize the sue of court case types JV & DR
4. Provide centralized information displays combining data available from both ACSES and Eclipse/jPOD (Judicial Processing on Demand)
5. Provide a real-time system interface between ACSES & Eclipse/jPOD the electronic exchange of APA case intake & management data. This interface is intended to:
  - \* Reduce manual data entry of APA data at the court
  - \* Improve data reliability and consistency
  - \* Facilitate the quick assignment of a docket # by Eclipse/jPOD to an APA case, and the timely delivery the docket # to ACSES
  - \* assign and exchange FSR account #
  - \* provide automatic and timely notification to ACSES that an APA order has been signed
  - \* Provide automatic electronic data updates between ACSES & Eclipse/jPOD when APA case management data is modified

**V. Review APA case flow- highlighting opportunities for data exchange and improved or standardized processes**

- A. Went through the flow chart to make sure that what we have documented as the case flow is accurate.
  - a. First Research Box is a step but it is not an opportunity for data exchange.
  - b. Fremont County- enters the data onto Eclipse so that they may print their label out. The first 6/7 steps on the Court Side (Step 2)
  - c. Acronym list- need to add- “AP & AV” case types- AP = support admin paternity av – administrative support

RPD- Report Paternity Determination- puts the name on the birth certificate- it's a form that the court needs to sign/stamp. The form gets sent to Vital Statistics- usually from CSE. Some courts may still do this.

The form is generated and filled out by CSE and then signed by a “Designee” and/or Certified by a Stamp. Boulder Clerk thought that there was at some point there was a statutory/CSE policy change (Mary Clair will check into)– Donna points out interstate issues on RPD's- child born out of state

This RPD is an area that the Group feels can be standardized and – group feels that the CSE side should be doing it- some counties have already changed their processes regarding this as well.

\*\*insert- note 5 standardization has already happened by recommendation by this User Group so that we can capture how many

Modifications- either IV-D negotiation or Court Negotiation can be required after NCP/CP files a Mtn. to Modify

We Changed the box that was a decision item that read, “10% change” to “valid modification” because there are other reasons that CSE could proceed with modifications-

Purpose is to come up with a list of what do we want it to do-

Because an item is highlighted does not mean that it will happen that way- or technologically can? We’ll start with what is ideal and work from there on what is possible. Lesson learned from SANCA Diana points out.

Step 1- Referral Application: to Research (highlighted: how could we achieve it?)

Chris: new search interface on the CSE side of building their new system that allows CSE to pull up data and pull it to one central location/screen – CBMS/Trails, same concept here = single screen we could pull up in one spot. Connect with judicial – to see if there an existing case already. Existing support cases, any court involvement- might have a hearing happening, for service, locate functionality – it was discussed that there may be the need to continue searching twice- once as you put the case up, matching name with – searching by name/SSN/referral and then again later as case proceeds.

Group felt it was a good idea to reach out to systems we can get and bring back information about that person with whatever information we have to see if there anything we can use when setting up the case.

Question arose regarding how do we go into the case? Question = can we see Minute Orders, who was served, who appeared? Courtlink allows us to see DR cases and many other case types- however it does not allow D&N, Foster care?, Truancy cases

Diana points out that this is a Public access issue- who can look at what court records- except foster care/D&N cases – new Chief Justice Directives and statutes regarding this issue. Boulder County notes pending legislation- SB 07-266: D&N – JD cases- access to name index, any other information will not be electronic access – cut the ROA information? Ok to give information to give to Trails and not to give to CSE? CSE not a party to the case- CLI Screen- CSE/DNN Side access to screen.

Something to keep in mind- what would this Shared centralized information screen to look like? What do the judges/magistrates want/need?

Information that would be useful to CSE- Date of termination? Who believes that the Court has custody right now?

Locate: search Judicial system for information – similar to Research box  
Sharing data for locate- question arose about whether CSE would have access to collections piece? Criminal collections Case? Bond information?  
Users point out that a lot of information is restricted, protected by their own set of policies? Maureen points out that Probation officer name/contact information was restored on Courtlink and that Jeff Co is working well with their probation dept. on these types of issues and are in the process of developing a MOU.  
To Do: Investigate with Jeff Co. information sharing with Probation- and the collections piece to find out if there is any information we could share- or if there are any prohibitions that we are not aware of.

Lexis Courtlink- is the Registry Of Action  
Lexis File & Serve- no access to documents, unless you are part of e-filing system??

Section of - ACSES Entry-

DNF – ECF Screens?

D & N filings

ECF -

Case Initiation

\*sending information back and forth, it's not going to populate automatically, some information will have to be reviewed and accepted.

\*name collection is a huge issue

\*legal name and caption does not match- "Jimmy Lee Ray vs. James Lee Ray III" e.g.

Batch Processes distinction information can be sent over in real-time and does not mean - overnight processing

User points out that we need an oops button- that needs to be covered in meeting #3

**Issue: How do we do that the quickest way to get CSE get their Case #?  
Once you get the data, what are we going to do with it, so we can get a**

- (1) Do we need to wait to get the paper?
- (2) Or is it a different type of paper- opening document?
  - a. CSE might not be ready to send the whole paperwork packet, but there might be a way to get some verification type of paperwork, so that the Court may initiate the
  - b. Verify the paperwork
  - c. Simple one page form with general demographic information-
  - d. Intent to file- how do you guarantee that the case is going to be filed with the Court? Users point out the following things to keep in mind.
    - i. Information on the piece of paper is going to be the same as the paperwork that will becoming over the
    - ii. Something can happen intermittent – there was a mistake

- iii. Mechanism that – if the paperwork is not filed – case could be set for a review hearing- envision that you would be setting the case up on Eclipse with the piece of paper
- iv. ECF screen – D&N, Boulder e-mails the Court a list of names/ and # of case #'s.
- v. Hurts open case report because the case is opened and then it has to wait until they get the paper -
- vi. If every year CSE is given a block of #'s, and then when they want a case #, they take their next # and the mechanism for the Court –
- vii. Fremont County – in D&N cases, Atty. faxes Ct “a request for a Case #” document has names/DOB/children names, etc and then the Court is able to open the case with that information - Case # and then sets a tickler for a week to make sure that they get the paper they need from the County Atty’s Office.
- viii. Boulder- points out that you don’t want duplicate data entry, so from an electronic standpoint, not have to do an electronic process and paper system.  
What is the advantage of having a case # early?  
Record keeping- (Boulder CSE)

~ 3 scenarios

- (1) Boulder Clerk of Court ,set aside a block of #'s and send them over to CSE , and they can assign them to their cases as they come in
- (2) Jeff Co./El Paso County/Denver County- Files the whole packet and gets the Court # - CSE leaves the Clerk’s Office with Court Case #- Clerk has to right
- (3) MINI- Agreement with CSE and Court, mini paperwork, they file it and Clerk
  - a. Either Clerk sets the #'s aside and then when the paper comes into office, the Clerk then goes into system and sets up a case
  - b. Or Clerk gives the # and goes in and puts the bare bones into Eclipse, and then Court gives the CSE Office a #,

\*there are multiple jurisdictions that have more than one judicial officer – Morgan, Prowers, Jeff. Co, Denver

Danielle said that her and Diana spoke with Bob Roper (JBITS- Judicial) at this point the possibility of automatic assignment of cases from jPOD is not out of the question, we’re not saying it can’t happen in the future, but right now it does not work that way.

Fremont County – Hurdle: There is a problem with Judge/Division Assignment - automation court case #, goes with Division #- Could you make it an acceptance level?

Larimer (Karen)- pre-assignment of case #'s – we want to make sure the processes- do not want the clerk to touch the case many times- takes time. It’s not just the exclusions – there are cases that we’ll have to standardize dismissals.

Denver – uncomfortable with not having all the information- if there are mistakes- does not want to have to tickle her cases to make sure that CSE is doing their job.

**Issue: SUP1-**

After the last user group meeting, met with Bilinda McKay Johnson from CSE regarding the assignment of FSR #'s. Recommendation whenever there is a

FSR # process can be changed – we can make a recommendation on how we want it to work. Filing date- court order #

Boulder- so because of needing a case number on the Order and needing the filing date It's better to have a case # at the time you're submitting the paperwork.

Question- is there a way we could make it work with the terms of the proposed order to get the case #- currently from ACSES we have to have an order from the court in order to add the information – is there a way to reprogram ACSES to allow the entry of a proposed order prior to the entry of the court order?

Boulder- look at ACSES

Denver – CSE adds it? It's not APA cases

Shana Denver- SUP1 Event issues- not having enough information (fix it for APA still have problem with Judicial) Change what is required to put up a SUP1 for APA we need to also fix that for Judicial .....FSR requires a SSN. Acknowledgment from Clerks

ACSES does not require SSN to set up a case. \*\*Homework\*\*

Court requires - Name/dob/address/SSN

SUP1 – child support federal registries for cases other than

Why do we need an SUP1? And for whom?

Federal registry requires a SSN? Could there be an exception? Chris Kain- Homework

CSE wants to enter the terms of the Order and transfer those terms over to Court System as a “proposed order”

Issue Concern- for ACSES sending it to Court?

Proposed Order to send it over?

What happens on the back side?

Clerk's Side of things- having a consistency you know where to look for a support order and the terms etc.

- going to be looking at exchanging addresses, etc.
- party information needs to be changed through the SUP1, can't just be on the party screen. (check with Danielle)

Note: Satisfaction of Judgment- that could also be an electronic exchange.

\*could be a time-saver on the court side.

\*Default Orders- Weld, wants to set a review for a signature on the Default Order Courts handle those different ways

Standardize – Jeff Co is getting a new Case # when the parents are switching roles

Are there Counties that would not appear at a Permanent Orders. ?? Discussed and answer is yes.

### **ISSUE: Scheduling**

CSE sets their own docket

Or Court sets their docket and lets the CSE Office know

Can not be standardized, system must exchange data both ways, for whomever set it.

Locations that have access to Court Docket, that information is stored in ACSES- that information will come over to Court (it's a field in ACSES)

Or Court will set the date and send that information over to ACSES

Court may clear the calendar- so CSE may know already know ahead of time-

Court may send other hearing dates to CSE that they might not have already known about.

Separate fields for return of service fields. – that may be an opportunity for data exchange and save the court time. WHO & HOW: Process Server, waiver, certified mail-Restricted service – CSE personally served?

## **XI. Wrap-Up**

*Next Meeting – June 21, 2007 10:00 a.m. – 3 :0 0p.m. Jefferson County CSE*

Homework-

- (1) Clerks and CSE meet to talk about the three scenarios – and to hash it out and – Assign Case #, Division #
- (2) Mary Clair – checking into RPD issue (see above)
- (3) Users need to start discussing what would they like to see in a shared centralized information screen- need additional input from Judges/Magistrates, IV-D atty's, Techs, Etc.
- (4) Management Team – set additional fourth meeting
- (5) Send out updated case flow processing

Next meeting: Purpose - Need to discuss specific Data elements

Finish this process we started today- revisiting issues regarding Case #'s quickly back and FSR-