

CCIS Subcommittee Agenda

Howey-in-the-Hills, FL

Thursday, August 17, 2016

1:30-3:00 p.m.

Mission Inn
El Nuevo Mundo Conference Center
Desoto Room

- I. **Welcome** – *Judge Terence Perkins, CCIS Subcommittee Chair*
 - Roll call

- II. **Related Party Workgroup Update** – *Dave Winiacki*
 - Producing reports on related case information
 - CCIS search demonstration – *Melvin Cox*
 - How related case reports will be displayed
 - Access directly to CCIS
 - Interface with CAPS viewer
 - Other

- III. **CCIS Subcommittee Update** – *Judge Perkins*
 - Top 20 percent of reliable data captured
 - Data used to automate and display for queries
 - Business rules for queries on related party/case searches
 - Specific party attributes requested on standard forms

Related Party Workgroup Teleconference

October 25, 2016

- The workgroup discussed the data elements that could be utilized in the CCIS application and the next steps of running reports on related case information. Dave Winiiecki point out that each county uses their own individual case numbers and would need to look at a standard to use the UCN number across all counties on related case information.
- Dave began discussing the logic behind running reports on related cases in CCIS. Melvin Cox suggested creating business rules or a ranking system that matches a certain percentage of the related cases. It would not be exact but would give the user an idea on the quality of the match.
- Judge Perkins described a scenario of two individuals that he only had a certain set of identifiers that could be put into a query search, where he could find out if there is any pending cases with case numbers, using these identifiers. Melvin stated that doing a query search with just a name would bring back a lot of results. Judge Perkins explained to set the queries up, able to put in as much or as little of the identifiers that the user knows on the parties. The accuracy of the search will be directly affected by the amount of identifying information that is submitted.
- Melvin Cox suggested demonstrating some name searches in CCIS at the next subcommittee meeting. The demo could show the variations of data currently in CCIS and filters can be available. Melvin explained the way searches are performed, impacts the results that are returned. Judge Perkins stated he would like as much certainty in the searches however, there is flexibility in the design process, as someone will be making the decisions on the information being included in the case or not.
- Dave Winiiecki pointed out the prevalent fields that are being submitted at time of data entry - the address, date of birth, middle initial, and race of the individual party. Judge Perkins stated once the identifying characteristics are decided and a search is performed, the results should have some designation on a case of which county it is pending in, the case number and the clerks' code. Melvin stated to establish something useable, will take time to deal with different scenarios and to ensure confidence in the search results.
- The workgroup agreed on specific identifiers for individuals would include: first name, middle initial, last name, date of birth, address, race, social security number, driver license number, and FBI/FDLE number, if known. Dave pointed out some of the party attributes are not included in certain case types.
- Judge Perkins suggested taking a very simple individual search and list out as many specific identifiable data sets as possible. Then demo a specific search, based on the

majority of factors submitted, to determine if there are other pending cases on the person identified and could result in case specific case information on the related case. Melvin stated he could facilitate the search demonstration at the next meeting.

- Judge Perkins called upon Fred Buhl to assist in the search performance. Fred agreed and described his goal of integrating this feature into the CAPS viewer with a button by each party listed that would perform a statewide search. Judge Perkins commended the idea of interfacing with the CAPS viewer and ultimately displaying the results. The initial set up would require creating a pilot program to allow a search information and produce some results that can be viewed by the subcommittee. Then figure out how close in concept that the final program would need to look like and how to put the program into production.
- Fred Buhl commented on what CCIS currently does on a name search. Melvin Cox said he would use the existing name search of CCIS to facilitate the demonstration. At a later point, the system can be tweaked to customize for the CAPS viewers on the related parties. Judge Perkins added, the results need to be configured and finalized before we can figure out the interface with the CAPS viewers, to ensure it is worth interfacing.
- Melvin Cox stated at the next meeting he can work through the information that needs to be looked at to generate a search, on a viewable screen. Judge Perkins requested the workgroup members to think through what information should be required to generate the searches and what it should look like within the CAPS viewer. In addition, think through how a fully integrated *Related Party Form* that the parties fill out, could assist in this regard and incorporate into CCIS 3.0.
- Melvin Cox gave a synopsis of the workgroups continuing progress to report back to Justice Pariente. Melvin estimated by the end of this year, obtain all the required data and by the end of the first quarter in 2017, be able to pilot in ICMS and CCIS.

CCIS Subcommittee Meeting Summary

August 17, 2016

- Judge Perkins opened up the meeting and called on Dave Winiecki to report on the Related Party Workgroup progress. Dave gave an overview on the report included in the meeting materials. The report was developed to look at the party attributes currently being captured in the CCIS system. The FCCC pulled the information from the CCIS system that identified the different case types that are a part of the unified family court division.
- Dave explained an analysis was done that looked at all the different case types and party attributes in the unified family court division. He went through the report and explained the different values for each column. There are figures for the number of counties that the party attribute data field is populated for *less* than 50% of the cases and there are figures for the number of counties that the party attribute data field is populated for *more* than 50% of the cases. In addition there is a report on the percentage of cases that had no values in the party attribute fields.
- Dave said the workgroup previously met on these results and determined which party attributes were readily available majority of the time, as well as which counties were not providing the specific party attributes at all. The results were sorted based on the data fields for the different case types that are being entered, with the highest amount of frequency by county. Dave pointed out that the information seems to be readily available in certain situations however, it is not being presented consistently. In reviewing the report, one can see the different case types where the information is being entered into the system. Dave suggested a standard be developed to get all the information into the system.
- Dave continued with the Source Document that also was provided in the meeting materials. The document explains the resource that the party information comes from for each case type. The two main source documents that the majority of party information comes from, is the civil cover sheet, which is a state mandated form, and the Petition, which attorneys file when necessary. Dave commented that the focus should be on the way the information is being provided.
- Judge Perkins inquired on the notification of related parties/cases form being scanned into the computer but the data was not being separately captured into the system. Dave asked Melvin if the notice of related party/case information transferred to CCIS. Carolyn responded that a civil cover sheet is created in the Portal when a new case is entered into the Portal. The related case is a field that is captured in the Portal and passed on to the clerks CMS, if the CMS has a data field for it. Carolyn added that the case number is captured, if it is entered into the field. Kim Stenger commented that the related case information is mandatory, but the clerk cannot hold up a filing if the party

does not know if there is one or not. The only information captured, is what is put on the form.

- Judge Perkins questioned in the family law context, how to automate the task of obtaining information on related parties/cases. In a divorce proceeding, judges may want to know if there is an adoption, an injunction proceeding, or a domestic violence case. Judge Perkins noted, some level of inconsistency or vaguity could be tolerated in the related party/case information, as it will be provided to the case manager, clerk or judge to determine if the information is the factual party/case to devote any attention to. Once automation can be determined, it can be expanded out to other areas.
- Judge Perkins discussed the important data fields that are necessary to obtain the related party/case info. He would like to identify the areas that would be most productive for determining related cases, in the family law divisions, then check the data items to compare them to the number of counties that are capturing the data field, more frequently.
- The subcommittee reviewed the list of party attributes and then sorted by case type from largest to smallest for the number of counties capturing the party attributes, to identify the most productive data fields for determining related cases. Judge Perkins questioned the party attribute significance on each of the related case types, i.e., plaintiff, defendant, respondent, etc. Melvin responded that attorneys, judges, law enforcement, etc. were excluded from the list and were limited to the plaintiff, respondent and defendant of the case. Dave noted an example in the adoption case type, the first and last name is captured for both adoptive parents. Judge Perkins reviewed list for a case number to the related party/case data. Dave stated case number was not added to the list and was assumed every case had a case number that could be added to the inquiry. Melvin to verify if CCIS has a related case data field.
- Tony Landry commented on moving towards utilizing UCN's (Uniform Case Numbers) for related case data. Melvin suggested to start at the CMS level to set standards. Fred Buhl pointed out the issue of most CMS systems not able to accept cases outside the county lines. Tony questioned CCIS giving access to validate UCN's statewide. Judge Perkins questioned the data coming from CCIS, would it not include data from multiple counties. Fred commented yes however, the related data is being pushed up from the local CMS and the local CMS only has *in*-county cases. Judge Perkins acknowledged knowing the related case information in a certain county is suitable.
- Judge Perkins posed question to Fred, on how to obtain the first and last name of the related parties on related cases, for any case type listed. If CCIS had the capability to identify those data elements that are being captured and the ability to automate the process of harvesting that information, can it be provided in a form of a report? Fred responded that it could be done natively in CCIS, if there is a related cases report added. Another way is a web service between the local CAPS system, where you could perform a search for related case information and it then pulls information from CCIS to send

back to the requestor. Judge Perkins indicated the requestor would be a case manager or judge who is familiar with the CAPS system to run the search through a function in the CAPS viewer system, although the search would be performed in CCIS. Melvin suggested a best practice workgroup be formed to develop business rules on how CCIS would query the database for the searches. Dave stated two ways of searching would be if we had the related cases, the actual case number could be searched or logic to look across at the data fields and compare attributes to determine if related party/case is sufficient. Fred mentioned doing data matching at the state level with algorithms going through and matching the data fields that could pre-calculate those relationships. Therefore, when you inquire through CCIS, it doesn't have to go through the whole database to perform the search, it would already know which cases it has that are related.

- Robert Adelardi addressed the concern of the case manager or judge looking at the results of the related cases and having some false positives in the results. Will these results be reported back to CCIS or is it only kept locally. Judge Perkins agreed there needs to be a verification step in the process of accepting the data, to prevent the next judge from pulling the same results.
- Judge Perkins reminded the subcommittee of the general assignment of developing a work flow for obtaining related party/case information in a number of circumstances. The specific task is how to obtain related party/case information in the family law divisions. The verification process can be obtained from the participant in front of the judge at the time.
- Sandra Lonergan commented, data is sufficient, as long as the data is being entered into the system. If the case information forms are not filled out properly, the data will not be available in any of the systems. Kim Stenger suggested looking at the standard forms on the different case types and determine if the specific party attributes are being requested. Judge Perkins replied before we recommend changes to the data that is currently being captured, let's see what can be done with the data that is already acquired.
- Chris Blakeslee questioned the single unique identifier to be given across all divisions in a given county, to assist with related cases. Judge Perkins commented, the identifier would make sense for precision results but does not feel it would happen on a statewide basis.
- Craig McLean mentioned the vehicles to display the data and suggested looking back at JIS, which has an effective reporting feature, to follow along the same format. Judge Perkins pointed out in his county, he can access JIS directly or through his CAPS viewer. Craig added the reason for mentioning JIS, is to access through the CAPS viewer and not having to interface with CCIS.

- Judge Perkins stated now that we have the data elements that are being captured in the CMS, he would like the Related Party Workgroup research the best way to produce the reports on the related case information. In addition, determine how the reports will be displayed, by accessing directly to CCIS, interface with the CAPS viewer, or some other means. Melvin suggested doing some research and development work, directly with the CCIS system. He then can provide some sample reports to review at the next meeting, for the subcommittee to determine preferences.
- Judge Perkins tasked the remaining subcommittee members to review the top 20 percent of the data currently being captured, as well as the frequency it is being captured, to determine if it is producing reliable data on related parties/cases, relevant in the family law division. Then determine how the data will be utilized to automate and display it. In other words, look specifically at the data that is most commonly being assembled and captured, to see if enough information can be obtained to solve our problem.