

**Commission on Trial Court Performance and Accountability**  
**Meeting**  
**Conference Call**  
**September 22, 2011**

**Minutes**

**Members in attendance:**

Judge Terry Terrell, Judge Paul Alessandroni, Judge Leandra Johnson, Judge Peter Marshall, Judge Ellen Sly Masters, Judge Elizabeth Metzger, and Judge Diana Moreland.

**Members absent:**

Judge Dawn Caloca-Johnson, Judge Brian Davis, Judge Kathleen Kroll, Mike Bridenback, Gay Inskip, Justice Jorge Labarga (Liaison), and Judge Lisa Davidson (Liaison).

**Staff in attendance:**

Maggie Geraci, Patty Harris, and Greg Youchock.

---

Judge Terrell called the meeting to order at 12:15 p.m. The roll was taken and a quorum was present.

**I. Approval of the July 22, 2011 Meeting Minutes**

Judge Metzger offered a motion to approve the minutes. Judge Johnson seconded the motion. The motion was approved by majority vote.

Judge Terrell stated that he met with Judge Laurent, chair of the Trial Court Budget Commission, about concerns raised at the last meeting regarding the role of TCP&A in the TCBC's efforts to cost out the court interpreting recommendations. He noted Judge Laurent both acknowledged and supported TCP&A's involvement in this effort.

**II. Status Update on TCP&A Projects:**

**A. TIMS**

Patty Harris provided an update on TIMS. She noted that a substantial amount of work has been done by the Probate Workgroup. The work will be posted on a website as part of the outreach efforts. She reminded the members that the TIMS project is a multi-phase, multi-year effort. The first two years are being dedicated to developing a plan for TIMS. No programmers are working on the project during this time as the focus now is for frontline staff to help design what a TIMS system will look like. Also, the first two years will be used to solidify the vision for the plan and thus, nothing has been locked in yet. Once the plan is developed, it will be presented to FCTC, CSWC, FCC, and then presented to the supreme court in July 2012. It will be up to the court to approve and seek necessary funding. There are three phases to develop this master plan. Phase one is to identify the needs. Phase two, in which FCTC will take the lead, is to determine the technical and functional standards. Phase three is implementation planning. Judge Terrell asked about Judge Kreeger's concern of the timeline and whether she is on board with this plan. Ms. Harris responded that she is on board; however, the plan will be reassessed in March 2012.

Ms. Harris noted that six divisional workgroups have been established as planned for phase one, with membership drawn from those individuals on the front line of processing cases, including representation from each sponsor committee. The Probate Workgroup met telephonically during a period of 10 weeks to complete their work. The specific process taken by the workgroup included mapping out the case flow processes, and then gleaning from those, key information and data characteristics necessary for building a TIMS data model which ultimately will serve as the foundation for the entire TIMS project. While it is recognized that there are currently great systems out there, the TIMS data model is the mechanism that will provide a standardized language that will allow the systems to “talk with each other” to provide information statewide. With the fundamental components of the data model now completed under the Probate Workgroup, staff has met with Judge Stephens, the chair of the FCTC TIMS Committee. The meeting went very well and things will get started with phase two at an optimistic level. There are impediments and some skepticism of the project. Staff is still working on hashing out the performance measure component of TIMS. The outreach responses will help with the performance measurement piece and will be compiled for the TCP&A to review at the November meeting.

Judge Terrell noted the work has been voluminous and he is glad to hear Judge Stephens is pleased with the work that has been done. Ms. Harris stated that staff is getting ready to deploy a communication strategy and will provide talking points for the members if that would be helpful. Judge Johnson affirmed that it would be helpful, so that the information presented is consistent. Judge Moreland asked for the website address, which Ms. Harris provided, noting the site was still in draft form and that additions are anticipated.

### **B. Recommendations on Resolving Civil Disputes**

Ms. Harris provided an update on the Recommendations on Resolving Civil Disputes. She noted that a workgroup has been created upon the suggestion of a TCP&A member, specifically to address the performance measures and benchmarks for the recommendations. The group will include civil judges, including Judge Metzger and other judges who have agreed to participate on the TIMS Civil Workgroup. Additionally, two trial court administrators have also agreed to serve, including Richard Callanan of the 20<sup>th</sup> Circuit, who was instrumental in developing the Judicial Performance Incentive Plan, which was the framework for the recommendations currently being drafted. Other members of the workgroup include Judge Bailey of the 11<sup>th</sup> Circuit, Judge Hulslander of the 8<sup>th</sup> Circuit, Judge Langford of the 10<sup>th</sup> Circuit, and Tom Genung of the 19<sup>th</sup> Circuit. A conference call meeting will take place in October and the recommendations of the workgroup will be presented to the TCP&A at the November meeting.

### **C. Cost Estimate on Court Interpreting Recommendations**

Ms. Harris reported that the chart completed by the TCP&A on which of the proposed court interpreting standards and best practices may have a fiscal impact had been provided to the staff of the Funding Methodology Committee (FMC). FMC staff has drafted a fiscal impact survey for the circuits which will hopefully go out today. Once the estimates are compiled, they will be provided to the TCP&A to determine an implementation plan. It is anticipated that the implementation plan will be on the agenda for the November meeting.

## **II. Schedule Next Meeting**

Ms. Harris reported that availability of the members for the proposed dates sent via email was limited, so the meeting may need to be held on November 18<sup>th</sup>. Judge Allesandroni noted that he could attend on the 18<sup>th</sup>. Ms. Harris stated she will send an email within the next few days finalizing the meeting date in November.

Judge Marshall asked, since the Probate Workgroup has finished, what is the next workgroup to start. Ms. Harris responded that the next group would be the Civil Workgroup with Judge Metzger as chair. Initially, it was anticipated that the Family Workgroup would be the second group to begin work, but with interest the legislature has taken on resolving civil disputes, it was decided to move the civil workgroup up in the timeline. Judge Terrell noted that the work of the civil workgroup goes hand in hand with resolving civil disputes and will offer valuable input to the court.

Judge Masters noted that the CSWC will meet on October 20 and will be discussing the reporting requirement for resolving civil disputes, so the timeline works nicely. Judge Terrell stated that it is evident that everyone is working together well in moving these matters forward. Judge Metzger agreed.

Judge Terrell adjourned the meeting at 12:42 p.m.