[]

DISH
Data Information SHaring

User Group Meeting Minutes: 8/2/2007

I.   **Introductions:**
   Attendance:

   i.   Chris Kain, State CSE
   ii.   Diana Coffey, SCAO
   iii.   Maureen Leif, SCAO
   iv.   Nancy Thoennes, Center for Policy Research
   v.   Dan Welch, State CSE
   vi.   Mary Clair, State CSE
   vii.   Debra Crosser, Boulder Courts
   viii. Donna Gibbs, Jefferson county CSE
   ix.   Traci Worthan, Jefferson County Courts
   x.   Shawny Corner, Prowers County CSE
   xi.   Eileen Wiseman, Jefferson County CSE
   xii.   Jim Hayen, Boulder CSE
   xiii. Teri Morrow, Morgan County Courts
   xiv.   Jeannie Larson, Arapahoe County CSE
   xv.   Mary Burson, Weld County CSE
   xvi.   Mandy Allen, Delta County Courts
   xvii. Kami Livingston, Arapahoe County
   xviii. Laura Burgess, Weld County Courts
   xix.   Beverly Tait, Weld CSE
   xx.   Robert Kurtz, State CSE
   xxi.   Kari Moreno, State CSE
   xxii. Shana Kloek, Denver CSE
   xxiii. Stephanie Barber-Haile, Larimer County Courts
   xxiv. Kristie Kleven, Fremont County
   xxv.   Kent Kai, Adams County CSE
   xxvi. Beth Stewart, Adams County Courts
   xxvii. Renee Vigil-Stokes, Denver CSE

II. <u>Purpose of Meeting:</u> To answer any questions about the completed the modification case flow and discuss outstanding standardization and business issues. Brainstorm on proposed centralized information screen. Brainstorm on a marketing plan for DISH.

III. 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.

IV. Project Objectives
> A. Improve the speed of APA case initiation and the execution of the corresponding child support order
> B. Produce processes which save time for judicial & CS Staff
> C. Produce processes that standardize the sue of court case types JV & DR
> D. Provide centralized information displays combining data available from both ACSES and Eclipse/jPOD (Judicial Processing on Demand)
> E. 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.   Answer any questions regarding the modification case flow
> a. No questions were presented.
> b. Eileen Jeff Co. said that she went through the case flow and realized that we had missed a step of entering service of process data into ACSES. Once the APA goes out for service, the service process comes back and that information is entered into ACSES.

VI.   Business Decisions
> a. **SUP1- SUP2 event (needs clarification**)
>> i. Did we decide that the group would recommend that the terms will be entered into ACSES and that it will be sent to Court as a proposed order, the Court will be able to accept it and then it will be sent back to CSE with an approval or denial and that it will automatically populate the SUP event? Group discusses-

1. Boulder Courts- technical concern relating information to the parties
2. Group agrees that in the civil world – the court would take the proposed Order and could modify it and add terms, change terms etc, and we would want that ability duplicated in DISH.
3. Determined in this discussion that it is better to use the term "Rejected" rather than "denied"
4. People agree that if the Order is Accepted – but modified, the new terms would then have to come back to CSE as a modified order- potentially flag that to the tech so they would know that the order was changed.
5. Temp Orders- on APA- the Order is not proposed, it is an Order that is stamped and goes to get filed, but does not require a judicial signature. There would still be SUP1

  ii. Will it always be sent as a proposed order – or could Judicial initiate the Order and send it to CSE? Group decides that it could be initiated at Judicial and go to CSE.

  iii. Is there still confusion on the Court side when you do SUP1- vs. SUP2. Is that standardized, or are there differences in practice? What happens when we get different Parties, parties changing roles, etc. Some Courts will enter a new SUP1 when there is a new support order. This mechanism allows the Court to retain the history of the child support orders (Boulder raises this issue) Denver does this, Weld County uses the comment line to include the history while they modify the SUP1. How many Districts change the SUP1 event? 4 Districts- they say this was the way they were trained.

  iv. Denver, Boulder, Arapahoe do new SUP1- this keeps history

  v. How many would be interested in helping in small workgroup in working this issue out more clearly offline? (almost everyone) Denver, Morgan Weld, Adams Boulder, Larimer

b. Assignment of Case Number
  i. Presentation of survey results from Nancy
1. She had a handout with results of the survey of both surveys
2. CSE- agreement that the Court should assign a docket number within 24 hours of filing- mostly medium counties responding
3. Boulder Clerks Office started two weeks ago giving the pre-assigned numbers to CSE- they report back that it is working great
4. Group feels like we should try to get more feedback from the larger counties – target them specifically by phone e.g. since they did not respond to survey proportionally

  ii. Why is it important to get Case number quickly?
1. What are the Federal Time Frames that CSE is working with? CSE reports that their time frame starts with the date that

you locate someone- have to have the Order up within 90 days. Jeff Co would love to have their numbers back in a week- right now it is taking a month. Boulder is getting the numbers on demand- and it's working really well. We need to further clarify this for both sides so that they will understand the importance of getting the case number back quickly.

iii. What are time constraints for each side?

1. C/S Order indicates a commencement date, but if it takes awhile to get the Order signed, a NCP could start in the arrears before he has even had a chance to start paying- credit reporting could show he/she was delinquent.

2. Payments processing – payments could come in on a case that did not have an FSR Account activated yet.

3. Court perspective- Court can reject a Stipulation- and does for many reasons, including a lack of reason for a deviation (example) incomplete data etc. So- CSE should not be doing anything further on case, until it has been reviewed by the Court- even if they get the case no. Jefferson County said that they do not do deviations and other counties report that they do if the parties agree; they just need to indicate in the Order why they are agreeing to the deviation.

4. We need to come up with a time standard- to recommend

   a. Diana throws out – 5 days to "process" the Case on the judicial side.

   We need to define "process"

   APA Order of Financial Responsibility case- is just Main Clerk's Office time- because it does not require the case to go up to Division Clerk or for a Judicial Officer to review and sign.

      1. Clerk's office is Assigning case number, putting case on ICON and closing, then files the case

      ii. Rejection time standard- that is the case is submitted to the Court from CSE and it is rejected for some reason- incomplete data missing documents etc. It is returned to CSE for them to remedy the submission

         1. Why are Courts rejecting cases?

            a. duplicate cases

            b. Adding children - after born kids if more than 5 years old ((only in Denver – and there is a proposal in the 2008 Child Support Omnibus Bill to change this))

            c. Incomplete party info

            d. Incomplete packet

            e. Return service missing

       iii. Where the case is rejected how does the Court notify the CSE Office?

           1. A lot of people said that there is a sticky note (Denver) with notes to CSE on what is missing- how fast can CSE remedy the situation – Jeff Co. recommends 3 working days. Idea- was develop form that could be uniform as to why it was rejected- and/or a code for when the case is sent back electronically.

7. Notice of Hearing- How are these handled?
Larimer- CSE sets its own docket
Weld, Arapahoe, Boulder, Morgan, Douglas, Elbert

Other Districts- Jeff Co. e-mails the Clerk's for dates, or the Clerk's office has the dates, so they just set it and it doesn't have to go up to the Division.

Jefferson (1-2 days) Fremont County (4-5 Days) the physical file goes up to Division to get the date and then the Clerk sends to parties

Reasonable turnaround – recommendation min. 5 days for whole process

Group feels that this is an area that we can recommend that Courts take the opportunity to re-look at business- we should include examples of how counties are doing it in our Best Practice Guide

Dee's good idea- The Court Clerk transmits the case data electronically within 5 days to CSE (CSE can start enforcement and activate FSR etc.) and then the hearing date will come back a few days later electronically. There really is no need to have both the case info and the hearing date sent back together, and it will cut 5 days off the time for CSE to get the case number back and start things on their end.

Arapahoe- Going through the Main Clerk's Office- and then it goes up to the Division –they have a quick turnaround 24 hours back on the system and then back down to the Clerk's Office- Clerk notes that they have a dedicated IV-D docket, so they are equipped to deal with this docket

5. How long is it taking to get Default Order back?
   a. CSE can't do any enforcement until they get the Default Orders back. Courts indicate that they are low on priority list. Denver notes the "Weighted Caseload Study".
   b. A month, 10 days, some of the magistrates want to hold for Rule 121 ((Best Practice- Idea – publish for Courts to not hold- there is no authority for holding them, nothing requiring them to be held under Title 23)) Adams County has big problem getting these orders back- 60 days to get Default Orders back and no idea why it takes that long. Fremont- Workload issues- traveling judges. Etc. Weld County- inputs Default Orders first so they can get up to the Division. Larimer – Clerk's puts a sticky note on them so Magistrate will know that she can get through there quickly (a week at the most). Denver County suggests that the Judicial Officer will be able to use the CIS (Centralized Information Screen) to process the Default Orders more quickly. Denver indicates that JV Judge – Paternity is the lowest priority next to delinquency and we need to be realistic when we set timeframes.
   c. Counties point out that relationship with the Division Clerks is key- good communication is key. Arapahoe suggest CSE tickle themselves and let the Court know if they haven't gotten a Default Order back that they are waiting on ((Default cases counts as an open case report on the Court side))
   d. Recommendation from User Group should include some education and best practices
   e. If we could recommend or ask for a reasonable time for the Default Orders to be signed and back to Clerk's Office- 10 days

iv. Denver- touching file just once- and she will be allowed to quickly to process more cases because of the data being populated
v. Morgan County inquires do we really have to standardize? Diana notes yes, we should issue a state-wide recommendation needs to be done- dealing with similar issues on SANCA.
vi. Denver- notes that if you have a pre-assigned case number on documents and if that case number gets sent out to counsel and they start filing stuff in a case that doesn't exist yet - it could be a mess. Dee agrees that there are things that there are things that CSE can do with just the Case no. that they shouldn't be doing until there is a complete case.

    c. Scheduling Hearings
- i. Is it as simple as whoever sets the event/hearing sends it over the date/time to the other side? What are the reasons why this is not a good idea? For the Counties where CSE sets the hearings- do those Courts have a problem with CSE populating their system seamlessly with a date/time etc. (if they do- what could be changed to accept data automatically?)

        1. Larimer County – they put the date in when they e-file and then there is a duplicate entry- Boulder notes that it is a Data Entry error- and you can erase those e-filing dates is there danger with that date?
   - a. Can there be junk data? It would have to be match with the data exchange.
   - b. The date that is entered into ACSES that is the date that populates the Notice of Hearing. Arapahoe IV-D files the Ntc of Hearing-
   - c. Boulder would be confirming court room and judicial officer
   - d. Arapahoe would like it to transfer seamlessly
   - e. Jefferson County – is there an electronic calendar- answer no. Raises the issue- of filing a paper notice of hearing.
   - f. CSE are you ok with the Court populates the CSE side- YES

VII. Supporting Documentation
- a. What needs to be filed statutorily and what do the judicial officers like to see?

Best Practice Checklist – for each side on what each side needs to be
And in what order they need to be filed. We reviewed the survey results and determined that the issue needs to go to a User Group that involves Judicial Officers, IV-D Attorneys etc.

- b. Make up of this further workgroup
   - i. Magistrate Hartman (Larimer), Carolyn MacLean (Boulder), Magistrate Martin (Arapahoe), Strobel (Weld), Voisinet or Livingston (Jefferson County)
   - ii. Child Support Enforcement Staff (IV-D Catty's)
      1. Ronda- Boulder,
      2. Sue Ann Craig or Lara Delka
   - iii. Dee & Robert Kurtz- State CSE Establishment APA
   - iv. Does the Court need the physical document?
   - v. Certificate of Mailing- does it need to be sent to the Court?
   - vi. Transcript of Judgment or Judgment Record (Fremont County)
   - vii. Cases being filed as DR or JV case types

- c. DONE: CSE no longer has to send I/A's to Court.

d. DONE: County CSE office will issue RPD.

VIII. Standardization

a. DONE: All APA will have an AV or AP case type. (coding in Eclipse) AV – Only c/s, and AP is when it involves paternity

b. DONE: All Child Support cases will have an SUP event. (Jefferson is not doing , Morgan is not doing SUP either)

c. How will FSR # be assigned? Will CSE assign the FSR #- and send it to the Court – if Court accepts Order- the event coming back to CSE to let them know will activate the FSR account??
(There is a difference between an assignment of FSR and activation of FSR account) We're not issuing two FSR #'s on a case. FSR #'s are currently pre-assigned. Dee says that it would be a huge ACSES change. We need to involved Bilinda McKay-Johnson and the technical team of ACSES. Further workgroup- needs to look at this issue.
We need Dee to help in this – she gets it better than most of us.
Susie Gager or Craig Carson is also suggested to be on this workgroup.
Same issue on the Court side- it is a technical question (Danielle Stecco).

d. Judgments- transfer of judgment data will go both ways and when the information is coming from CSE it will be sent as a "proposed judgment" that will be reviewed and accepted.
> Standardize the issue of whether cost (service, genetic testing etc. – cost owed to the county cse office) are entered as judgments and whether the Court wants to see those amounts etc.
> In Boulder- CSE files a county civil case for recovery of cost
> We may need further combined workgroup- Mike Erickson & Mary Clair suggested to participate.
> Larimer County- does enter costs as judgments- Boulder, Adams enter judgments only if the case go through hearing.

e. Modification- who gets what? What needs to be sent to each party and the Court? F/A, Proposed Order, Proposed Stipulation?
> Mini-Modification group can make recommendation
> And include in the best practices guide
> Jeff Co. suggests a checklist that is standardized. Group likes this idea

f. Issue raised in the Mini-Modification group: If a case is closed on the CSE side– future attempts to modify the case for p/time etc. should result in a new case being filed rather than modifying the original c/s order.
   i. Boulder, Larimer, Morgan: can't file a Title 14 parenting time action into a JV Title 19 case. Boulder- consolidates the support order into the DR case- good public policy to have the public deal with one case no.

ii. Larimer- Magistrate will take Judicial notice of the JV Case if she hears the DR case.

iii. Need further research– Denver indicates it's a legal issue and weighted caseload issue- because paternity has low priority in the weighted caseload. One case is a lot easier than having two cases open, but DR gets higher credit for weighted caseload

iv. Courts often say they can't consolidate a JV case into DR case- now we have multiple FSR #.

v. Arapahoe County will go with parenting time issues in the JV case, and points out that the Order is still valid even if CSE is no longer involved.

vi. Public access issues when we open DR case- info that was not open to public in JV case

vii. Group thinks that this is an issue that should be standardized. (Routed to Small Legal Issue DISH Group)

g. DONE: Closing case - CSE wants information on closed cases and some kind of alert on open cases

h. When do the Courts open the case into a DR vs. JV or is the way the CSE files the case? Brand new filing-

i. Interstate case- case is a JV case and it is put up on the system as a DR case. How many people are e-filings? Currently just Weld County is e-filing in DR cases. Weld County files all c/s cases in JV actions. Recommendation- issue should there be a state-wide all recommendation that all interstate cases should be filed as a DR case type.

i. We need to standardize issue – Jeff Co is getting a new Case # when the parents are switching roles?? (This is a note from June Meeting)

IX. **Accepting Data from the other agency without need to validate?**

a. Initial Data Package: what has to be validated for the data to be accepted and what can be populated automatically? We decided this is an issue for when we break out into our smaller data exchange groups

b. Nancy, CPR- reviewed survey: relatively low error rate from survey from both sides– can we fix some of the errors so that more data can populate automatically and how do we figure that out? Group likes the standardized checklist- keeps consistency. Does any one track incomplete data are? No. Boulder- caption and body of pleading has a different name/spelling etc. Dee is surprised that APA Professionals are not double-checking their spellings etc. Eileen says it could be a SIDMOD issue- birth certificate issue. Eileen brings up alias issue. Weld County brings up that name exchange is critical. ACSES can't enter hyphens/apostrophes – name entry standardization- it would be interesting if we could come up with a name entry standardization- problem Dee points out in some regard, other system that feeds our system and we're subject to their entry- if someone else entered an apostrophes –

and we tried to remove it- it could be rejected, Fremont County – raises the inmate issue.

X. Best Practices Issues
 a. We captured some of these ideas as we went along- modifications, scheduling hearings etc.
 b. What other best practices issues need to be resolved?

XI. Public Access Issues
 a. Resolve issues similar to SANCA (i.e. who has access to CIS etc)
 b. CSE does not have access to D&N records currently- can that be changed? How to best deal with this.
 c. CSE doesn't have access to a lot of cases that they used to have access to.
 d. JV- If Child is in Foster Care, if Dept is asking CSE to establish C/S against the parents – they have access to find out where the child is and how long in placement etc. Is there an indicator that the Dept is involved – then access would be opened? If Department has custody then they needed custody. Linda Bowers, Judicial.

XII. Linking existing cases
 a. What are the benefits? It is a day forward project, or do we want to try and exchange data on existing cases? Chris Kain thought that we already have a unique identifier (case no.) already, so it may be very easy to link cases. As long as there is not an in-depth human intervention.
 b. Further workgroup? Possibly to be reviewed by small user groups that deal with specific data exchange.
    What info might you get access to?
    Data we will exchange systematically

XIII. Misc. Issues

 a. Carryover issue: How is Non-Disclosure Indicator- NDI going to be handled??? Code or Flag on jPOD?
    i. We don't do APA on NDI cases.
    ii. It's a whole different action even if we served him
    iii. Mary Clair will look at APA manual

XIV. Centralized Information Screen (CIS)
 a. Dee raises important question- is this screen at a case level/person level? This changes what the request on the centralized screen would be.
 b. Diana gives description of what SANCA- they use Client Id for SANCA, but would like to move toward State Id. Because there would be more information to gain by using it. Whatever number is used, the number needs to be consistent and follow the person around.
 c. Does each person have State Id? Not all people have State Id's, but most of them do. All IV-D persons have an IV-D person no. which is virtually the same number as the State ID.

d. CMBS, Trails, ACSES – the only number that is common is the State Id. SIDMOD has its own unique criteria and sometimes an IV-D person doesn't have all of those criteria.

e. How did you get access to information? In order for you to gain access to information you would have to ask for it, it would not proactively give you information about people and their pending cases around the State.

f. SANCA, how does the client id get linked to all of the other cases? Client Id are unique to D&N cases, this person has more than a D&N case. We get the true case id from matching the case information from D&N.

g. When you send case over from CSE to Court, you also send the state id's if we know the child has four other cases- the cases are linked the if the cases are matched

h. Dee – ask the question about why could we not upload our two systems and build the data base first before we go live. She thinks a lot could be done upfront with a significant piece of the work done upfront. Great idea!!!

Need to refigure our brain- locate is different than the CIS- Screen should be used to search to find out about a person- don't have a place to store- etc. Don't get bogged down with who has what.

i. Dream Piece – info by case or person or both????
   i. What would you like to see?
   ii. Info from other systems?
   iii. Case information
      1. names
      2. children's names
         a. relationship codes in ACSES
         b. Mother/father etc.
      3. Case Worker –contact information
      4. Location Information in chronological information
      5. description information – sending out to process server
      6. SSN?
      7. DOB
      8. All alias
      9. Physical Information- height, weight, eye color, hair etc.
      10. Sentencing information- date and when it started and location and expected release date- DOC no.
      11. Probation Information
      12. Went through exercise with counterparts with Trails. We told them we didn't want to know that- relative codes- didn't care about the specifics. Is there a need?
      13. What children are on other Orders
      14. Attorney Information Screen
      15. Children emancipated and

Weld- envisioning a case summary screen- return of service, and case history
jPOD- designing screen- JV case processing. DO you see a need for a person summary screen or just a case summary screen or both? Weld says mostly case info, Arapahoe thinks

both- the guy comes into court on a contempt and he says he's been in jail in another county- and she has to go through screens

1. Child support orders and locations/CO vs. other states. Terms
   a. active vs. inactive??
2. child support arrears on different cases- same for each party
3. paternity order only
4. Restraining Order Information
5. NDI – court would like to see an NDI flag.
6. Warrants esp. from other cases
7. Enforcement action-
   a. Administrative Remedies CSE does not want to share
   b. Contempt
8. D&N Case information- paternity established/c/s order entered?
9. C/S Liens- those go to the Clerk and Recorders – not currently stored in jPOD (CSE)
10. FSR History (Court Side)
    a. Tax Payer information
11. C/S Order suspended, dismissed, vacated, consolidated etc. (CSE side)
12. Judgment Information (both sides)
13. Technician information (contact information) (Court side)
14. Address history (Court side)
15. Pending court hearings- tied by person
16. Division assignment by case

jPOD- re-write may take care of some of the case summary screens.

    XV. **Marketing**
   a. Candy DISH- with logo
   b. Conferences
   c. Peer to peer marketing

    XVI. **Wrap-Up** – Management team thanked group for their dedication to this project and all the time that they have invested up to this point. Mgt team explained that we are going to be working hard over the next month to do project planning and that if they do not hear from us for awhile, that is why. We promise to keep them updated on the progress, and once we are to the point of doing more detailed data exchange discussions, we will be calling on the individual user groups.