FullCourt Pilot Project
Case Management System
for the
Montana District Courts

Functional Specification

Supreme Court of Montana
Office of the Court Administrator

May 2007

Prepared by:
Information Technology Division
Montana Supreme Court

DRAFT

I. Executive Summary

District Courts in the state of Montana are courts of general jurisdiction. General jurisdiction courts process all felony cases, all probate cases, most civil cases at law and in equity, certain special actions and proceedings, all civil actions that may result in a finding against the state for the payment of money, naturalization proceedings, various writs, and some narrowly-defined ballot issues. The district courts also have limited appellate jurisdiction over cases arising in the courts of limited jurisdiction in their respective districts as may be prescribed by law and consistent with the Montana Constitution.

A judicial caseflow management software application called "JCMS" was developed in house by programming staff from the Office of the Court Administrator in 1986 and subsequently installed in Montana's District Courts. JCMS allows the Clerk of the District Court to manage, track, report and account for actions and events for criminal, juvenile and civil cases. It also contains programs to manage calendars, juries and document imaging. JCMS and its predecessor "GJCMS" do not meet state technology standards and technical support for the program is limited.

The 2005 Montana Legislature appropriated a total of $1,095,000 in one-time only funding to partially purchase a commercial off-the-shelf case management system for Montana's District Courts and to complete the installation of the FullCourt Case Management System in Montana's Courts of Limited Jurisdiction (COLJ). The Judicial Branch request for a statewide document imaging, jury and document management system was not funded by the 2005 Legislature.

During the FY06-FY07 biennium a graphical version of JCMS was deployed to 53 district courts. This upgrade was necessary to ensure that district courts were using the same version of the program and to provide a level of technical stability to allow the program to run correctly in a Windows environment. Also, during the biennium the deployment of FullCourt was completed in Montana's Courts of Limited Jurisdiction and the general jurisdiction version of FullCourt was piloted by the Clerks of District Court in Missoula and Mineral counties (4th Judicial District).

The 2007 Montana Legislature appropriated an additional $1,100,000 to purchase a statewide site license for the FullCourt case management system, the FullCourt jury program and the FullCourt imaging subsystem. These are the FullCourt products have successfully been piloted in the 4th Judicial District.

The 4th Judicial District pilot included the compilation of functional requirements for a district court case management system. It has always been envisioned that these functional requirements would be vetted by track committees of subject matter experts prior to a statewide deployment. This document summarizes the functional requirements identified during the pilot that will serve as a guideline for the track committee meetings scheduled for the end of June 2007.

II. Introduction

Purpose

The purpose of this report is to describe the features and high-level functional requirements of a case management system for District Courts.

Project Background

FullCourt is an Oracle based case management system meeting all current state technology standards. In addition, the system complies with the National Center for State Courts functional requirements for a court case management system. FullCourt is well received by Montana's COLJ and operates reliably in a variety of urban and rural settings. Although FullCourt is used in Montana only by COLJ and the 4th Judicial District the product is designed for use in general jurisdiction courts.. For instance, Kansas and Idaho have statewide district court implementations of FullCourt and Wyoming has installed FullCourt in 13 of their 26 district courts. It should be

noted that when FullCourt is installed the installation requires a court designation, i.e., general jurisdiction court or limited jurisdiction court. Therefore, certain functionality is turned off or on depending on the type of court being configured.

The Clerks of the District Courts in the 4th Judicial District have been piloting FullCourt in their offices since the summer of 2006. The 4th Judicial District has been a superb choice because it includes both an urban and rural Montana county. The FullCourt case management system was chosen for the pilot because the Judicial Branch has a significant investment in this application in Montana's Courts of Limited Jurisdiction and there are significant advantages to be gained if a common case management system is used by all Montana district and limited jurisdiction courts.

Standardization:

Montana's Courts of Limited Jurisdiction and District Courts share many common functional case management system requirements including certain elements of criminal and civil case processing, financials (tracking fines, fees and general accounting), jury management, document management, and calendaring. A common case management system provides uniformity for Montana courts and simplifies any future technology initiatives including electronic filing and system integration.

Economy of scale:

The Judicial Branch can leverage full purchasing power to negotiate an enterprise license for case management software and leverage system changes so that agreed upon changes are paid for once by the state and deployed to all appropriate systems, thereby, reducing the cost for Montana courts and Montana tax payers.

In addition, a common case management system provides synergy in the areas of training, support and development.

There are disadvantages to a commercial product as well. These disadvantages include the cost of custom development and the necessity to accept certain standard functions and features native to the product.

Project Objectives

- ✓ Pilot the FullCourt Case Management System in District Courts of the 4th Judicial District
- ➢ Establish track committees to define and document the functional requirements of a statewide district court case management system

Business Requirements

Case flow management is the primary tool used by courts to move disputes in a timely and effective manner from filing to closure. Case flow management encompasses many aspects of judicial activities. When done best, it involves the integration of many different but interrelated activities. Some examples of these activities are case intake, filing, tracking, calendaring, jury selection, document management, reporting, word processing, accounting and finally, sharing of information inside and outside of judicial offices.

In the 21st Century, effective court case flow management depends on the application and use of modern technology. Montana state government has adopted and the Judicial Branch's Commission on Technology has endorsed enterprise standards for technology. These standards are the result of a formal and open selection process. The application and use of these standards reduces the overall cost of ownership for technology and helps ensure court technology initiatives are compatible with those of executive branch agencies.

In-Scope Goals

- ➢ Document business practices and subsequent basic needs and functional requirements of a case management system for Montana District Courts.

DRAFT

- Define the gap between the existing case management and the necessary modifications to the FullCourt system in order to meet the desired case management and technical goals.

- Develop and document a Change Management Process whereby modifications, enhancements, or changes identified at the court level, to the case management system for the Montana District Courts would flow through a documented process for approval.

Track Committees

There are four (4) general tracks proposed to confirm pilot work on the FullCourt case management system in the Montana District Courts. Key stakeholders for each track committee will be selected and formed to participate in gap analysis sessions.

- Case Management, Document Management and Imaging

- Jury Management

- External Interfaces and Reporting Requirements

- Legacy Data Conversion

Functional Specification Structure

This document is divided by the four (4) tracks and will serve the following functions for each track:

- Provide a preliminary outline of table elements and processes that should be established as standard statewide,
- Identify specific elements that require Track Committee participation to define the values for statewide standards,
- Identify tables and elements that allow for customization based on local rules, and
- Provide an outline of possible customizations for review by the Track Committees

Assumptions and Constraints

FullCourt was designed and is implemented in a number of other states for general jurisdiction courts. Because JSI (vendor for FullCourt) was involved in the effort to develop functional standards with the National Center for State Courts, the assumption is that FullCourt will meet the national best practice guidelines and 85% of the District Court functional requirements as an off-the-shelf application. Further, working with the pilot counties and the track committees the project team will be able to determine and document the remaining 15% gap in requirements.

Additional assumptions are as follows:

- Case Number, Types, and Sub-Types will be uniform based on the Uniform Case Filing Standards
- Overdue Processing is not a requirement of the District Court processes
- General Ledger functionalities may be optional based on the court and financial department preferences

DRAFT

III. Specific Business Operations Discovery and Requirements Findings

A. ***Case Management System Requirements***

Purpose

- Montana District Courts require a fully functional CMS that is reliable, scalable and easy-to-use in order to manage and track case filings from initiation to closure. Montana District Courts require a CMS that is sustainable and easily adaptable to changes in business processes and technology. The CMS must have a proven history of successful deployments in courts of general jurisdiction.

Functionality Involved

- Provide a comprehensive modern CMS application to assist in the day-to-day activities of the Clerks of District Courts providing a means to capture essential data elements and produce statutorily required reports defined within the general duties of the Clerks of District Court.

Requirements

The Project Team determined the levels of requirement for the following functionalities:

- Essential Functions – No Modification Required
- Essential Functions – Requiring Modification made in Pilot
- Necessary Functions – May Require Modification

The Track Committee will provide further input and prioritization based on discussion and review of modification quotes.

Statutory Requirements

- Ability to manage cases that the district courts have original jurisdiction, concurrent original jurisdiction, and exclusive original jurisdiction over
- Ability to safely keep or dispose of according to law all books, papers and records filed in the clerks of district court's office
- Issue all process and notices required to be issued
- Enter all orders, judgments, and decrees proper to be entered
- Must be able to accommodate the statutory record keeping duties of the Clerk of the District Court
  - A register of actions in each court
  - A register of all criminal actions
  - Two separate indexes, plaintiffs and defendants
  - A minute book of daily proceedings of the court
  - A fee book which shows an itemized list of all fees received for services rendered
  - A proper book for indexing bonds given in criminal cases
  - A book to be called Judgment book, in which judgments must be entered
  - A docket book of judgment debtors and creditors, and specific judgment information
    - The docket book must be available for inspection by the public at all times during office hours
  - A book called Record of Probate Proceedings containing all orders and proceedings of the district court in probate matters
  - A book called Register of Probate and Guardianship Proceedings containing the name of the estate and the register number with a memo of every paper foiled and order or proceeding

DRAFT

Functionality Assumptions

The case management system in its current build/revision provides the following functionality without requiring any type of modification to the system.

- ✓ Ability to support and the Uniform Case Filing standards adopted by the Montana Supreme Court
- ✓ Ability to properly account for all fines, fees and monies received and disperse as appropriate.
- ✓ Ability to create common document templates in a contemporary word processor and populate values using database merge codes.
- ✓ A robust reporting utility that provides on-demand reports for frequently needed information (statistics, case listings, etc) and a set of tools to permit ad hoc queries and internal reporting.
- ✓ Ability to accommodate the statutory record keeping duties of the Clerk of the District Court
- ✓ Ability to define various levels of access to case information and case records
- ✓ **Table Standardization –** FullCourt is a table driven case management system - Track Committee members will be asked to review standard table values used in the pilot and provide additional input and guidance to standard table values for the following tables:
    - Case Numbering
    - Numbering Schema, Case Types, Case Sub-Types (following the Uniform Case Filings standards)
    - Case Status
    - Civil case processing rules
    - Degrees
    - Findings
    - Pleas
    - Register of Action (ROA) Codes
    - ROA Event Processes (following the Uniform Case Filings standards)
    - Statute Table
    - Fines/Fees

Essential Functionality – Modifications Made in Pilot

The following modifications were made in the pilot to support essential functions identified by the Pilot Project Team.

- ✓ Ability to capture Marriage License data and maintain appropriate levels of confidentiality and security
- ✓ Ability to mark ROA's (register of action) as document filings, maintaining separate sequence numbers for the documents
- ✓ Ability to create a report with only the document filings and header information
- ✓ Ability to produce reporting of Civil Trust information by Trust Type
- ✓ Ability to capture information on Civil Judgments needed for required statutory reports
- ✓ Ability to identify the creditor/debtor when a judgment is entered on a civil case and enhanced sorting on Hearings Scheduling/Docket Sheet

Necessary Functionality – May Require Modification

The initial release of the application will be functional without the following modifications, however, these modifications may be required in a subsequent release of the application.

<u>Possible Modifications</u>

- ➢ Supplementary prioritization functionality to Hearings Scheduling/Docket Sheet
- ➢ Inclusion of Alias Name on Name Index Report
- ➢ Inclusion of Alias Name in the Parties of the Judgment Window
- ➢ Addition of a Department Number data field
- ➢ Addition of Department Number to Web Page Calendar
- ➢ Media Disposition Report should not show Defendants Date of Birth, rather display Defendants Year of Birth in order to comply with the Supreme Court Access rules.
- ➢ Allow alternative charging statutes to be entered
- ➢ Allow charges with modifiers to be entered

DRAFT

- Party drop down box on civil trust payment window
- Security level to change only the text of a ROA code setup

DRAFT

A.1 ***General Case Management System Use Cases***

1. Case Initiation (Intake)

- Search database prior to case initiation
- Start with random judge assignment
- Ability to define case types and subtypes
  - Case Filing Standards
  - Marriage Licenses
  - Special Books – Cases that don't pertain to the specific court and don't have fees attached
- Ability to define Case Status
  - Define activities or events that can automatically trigger a change in the case status
- Ability to assign sequential case numbers
- Setup ROA Events to trigger actions on cases based on the Uniform Case Filing Standards
- Ability to enter multiple charges on a single case
- Ability to enter multiple parties on a case with ability to:
  - Differentiate between a party and a participant on a case
  - Allow user to clearly identify and track the role of each party on a case
- Ability to enter attorneys on cases
- Case Inactivity Dismissal – standard rules defined
- Ability to record alternative charges on a case
  - Admission
  - Contempt
  - Conspiracy

2. Filing

- Documents filed must have a unique document ID and sequence ID (statutory requirement)

3. Reporting (Tracking)

- ROA report must be able to be produced filtering either document ID or sequence #, 3-5-504
  - Statute for Register of Actions – all information could be in the text of the ROA, would have to accommodate the Document Sequence #
  - Filing fee must be reported
- Register of Criminal Actions – 3-5-505 (per case)
  - Case Register Report
  - Register of Criminal Actions is the same as the Civil Register of Actions
- Register Log Report (All Cases Included, Not Statutory, Available in JCMS)
- Judgments (Judgment Index Report) – 27-18-408
  - Clearly identify the debtor/creditor
  - No showing of judgment amount
- Judgment Book (Judgment Book Report) – 3-5-507
  - Clearly identify the debtor/creditor
  - Reflects judgment amount
- Docket (Transcript of Judgment Report) – 3-5-508
  - Clearly identify the debtor/creditor
  - Reflects the judgment amount
- Index Report Plaintiff – 3-5-502
- Index Report Defendant – 3-5-502
- Marriage License
  - ML information to Vital Statistics
- Civil Trust Reporting (including Child Support)
- Statistical Reporting – Monthly, Annually
- Financial Reporting

DRAFT

5. *Searching*

- Allow authorized users the capability to quickly search, retrieve, display and manipulate data captured in the case management system in a variety of ways
- Allow users to search by:
  - Case Number
  - Party Names (Last Name, First Name)
  - Attorney Names
  - Judge Names

4. *Calendaring*

- Enhanced sorting on Scheduling/Docket sheet (sort set at local level)
- Ability to prioritize hearings based on local rules or judges requirements

5. *Fee Tracking/Accounting/Financials*

- Tracking Criminal Bonds
- Fines/Fees by statute
  - Fine – flexible
  - Fees – not flexible
  - Surcharges by Statute – 46-18-236
- Identify Fees
- Identify Priority Order based on Statute or local rules
- Civil Trust Payments (Child Support Receipting and Disbursing)
- Clerks office has no enforcement authority
- Clerks office no has obligation to determine delinquency
- Restitution amounts are entered on cases, however, courts do not track whether the restitution obligation is being met

6. *Security and Information Sharing*

The case management system will require the ability to define various levels of access to case information and case records (images and documents) in accordance with state law and the Supreme Court's Rules on Public Access to court records.

- Allow authorized users access to information by case type, restricting capabilities and access on the system by defined roles
- Allow creation of security groups/roles authorizing various levels of access
- Provide multi-level security over access to information
  - System Administrators (Main Clerk Full Access)
  - User Security (Deputy Clerk Access)
  - Judge and Staff Security (View Only, Confidential & Non-Confidential?)
  - County Attorney, Public Defender Security (View Only, Non-Confidential Cases Only?)
    - Criminal Justice Access Rules? Request, Business Purpose Verification, Court Order
  - Marriage License Confidentiality Rules
  - Public Access – Non-Confidential Case Information and Images Only
    - Masked presentation of demographic information and personal identifiers
- Allow users to designate cases as sealed
- Allow users to designate images/documents as sealed
- Provide visual cue that case is sealed
- Provide visual cue that the document is sealed
- Allow authorized user to update a sealed case while maintaining the sealed status
- Provide a "public" view/access to court data either through a publicly accessible computer or via the Internet, restricting public view only to data designated as public

DRAFT

B. *Jury Management*

Purpose

- The Clerk of the District Court as jury commissioner for the county requires a Jury Management System that is reliable and easy-to-use to manage the jury process including all lists of persons to serve as trial jurors for the ensuing year for all courts in the county.

Functionality Involved

- Provide a comprehensive modern Jury Management system to assist in the day-to-day activities of the Clerk of District Court in his/her role as Jury Commissioner as currently statutorily defined and as described in HB540 (2003) effective October 2007.

Requirements

The Project Team determined the levels of requirement for the following functionalities:

- Essential Functions – No Modification Required
- Essential Functions – Pilot Modification Made
- Necessary Functions – May Require Modification to Implement

The Track Committee will provide further input and prioritization based on discussion and review of modification quotes.

Jury Management Statutory Requirements

- Randomly choose potential jurors for each of the courts in the county
- Keep a juror attendance record
- Compute amount due for mileage to juror
- Produce a detailed statement containing list of jurors and amount of fees and mileage earned by each, to be filed with clerk of the board of county commissioners
- Provide ability to discharge a person from serving as a trial juror (death or permanent excusal)
- Maintain copies of latest jury list for public inspection
- Provide a description of approved computerized random selection process to be made available for public inspection
- Provide ability to filter/search/verify a person's names as they may not appear on a jury list for more than one court during a 1-year term
- Ability to prepare jury list for the district court and each division of the district court
- Ability to prepare notices to be served by mail to persons drawn as jurors
- Ability to enter juror questionnaire information into system detailing the prospective juror qualifications or lack thereof
- Ability to draw multiple jury groups for districts with multiple judges
- Ability to draw and add additional jurors to a given panel
- Ability to draw additional jurors filtering by a designated area of the county (as ordered by the judge)
- Ability to reinstate drawn juror names back to the original juror group
- Ability to produce a report of trial jurors that have been summoned to appear and not excused
- Ability to draw a grand jury of not less than 15 jurors but not more than 20 jurors, based on an order from the judge
- Ability to export a juror group to be transferred to the courts of limited jurisdiction in their district
- Ability to lock the limited jurisdiction group for use by the jury commissioner
- Ability to import the produced juror group into the jury management system at the lower level

DRAFT

Functionality Assumptions for Jury Management System

The jury management system in its current build/revision provides the following functionality without requiring any type of modification to the system.

- ✓ Randomly choose potential jurors for each of the courts in the county
- ✓ Keep a juror attendance record
- ✓ Compute amount due for mileage to juror
- ✓ Produce a detailed statement containing list of jurors and amount of fees and mileage earned by each, to be filed with clerk of the board of county commissioners
- ✓ Provide ability to discharge a person from serving as a trial juror (death or permanent excusal)
- ✓ Maintain copies of latest jury list for public inspection
- ✓ Provide a description of approved computerized random selection process to be made available for public inspection
- ✓ Provide ability to filter/search/verify a person's names as they may not appear on a jury list for more than one court during a 1-year term
- ✓ Ability to prepare jury list for the district court and each division of the district court
- ✓ Ability to prepare notices to be served by mail to persons drawn as jurors
- ✓ Ability to enter juror questionnaire information into system detailing the prospective juror qualifications or lack thereof
- ✓ Ability to draw multiple jury groups for districts with multiple judges
- ✓ Ability to draw and add additional jurors to a given panel
- ✓ Ability to draw additional jurors filtering by a designated area of the county (as ordered by the judge)
- ✓ Ability to reinstate drawn juror names back to the original juror group
- ✓ Ability to produce a report of trial jurors that have been summoned to appear and not excused
- ✓ Ability to draw a grand jury of not less than 15 jurors but not more than 20 jurors, based on an order from the judge

Essential Jury Functionality – Modifications Made in Pilot

The following modifications were made in the pilot to support essential functionality identified by the Pilot Project Team.

- ✓ Add label printing
- ✓ Allow for alternating periods of excusal or postponement
- ✓ Print Preview ability for all reports
- ✓ Enhancement to Jury Expense Disbursement Report to meet CAO financial reporting requirements.
- ✓ Unavailable Juror to Juror Status Tab

Necessary Functionality – May Require Modification

The initial release of the application will be functional without the following modifications, however, these modifications may be required in a subsequent release of the application.

.

- ➢ Panel Selection Number to Voir Dire and Merge Codes
- ➢ Allow export of juror data based on groups
- ➢ Allow expense and disbursement records not tied to a specific juror, but that reference a group or panel (i.e. meals, witness fees, airline tickets)
- ➢ All questionnaire fields to the Juror Record (to match questionnaire)
- ➢ Add zip code to the group window for sorting
- ➢ Add check printing functionality
- ➢ Allow for mass assignment of juror status and next eligible date by juror number or reporting number
- ➢ Add a Default Post-Summons Panel Status
- ➢ Enhance Panel History Tracking Report
- ➢ Panel Trial Report
- ➢ Panel Merge Codes
- ➢ Unavailability Juror Report
- ➢ Indicate on Jury Master record tabs whether there is data present
- ➢ Add imaging functionality

DRAFT

B.1 Jury Management System Use Cases

1. Jury Lists

- Create a Master Juror List by Year (ability to maintain 2 separate master juror lists)
  - Filter/search/verify an individual as a person may not appear on the combined jury master list more than once
- Maintain permanent excusal statuses for each Master Juror List [3-15-402(2)]
- Retain Voter ID for each person on master list
- Permanently excuse
- Randomly choose and export multiple Juror Groups by Year for each District Court and each lower court within a county
  - Filter/search/verify an individual as a person may not appear on a jury group more than once in a given year
- Prepare questionnaire by juror groups for mail out
  - Qualify individuals in juror groups
  - Discharge individuals in juror groups from serving as trial jurors (death or permanent excusal)

2. Trial Panels

- Randomly select trial juror panels from specific juror groups for a specific timeframe
- Prepare notices to juror panels of requirements to show to court for a specific jury trial
- Prepare juror questionnaires for attorneys of individuals chosen for jury panel
- Qualify/dismiss individuals from trial panel

3. Reporting

- Produce list of Jury Masters (combined voter list) by year for public inspection
- Produce list of each Jury Group selected from Master by year for public inspection
- Produce report of individuals not returning questionnaires for Sheriff's Department, questionnaire document servicing
- Produce list of each Trial Panel by year for public inspection
- Produce report of trial jurors that have been summoned to appear and not excused
- Produce a Juror Attendance Record
- Produce detailed statement containing list of jurors and amount of fees and mileage earned by each

4. Financials

- Compute amount due for mileage to jurors
- Track expense and disbursement records not tied to a specific juror (meals, witness fees, airline tickets)
- Print juror reimbursement checks/warrants
- Prepare statement of expenses for jury trial to be submitted to the state for reimbursement

5. Security

- System Administrator
- User Security

DRAFT

C. *Imaging & Document Management*

Purpose

- Montana District Courts require an imaging system that is reliable and easy-to-use for the daily management, storage, and retrieval of electronic court documents. In addition, Montana District Courts require a document management system to provide for the secure long-term storage of documents in compliance with statutory document retention schedules and requirements.

Functionality Involved

- Provide a document imaging capability to assist in the day-to-day activities of the Clerks of District Courts. The system must provide the ability to capture, search, retrieve, and distribute court documents. In addition, a document management system is needed to store vital court records in order to meet retention requirements, allow for the automatic distribution of court records according to court rules, and improve access to court records.

Functionality Assumptions

- The imaging subsystem of the case management system (FullCourt) meets the business need of the Clerks of District Court. The imaging subsystem does not meet the requirement for archival record purposes for long term storage.

Security Assumptions

- Initially, court access will be limited to case information and related records of the court/courts of respective responsibility.
- State and federal law and the Access Rules adopted by the Supreme Court in February 2007 govern public access to electronic court records.

Business Functionality Requirements

The following is a list of current business functionalities that the document imaging system supports as

- ✓ Ability to scan images that commence an action
- ✓ Ability to associate a scanned image with items recorded in the register of actions for a case
- ✓ Ability to attach documents to a case (i.e. minute entries)
- ✓ Ability to associate integrated documents with items recorded in the register of actions for a case
- ✓ Ability to ensure appropriate security (access) to case images and documents from within the case management system
- ✓ Ability for the application users to search and retrieve scanned images and documents
- ✓ Ability to provide public access at the courthouse to search and retrieve documents and images
    - Ability to mask specific information (demographic info and personal identifiers)

Necessary Functionality – May Require Modification

The initial release of the application will be functional without the following modifications, however, these modifications may be required in a subsequent release of the application.

- Ability to index documents and images based on a defined set of index values looking toward the future of content management and the projects of the Law Library and C-Track
- Document archival

DRAFT

C.1 Document Management Use Cases

1. Image Submittal

- Image filing with Clerk of District Court upon case action (local court procedures)
  - Image scanned and indexed to the specific case
  - Case indicates that a image was scanned and filed

2. Document Submittal

- Documents created and indexed to a specific case by the Clerk of District Court
  - Minute Entry document created by Clerk of District Court
  - Document saved, indexed, and submitted to document management system
  - Case indicates that a minute entry was submitted

3. Clerk Image Retrieval

- Image inquiry
  - Case search, generally via party name or case number
  - Register of Actions inquiry
  - Image indicator found
  - Image retrieved
  - Image viewed or printed
  - Image closed

4. Public Image Retrieval

- Public security and access enforced
  - Case search, generally via party name or case number
  - Register of Actions inquiry
  - Image indicator found
  - Image retrieved
  - Image viewed or printed
  - Image closed

5. Clerk Document Retrieval

- Document inquiry
  - Case search, generally via party name or case number
  - Register of Actions inquiry
  - Document indicator found
  - Document retrieved
  - Document viewed or printed
  - Document closed

6. Public Document Retrieval

- Public security and access enforced
  - Case search, generally via party name or case number
  - Register of Actions inquiry
  - Document indicator found
  - Document retrieved
  - Document viewed or printed
  - Document closed

DRAFT

7. Reporting

- Produce case report listing only document filings

8. Security and Information Sharing

- Full Access to documents and images
- Confidential document and image access
- Non-confidential document and image access
- Public access to documents and images

E. External Interfaces and Statutory Reporting Requirements

Purpose

Montana District Courts require an information exchange architecture to support the electronic exchange of accurate, timely and complete information in a secure and efficient manner.

Assumptions

- The FullCourt case management system coupled with the document imaging subsystem stores core information about the parties (names, address, personal identifiers), the case (court identifiers, case number, case type and case subtype, findings) and has the ability to link a digital or digitized document to the case Register of Action (ROA).

- The FullCourt case management system without modification includes over 250 canned reports used by courts to track case statistics, evaluate workload, case status, financials and receipts, etc. In addition, Crystal Reports may be used by any trained user to develop customized ad-hoc reports.

- Montana FullCourt courts replicate nightly to the Central Court Repository (CCR) for the purposes of catastrophic disaster recovery, statewide statistical reporting and information exchange. Whenever possible electronic reporting will be facilitated through the CCR and the IJIS broker (see below).

- The CCR has a current interface to the Department of Justice's Integrated Justice Information System (IJIS) Broker. The IJIS Broker provides a variety of messaging services including message authentication, validation, logging, transformation and translation. Where guaranteed message delivery is an information exchange requirement the IJIS broker will be used.

- Child Support Enforcement and Vital Statistics reporting is the only electronic reporting currently supported in the JCMS environment. However, this process has been problematic for the Department of Public Health and Human Services. .

Primary Statutory Reporting Requirements targeted for Electronic Reporting

- Child Support Enforcement Case Registry (40-5-907 & 40-5-908)
- Vital Statistics Reporting (50-15-301, 50-15-302, 50-15-303, 50-15-304, 50-15-311)
- Criminal Disposition Reporting (44-5-213 and 46-18-204)
- Estate/Probate Reporting (72-3-1015)
- Traffic Convictions (61-11-101)
- Judgment & Sentencing Orders (Title 46, Chapter 18)

DRAFT

Necessary Functionality - May Require Modification

In the G-JCMS environment the only information that is electronically reported is case specific DPPHS child support and vital statistics information. The information transmitted from G-JCMS to the Department of Public Health and Human Services is based on a paper form filled out by the parties or by the party's attorney in dissolution, legal separation, dependent neglect and invalid marriage cases. The form as it currently exists attempts to capture many DPHHS child support and vital statistic information gathering requirements. Once the form is filed with the Clerk of Court the information on the form is entered into G-JCMS by a District Court clerk, thereby, converting the information into an electronic form for FTP transmission to DPHHS.

Over the course of the past three years there have been a number of meetings between members of the automation committee of the Clerks of the District Court, the Child Support and Vital Statistics staff of DPPHS and IT staff from the Office of the Court Administrator. These discussions have centered on the problems with the process as it currently exists. These problems include data integrity problems and problems with the transmission of the information. A complete discussion of the systemic problems is outside the scope of this document, however, there are many who believe the process is inherently flawed for the following reasons:

- The person filling out the form may not understand the question or chooses not to fill out all elements of the form.
- The information on the form may not accurately reflect the particulars of the case when converted to electronic form, i.e., the form is designed to be filled out when certain orders, decrees or judgments are docketed, consequently there may be multiple reportable events within a given case thereby creating the possibility for erroneous statistical information.
- Data entry errors that may be introduced when the clerk entered the information into G-JCMS (double entry).

An estimate from JSI to duplicate the current CSED process is $21,000. Pilot project members agreed that this change should be deferred until the process could be reviewed and hopefully improved.

Discussion

The Supreme Court's Commission on Technology identified electronic information exchange and integration with other government systems as a key strategic objective for Montana courts and judicial offices. Core case management and jury systems are predominately court specific applications whereas successful integration and information exchanges require significant investment and coordination from all governmental entities involved. Further, the most successful integration efforts lean into national standards for systems design and management.

The primary integrated justice information sharing project underway in Montana is the Department of Justice's IJIS Broker project. This project follows the US DOJ global justice information exchange model (GJXDM). The Montana IJIS Broker steering committee includes representatives from the Office of the Court Administrator, the Department of Corrections, and the Department of Administration with a number of other local, state and not-for-profit stakeholders participating in design and strategy sessions. See http://www.doj.mt.gov/enforcement/ijisbroker.asp. The IJIS Broker is being used to route traffic conviction information and error messages between the Court CCR to the Department of Justice's Motor Vehicle Division and to route and store criminal photos for criminal justice use. In addition, projects are underway to develop IJIS Broker transactions for automated crime victim notification, e-citations and electronic judgment and disposition reporting.

The Track Committee will be asked to evaluate and comment on the electronic information exchange strategy proposed for the targeted statutorily required information exchanges.

DRAFT

D. Legacy Data Conversion

Purpose

To the maximum extent possible convert active and closed case information (including documents) from JCMS to FullCourt.

Assumptions

The following assumptions have been made:

- Due to the move from a case centric system to a party centric system, a field to field data conversion would not provide quality data to the proposed case management system
- Because the legacy system did not provide many standard database table controls, data uniformity cannot be guaranteed

Business Functionality Requirements

- Ability for the Clerks of the District Court to access from within the case management system:
  - Case Number
  - Party Names
  - Associated Attorney Information
  - Judge History
  - Register of Actions
  - Open/Closing Information
  - Judgment History
  - Receipt History
  - Event History
  - Information contained in the "Notes" field on JCMS main screen
  - Attached Images
  - Minute Entry Documents
- Required search criteria:
  - Party names
  - Dates
  - Case Numbers
  - Case Types
- Ability for public users to access closed case histories and case related records for categories of information not restricted to public access pursuant to state and federal law

DRAFT

D1. Data Conversion Use Cases

1. Clerk of District Court

- Ability to clarify and produce information on closed cases
  - Information on a case where the file is in another county with the judge but an attorney comes inquiring about the case
    - Can produce case history information
    - Can produce a copy of the scanned image or the document
  - Information is used to clarify cases, particularly when there are several cases with the same plaintiff or defendant
  - Civil Cases – a John Doe case with Collection Professionals (satisfied), 1 with Collection Bureau (not satisfied), and a Jane Doe case (not satisfied) – if a title company is inquiring the court needs to be able to tell them that 2 are pending (not satisfied, but filed with or without activity) and one is satisfied. Should be able to tell them the amounts owed/satisfied and the dates of filing/satisfaction
  - Criminal Cases – have had information requested from cases as old as 20 years from various agencies for various reasons such as:
    - Employment searches or
    - DOC record keeping to Sexual and Violent registration information
  - Marriage license requests are ongoing – if a call is received requesting a copy of a marriage certificate from 1932 the court needs to be able to access the information to ensure they have the license

1. Internal Users

- Identified as:
  - Clerks of the District Court & Staff
  - Judges
  - Judicial Assistants
  - Law Clerks
  - Court Reporters
  - Juvenile Probation Offices
- **External Users**
  - County Attorneys
  - Defense Attorneys
  - Title Companies
  - General Public
- Title companies need access to case registers – sometimes inquire twice or more per day
- Title companies need access to judgment information to determine whether there are liens on property they are about to insure

DRAFT