

Florida Courts Technology Commission Meeting

FCTC Action Items/ Summary of Motions

October 19 - 20, 2010

Commission Members Present

Judge Judith L. Kreeger, Chair, 11th Circuit

Judge Manuel Menendez, Jr., 13th Circuit

Jim Fuller, Clerk of Court, Duval County

Ted McFetridge, Trial Court Administrator, 8th Circuit

Judge C. Alan Lawson, 5th DCA

Dennis Menendez, CTO, 12th Circuit

Mary Cay Blanks, Clerk of Court, 3rd DCA

Judge Scott Stephens, 13th Circuit

Karen Rushing, Clerk of Court, Sarasota County

Judge Sheree Cunningham, Palm Beach County

Charles C. Hinnant, Ph.D., Florida State University

Paul Regensdorf, Esq., Fort Lauderdale

Murray Silverstein, Esq., Tampa

Ken Nelson, CTO, 6th Circuit

Judge George S. Reynolds, 2nd Circuit

Jannet Lewis, CTO, 10th Circuit

Judge Lisa Taylor Munyon, 9th Circuit

Judge Stevan Northcutt, 2nd DCA

Laird A. Lile, Esq., Fort Myers

Dale Brill, Ph.D., Florida Chamber Foundation

Judge Robert Hilliard, Santa Rosa County

Present via phone

Carol Ortman, Trial Court Administrator, 17th Circuit

Thomas Genung, Trial Court Administrator, 19th Circuit

Members Not Present

Kent Spuhler, Esq., Executive Director, Florida Legal Services

James B. Jett, Clerk of Court, Clay County

Supreme Court and OSCA Staff Present

Tom Hall

Donna Brewer

Laura Rush

Greg Youchock

Lisa Goodner

Lakisha Hall

Steve Henley

P.J. Stockdale

Alan Neubauer

Jenna Simms

Candace Causseaux

Sharon Buckingham

Chris Blakeslee

Maria Arnold

Blan Teagle

Kristine Slayden

Other Attendees

Steve Shaw, CTO, 19th Circuit

Craig McLean, CTO, 20th Circuit

Craig Van Brussel, CTO, 1st Circuit

Jon Lin, CTO, 5th Circuit

Laura Roth, Volusia County Clerk's Office

Bob Inzer, Clerk of Court, Leon County

Ken Kent, Executive Director, Florida Association
of Court Clerks and Comptrollers

Melvin Cox, Director of Information Technology,
Florida Association of Court Clerks and Comptrollers

Cindy Andrews, Florida Association of Court Clerks and Comptrollers

Fred Buhl, CTO, 8th Circuit

Noel Chessman, CTO, 15th Circuit

Gerald Land, CTO, 16th Circuit

Sunil Nemade, CTO, 17th Circuit

Christin Gallardo, 17th Circuit

John Stott, Chief Deputy Clerk, Leon County

Fred Baggett, General Counsel, Florida

Association of Court Clerks and Comptrollers

Karl Youngs, Manatee County Clerk's office

Chips Shore, Clerk of Court, Manatee County

Judge Kreeger welcomed all Commission members and other participants and called the meeting to order. She began by talking to the new Commission about the future of technology in the courts and her hopes for everything it can become. Also discussed briefly were future meetings and the committees and workgroups that will be formed to carry out the work of the Commission.

These items will be discussed in greater detail in agenda items II and XI.

Agenda Item I. Introductions/Role Call and Member Discussion

After an initial welcome, Judge Kreeger moved into item number one on the agenda, introductions of members. The FCTC membership has increased to 25, with 13 members new to the Commission. Judge Kreeger asked each member to introduce himself or herself, including where the member lives and which group the member represents. In an effort to know the non-members who attended, Judge Kreeger asked those in the periphery to introduce themselves as well.

Agenda Item II. Discussion of Rule 2.236

To begin, Judge Kreeger discussed the subcommittees and workgroups that will be created in order to perform the work that the rules directs the Commission to do. There will be 8 committees/workgroups, each of which was described briefly. (1) Rules and Access – Judge Kreeger stated that the business rules for courts should be modified because they were written for a paper world. There are issues concerning access to court records in an electronic world. For example, pro-se litigants – how will they access the courts? (2) Manatee Oversight – to monitor the Manatee County Pilot project which has been operating under an MOU since 2007. This will be a short-lived committee with a few members, since the pilot project has just recently completed its second of two phases; the committee will present its recommendations after the independent review by the NCSC (National Center for State Courts) has been completed. (3) TIMS (Trial Court Integrated Management Solution) Project – development of an automated solution to address certain major needs of the trial court system (see agenda item IV for more information). (4) Funding – to identify funding sources for current and future technology projects. (5) Education and Outreach – will identify ways to share information regarding e-filing and the statewide e-portal, as well as other technology initiatives. (6) Annual Reports – evaluate the current template for annual reporting from trial courts; identify what is needed and perhaps develop a new method for collecting information from the circuits. (7) ePortal – this group will work with the E-Filing Authority Board and the FACC on development and modifications, i.e. “special instructions” with filing, as well as testing of the portal. Additionally, the ePortal committee will be identifying the envelope data elements for all court divisions. (8) Technical Standards – this group will be responsible for updating the Integration and Interoperability (I&I) Document (last updated in March 2008), as well as other standards-type documents.

Judge Kreeger expressed her interest in collaboration and invited members and non-members alike to volunteer for service on any of the subcommittees/workgroups of interest.

Operational Procedures

The Operational Procedures document was presented to the Commission and Judge Kreeger opened the meeting for discussion. Karen Rushing raised an issue about Item IX (Approval Process...) and asked whether the current language regarding development of systems and the FCTC's control was too broad. She suggested they could be narrowed, while still meeting the needs of the court. Ken Nelson and Judge Reynolds said they should remain broad because the section is intended to capture more than just e-filing systems.

Karen discussed setting standards, to which Chris Blakeslee referred to the I&I document, as well as the e-access standards, et. al. The E-Access Standards are currently in the process of being updated and the I&I document will be reviewed and updated over the next few months. Judge Kreeger suggested that a committee be set up to review current standards and modify as needed. Tom Hall agreed that standards need to be set, in an effort to avoid day to day changes/updates having to come before the Commission for approval.

Paul suggested the name of the E-Filing Committee be changed, because they do not just review e-filing requests. The Commission discussed a potential name change to e-initiatives committee.

Judge Hilliard suggested that the Roberts Rules of Order be the rules that govern Commission proceedings.

Ted asked if the Commission should adopt interim procedures, keeping the draft document as the interim. Mary Cay agreed and added that the Commission should not allow one portion to hold up the passage of the document.

- **Motion: approve additional paragraph in section IX, in concept.**

“Approval is not required for modification of an existing system unless it is substantially or materially impacts the performance of court-related functions. Any modifications or new system must meet the standards outlined in the Integration and Interoperability Document and any other standards approved by the Florida Courts Technology Commission or the Florida Supreme Court.”

- **Supplemental Motion: approve operational procedures, as modified by workgroup (including additional paragraph in section IX), as “interim” procedures of the FCTC.**

MOTION OFFERED: Karen Rushing

MOTION SECOND: Laird Lile

MOTION PASSED BY UNANIMOUS VOTE

After the discussion, Judge Kreeger suggested that a workgroup be formed to review the procedures and modify the document, giving careful consideration to the appeals process issue. The procedures should be brought back to the Commission for review and vote at the next Commission meeting

(scheduled for February 2011). A workgroup (Tom Hall (chair), Judge Munyon, Karen Rushing, Judge Reynolds, Ken Nelson, Paul Regensdorf, Randy Long, and Melvin Cox) met during the lunch break and began discussion on the initial modifications to operational procedures. Additional work must be completed prior to finalization.

Commission/Committee Structure

Blan Teagle discussed the collaborative workgroups that have been created at the OSCA. He stated that the business process has to drive what you do with technology. The OSCA internal workgroups were created for a number of reasons, primarily to have staff work more effectively given the complex world we live in and the loss of 12 positions during the 08/09FY. Judge Kreeger mentioned that historically there has been other committees' work involved technology issues, but some committees did not interface with the FCTC. She emphasized that it is important to have collaboration, especially at the staff level.

Judge Kreeger then discussed the committees within the scope of the FCTC, specifically those identified by Supreme Court administrative order – the Appellate Courts Technology Committee (ACTC) and the E-Filing Committee (EFC).

Judge Menendez, chair of the EFC, provided an update on the activities of that Committee. It is responsible for reviewing applications for e-filing and e-processes (e-initiatives), updating the standards (currently underway). He referred to the updated website which keeps a current listing of approved e-initiatives, among other information.

Judge Northcutt, chair of the ACTC, provided an overview of that Committee's work to the Commission including membership and responsibilities. That Committee has primarily been responsible for allocating money for hardware/software/refresh needs. The Committee is now working on updating the document management, case management, etc. systems (FACTS project and iDCA/eDCA). The FACTS project is currently in the development stage and will be piloted by the 2DCA and Supreme Court. It is expected to be ready after the first of the year. The 1DCA developed an e-filing system (iDCA/eDCA) for the Office of Judges of Compensation Claims, and has been piloted in the 1DCA since 2009. The 5DCA recently installed the iDCA/eDCA and will pilot the system. Judge Lawson, also a member of the ACTC, added that the 7th Circuit will begin to send records on appeal electronically, on a trial basis, this month to the 5DCA. Eventually, the Supreme Court will select which system the appellate courts will use.

AGENDA ITEM III. The Technology Landscape Today

OSCA staff provided to Commission members charts identifying the system(s) being used by each county in each court division. They compiled the Information by surveying the local court technology staff and it is available on the FCTC page of the court technology site (http://www.flcourts.org/gen_public/technology/techcomms.shtml)

AGENDA ITEM IV. TCP&A Charge #1

Trial Court Integrated Management Solution (TIMS) Project

Sharon Buckingham gave an overview of the Trial Court Integrated Management Solution (TIMS) project. The purpose of the project is to develop an automated solution to address certain major needs of the trial court system. We need to eliminate the case maintenance versus case management dichotomy. Florida's trial courts do not have a standardized statewide solution for addressing the automation of certain court functions, which most agree is needed. Sharon described case processing and case performance (performance monitoring) – the two major functions of the TIMS project. Case processing includes six sub-functions: (1) case intake; (2) document management; (3) case management/tracking; (4) case scheduling; (5) court proceedings; and (6) resource management. The Supreme Court directed the Commission on Trial Court Performance and Accountability (TCP&A) to work collaboratively with the FCTC and to "...identify the information, by case type, that needs to be accessed and tracked by judges, case managers, and other court staff in order to move cases efficiently and effectively through the trial court process." Sharon discussed the project collaboration strategies (available in meeting materials packet).

Phase I: (a) Develop recommendations regarding the standardized information that judges, case managers and other staff must access and track in order to move cases efficiently and effectively through the trial court process and (b) Develop recommendations concerning the standardized caseload and workload information needed at the circuit and statewide reporting levels, which is essential for performance monitoring and resource management.

Phase II: Perform a technology assessment and develop recommendations regarding the technological approach that is most feasible to develop an automated solution which addresses the needs identified in Phase One.

Phase III: Develop a recommended implementation plan for TIMS.

Phase IV: Implement TIMS.

The complete power point presentation is available on the FCTC page of the court technology site (http://www.flcourts.org/gen_public/technology/techcomms.shtml)

Jannet asked if the TIMS is a resource management project or a case management project. Sharon responded that it is both.

Reviewing the project principles, Judge Kreeger stressed the importance of technology enabling courts to be fully accountable and thinks that principle should be added. In Phase I, the goal is to focus on what is "necessary and pure." "During phase one, the identification of information needed for processing cases, managing resources, and monitoring performance will be based purely on 'need' and will not be restricted by fiscal or technological constraints. Rather than simply automating existing business processes, phase one will endeavor to incorporate improvements to those processes wherever practical."

Judge Kreeger suggested putting updates and notice of meetings regarding the TIMS project on the court technology webpage.

Karen Rushing applauded the presentation and courts looking to move forward. She added that in order to be fully collaborative, the clerks should be more involved and not just considered as “others involved” as stated within the power point. PJ Stockdale stated that one of the top priorities is to determine who will be doing what and the clerks will certainly be involved in that discussion. Carol Ortman suggested having trial court members or CTO’s involved in the first phase as well. Jannet added that case managers should also be involved. Blan clarified that the project steps listed in the power point presentation are a high level view of the project. There will be more detail forthcoming and all groups mentioned will be involved (case managers, clerks, technology officers, etc.)

Ted McFetridge asked if this was a unified case management system. Judge Kreeger responded that it is not to dictate how cases should be managed, rather it should provide the ability to gather and use information effectively. Information will be gathered at intake, the court will identify needs, and the clerk will meet those needs. Sharon said this project is more about unified data. Judge Kreeger added that the objective is to have the basic information that every court in the state needs, as well as the tools needed to appropriately address the cases assigned to them. She hopes the TIMS will enable a judge to have the tools to obey the statutory timeframes and manage his/her cases in a timely and effective manner.

Discussion ensued over envelope data elements and data elements to be captured at the portal. Staff clarified that the envelope is only the initial basic information that has been identified for the initial “launch” of the portal. Identification of data elements is an ongoing project, and there are likely to be other elements that will subsequently be identified to be captured. There is still much work to be done in this area. Broward County expressed concern that they would like to continue to receive the same information they currently are capturing, not any less. Karen Rushing said any departure from uniformity causes concern and said the clerks are embracing the court’s effort to move towards uniformity. Judge Kreeger said the goal is to have certain fundamental information, needed at the present time, delivered to the courts. PJ added that the current focus of the TIMS project is what is needed for effective case management and not what is going to be stored. Melvin Cox said that if the data is being packaged and sent using valid XML, the data will be passed through the portal and should be received.

Judge Kreeger said there are several working case management systems that will be reviewed by members of the TIMS committee and assured everyone that the goal is to not take away what is currently in place, but to use the positives from each for the statewide approach.

Judge Kreeger asked for volunteers to serve on a TIMS workgroup. She wants to form a committee of the FCTC to work with the TCP&A on this project.

Murray asked what phase four is expected to look like. Phases one, two, and three are the planning stages, while phase four is the implementation of TIMS. Sharon referenced the judicial “dashboards” that are currently in use in some areas as examples.

E-Portal Demonstration

Melvin Cox gave a demonstration of the e-portal and opened the floor up for discussion, suggestions, etc. Christin Gallardo asked if third party vendors would be able to access data elements via the portal. Melvin Cox confirmed that the portal does allow for a third party vendor to “hook up” to the e-portal and gather data elements. Judge Kreeger suggested adding language next to the physical address item to say “needed for service” or something similar, because victims of domestic violence are entitled to have their addresses protected. Paul suggested adding a box that notifies the reviewer of confidential information contained within the filing. Tom Hall suggested an explanation for “CVV” on the payment page, perhaps having a link with a definition or scroll-over feature. Judge Lawson suggested adding a disclaimer that when you hit the submit button “you acknowledge the following...” Karen Rushing asked what would happen if a filer pays the incorrect filing fee amount. Melvin Cox said there are provisions set up for the individual clerk’s office to handle that correction. Ted McFetridge added that he would like the portal to allow judges to send out signed orders. Murray Silverstein mentioned that current e-filing standards state all filings should be in .pdf format so the portal should not allow for word or .tiff documents, for security reasons. Melvin Cox said the portal can accept documents in word, word perfect, .tiff format and will convert them to .pdf on the back-end.

Judge Kreeger suggested forming a workgroup to work with Melvin and the FACC on reviewing the portal, suggesting changes, etc.

Data Elements Workgroup

Data elements were identified for what is to be included as part of the initial filing. Additional data elements will be identified at a later date. FACC will have 90 days from the date new data elements are identified to add those elements to the portal.

- **Motion: on the civil envelope, make fields three (3) “plaintiff address details” through ten (10) “defendant race optional”**

MOTION OFFERED: Laird Lile

MOTION SECOND: Murray Silverstein

MOTION PASSED BY UNANIMOUS VOTE

- **Motion: change “role/actor ID” to “party type”**

MOTION OFFERED: Laird Lile

MOTION SECOND: Karen Rushing

MOTION PASSED BY UNANIMOUS VOTE

- **Motion: Remove “Judge Name/ Date of Hearing”**

MOTION OFFERED: Laird Lile

MOTION SECOND: Paul Regensdorf

MOTION PASSED BY UNANIMOUS VOTE

- **Motion: adopt all data elements based on civil cover sheet**

MOTION OFFERED: Murray Silverstein

MOTION SECOND: Laird Lile

MOTION PASSED BY UNANIMOUS VOTE

- **Motion: keep “proceeding type of case” (line 28) through “jury trial demanded” (line 34) on the envelope.**

MOTION OFFERED: Laird Lile

MOTION SECOND: Murray Silverstein

MOTION PASSED BY UNANIMOUS VOTE

- **Motion: exclude “court interpreter language” (line 47), “special handling instructions” (line 38), “case characteristics” (line 46).**

MOTION OFFERED: Laird Lile

MOTION SECOND: Murray Silverstein

MOTION PASSED BY UNANIMOUS VOTE

- **Motion: adopt all XML envelopes with the aforementioned changes.**

MOTION OFFERED: Murray Silverstein

MOTION SECOND: Laird Lile

MOTION PASSED BY UNANIMOUS VOTE

AGENDA ITEM V. Manatee County Pilot Project

Chips Shore and Karl Youngs discussed the e-access pilot program and AOSC06-20 – In re: Implementation of report and recommendations of the committee on privacy and court records (Fla. June 30, 2006). There are two competing principles: (1) openness and transparency of court records; and (2) rights of individual privacy. Access to images is determined by the type of record: (1) case type; (2) document type; and (3) information in document. Access to images is also determined by security level of user.

Phase I: subscriber access

Phase II: phase I access plus public internet access; no subscription needed

Karl discussed the process for protecting confidential information in public documents by redaction or viewable on request. Viewable on request allows the clerks to look for numbers or specific words. Additionally, some documents require an additional examination by clerk to redact numbers or identity

of sex/child abuse before public access. Examples: Sexual Abuse Criminal Records, Depositions, Transcripts, Letters. When a public subscriber selects the document, a request is sent to the clerk. A clerk reviews the document and redacts personal identification numbers and identity of sexual victims. After it is requested, reviewed, and such confidential information is redacted, the remaining document becomes a public document and next person does not have to request review. The redaction process uses software to identify and remove Personal Identification Numbers from images of court records, SSN's, Bank Account, Credit and Debit. It also searches for clue words, which is followed by a clerk review. The numbers are blacked out on public record but not on the original document that is used by the court.

There are almost 7,000 subscribers of the pilot. Manatee County imaged 2,769,636 documents between July 1, 2007 and August 31, 2010. They stated that they hope to have it approved and other courts/clerks can use what they developed as a baseline for any future system. Chips Shore stated that the pilot has been very successful and they have not received any complaints from the public after the implementation of phase II.

Chips asked the OSCA for assistance in obtaining funding to complete the audit of phase II. The expected cost is between \$5,000 and \$8,000, depending upon whether travel to Manatee County would be required. The Florida Association of Court Clerks and Comptrollers (FACC) paid for the National Center for State Courts (NCSC) to complete the audit of phase I.

Dale Brill asked if there were any lessons learned with regard to security and storage of data.

- **Motion: allow pilot project to continue**

MOTION OFFERED: Laird Lile

MOTION SECOND: Judge C. Alan Lawson

MOTION PASSED BY UNANIMOUS VOTE

- **Motion: approve scope of audit of phase II set forth in power point presentation (slide# 36)***

MOTION OFFERED: Judge George S. Reynolds

MOTION SECOND: Laird Lile

MOTION PASSED BY UNANIMOUS VOTE

*Slide # 36 – NCSC Audit of Phase II

- a. Review and evaluate Manatee County Audit of Phase II including determining proper security for public Internet users by:
 - i. Case number and the party name
 - ii. Images of Court records
- b. Review and evaluate changes to the security matrix and compare to Florida's newly adopted Rule 2.420, Rules of Judicial Administration.
- c. Review and evaluate the Phase II statistics for system use and the survey conducted by the Manatee County Clerk.

Complete power point presentation is available on the FCTC page of the court technology site (http://www.flcourts.org/gen_public/technology/techcomms.shtml)

AGENDA ITEM VI. E-Portal Update

Tom Hall, a member of the E-Filing Authority Board, provided an update on the statewide e-portal. The Florida Association of Court Clerks and Comptrollers Services Group (FACCSG) developed the e-portal, E-Filing Court Records Portal, which was agreed to be used as the statewide portal. The E-Filing Authority Board is comprised of seven trial court clerks, plus the clerk of the Supreme Court. The responsibility of the Board is to establish a budget, provide oversight, etc. The Board conducted its first meeting in September and they will continue to meet monthly.

There are four areas that must be approved unanimously (including the Supreme Court Clerk): (1) approval of any assignment of the contract or agreement between the Authority and the FACC, Inc. and/or FACCSG, LLC, to design, develop, implement, operate, upgrade, support and maintain the E-Filing Court Records Portal; (2) whenever the performance of the Court-related functions of the Portal may be materially and adversely impacted by a project, action or matter within the authority of the Authority; (3) approval of any vote to terminate the Agreement with the FACC, Inc. or its assignee; and (4) approval of any vote by the board to dissolve the Authority. Tom also clarified that to the extent the Supreme Court can mandate, they have the authority over the operations of the portal.

The purpose of the e-portal is to allow a user to electronically file a document from anywhere with a single log-on. The portal will not come on line to all at once; there will be a phased-in approach, by division of the courts. The E-Filing Authority will have to make efforts to inform the public. Initially, the e-portal will fully support filings in the Probate, Juvenile Dependency, County Civil, Circuit Civil, and Family divisions. Simple e-filing will be available for all other divisions.

Ted McFetridge asked if there was a connection between the E-Filing Authority and the FCTC, i.e. oversight and reporting, or whether they are separate and independent Tom Hall replied that the Authority is an operational body, while the FCTC is a policy-making body. Lisa Goodner added that the Authority will be governed by the decisions (i.e. rules and standards) made by the FCTC. Additionally, Karen Rushing (also a member of the E-Filing Authority Board) said the Authority will make sure that the courts' needs are addressed. For example, the FCTC will identify data elements and the Authority will ensure that they are implemented. She expressed eagerness to have the portal available statewide.

Judge Kreeger asked Tom Hall and Karen Rushing, as members of the Authority Board, to provide updates on the e-portal at subsequent FCTC meetings.

AGENDA ITEM VII. Florida Appellate Courts Technology Solution (FACTS) Project

A presentation of the FACTS project will be scheduled for a future FCTC meeting. The project is currently in Phase I, and in the interest of time, the update was postponed for a subsequent meeting.

AGENDA ITEM VIII. AOSC03-16

Chris Blakeslee stated that AOSC03-16 In re: Adoption of Functional Requirements, Technical Standards, and Strategic Plan is outdated in some respects, and questions whether something else should be done, such as changes be made to the current order. Ken Nelson mentioned that most of what is in that order is also addressed within rule 2.236. His concern would be the attachments to the order (i.e. JAD sessions, I&I document, etc.) He asked whether if that order was rescinded, those documents would also become ineffective.

Judge Kreeger stated that paragraph one and two in the order are both covered under the rule. Paragraph three will be covered under the work of the TIMS project, as that will be developing a baseline for technology in the courts, which will, in effect, become the strategic plan.

Craig McLean added that the CTOs do not mind preparing the annual reports, as long as they are going to be used and not “put on a shelf.” The information compiled for the report should be relevant to present needs. Lisa Goodner added that there is a requirement for the Unified Family Court to submit an annual report to the Court, which is not in a template form. That report is directed to a critical issue. She suggested the FCTC adopt something similar.

Motion: request that the Supreme Court rescind Administrative Order 03-16, In re: Adoption of Functional Requirements, Technical Standards, and Strategic Plan in its entirety.

MOTION OFFERED: Laird Lile

MOTION SECONDED: Karen Rushing

MOTION PASSED BY UNANIMOUS VOTE

At the request of the FCTC, Judge Kreeger will send a letter to the Supreme Court requesting that the order be rescinded.

AGENDA ITEM IX. Access to Court Records Workgroup and User Policies Workgroup

Access to Court Records

Paul Regensdorf chaired the access to court records workgroup. He said the work of the group deals primarily with Rule 2.420. There is a new proposed rule (rule 2.425), which pertains to the minimization of non-confidential, but sensitive records/information. There are issues, however, with regard to the 19 items that the clerks and filers both have the obligation to identify as “confidential” upon filing. There are efforts underway to expand this list. Some courts have issued local administrative orders to cover areas that are not covered within the rules or statutes. Paul Regensdorf stated better practice would be to not to place information in a court file, unless it is then required by rule or statute. Murray Silverstein added that the Rules of Judicial Administration (RJA) committee has streamlined the process, making substantial efforts towards improvement. Steve Henley suggested that before finalizing the coversheets, a cross check with the rules of judicial administration should be done to ensure that unnecessary information is not included. Tom Hall asked if the RJA was considering a

“glitch” bill. He has a list of items with regard to rule 2.420 and will work with Paul Regensdorf to have those incorporated in the new rule.

Judge Kreeger noted the importance of this group’s work and that it should continue, with Paul Regensdorf serving as the chair.

User Policies

Jannet Lewis, who took over for Carol Ortman as chair of the user policies workgroup, reported on the accomplishments of the workgroup. She said the workgroup progressed on most of the charges; however, she recognized that there is still more work to be done. There are overarching issues that were given to the TRW (Technology Review Workgroup). The group drafted a report at the close of the previous Commission’s term and included recommendations. (1) Electronic access should be differentiated based on user role; the deeper the level of access, the more personal information would be required and could be accessed. (2) There should be a unified fee structure. (3) The group suggested that some strategies be deployed to deter “screen scraping”. Jannet noted the most challenging area was the commercial use of records. There were no firm recommendations made for this area.

Judge Kreeger thanked Carol Ortman for her work, as well as Jannet Lewis for taking on the duties of chair. She added that the newly formed Funding Committee will continue the work of the user policies workgroup.

AGENDA ITEM X. Funding for Technology in the State Courts

Judge Kreeger stated that a cost analysis must be done statewide, to present to the legislature. This must be a collaborative effort. A committee will be established and representation from all groups is desired. Judge Kreeger suggested looking at existing funding streams and then proceed in a systematic and multi-function approach. There are many projects ahead that will require additional funding, including the e-portal.

AGENDA ITEM XI. Committee Assignments

Judge Kreeger established 8 committees/workgroups, in addition to the standing committees mentioned in the rule (ACTC and EFC). (1) Rules and Access; (2) Manatee Oversight - will conduct a review of the evaluation from the National Center for State Courts. Additionally, a recommendation may be made from that committee with regard to the current moratorium on remote electronic access to digital court records. (3) Trial Court Integrated Management Solution (TIMS); (4) Funding; (5) ePortal; (6) Education and Outreach; (7) Annual/Periodic Reports; (8) Technical Standards.

Judge Kreeger asked members to volunteer for workgroups/committees that are of interest to them. She will establish committee membership after she hears from all Commission members about their preferences. There will be a staggered approach to the work, as there are limited staffing and funding resources available.

AGENDA ITEM XII. Outstanding Items from the past Commission

Judge Kreeger spoke about a few items that will carry over to the new Commission – the work on the minimization petition and outreach and education efforts. A committee has been established to work on outreach and education, and the minimization petition is being addressed through the work of the access to court records workgroup.

AGENDA ITEM XIII. Wrap-up / work ahead for the FCTC

Judge Kreeger again emphasized the importance of the work and efforts on the horizon for the Commission. A few of the committees and/or workgroups will be starting to work immediately, while others have some time before their work will commence.

Staff will work on planning the next four Commission meetings (they will be planned once per quarter). Judge Kreeger reminded members to review the Commission member directory and notify staff of any additions or changes. She also mentioned her secondary email address that can be used for all FCTC related correspondence, kreegerj@flcourts.org.

Closing Business

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned.