

Minutes

Problem Solving Committee Overlap Work Group

February 4, 2009

The Problem Solving Committee's Overlap Work Group met in room 204 at 225 Spring Street, Wethersfield at 4 p.m.

Those in attendance: Judge Lynda Munro (for the 1st agenda item only), Family Support Magistrate Sandra Sosnoff Baird (ex officio), Family Support Magistrate John Colella, Patrick Deak, Joseph DiTunno, Joseph Greelish, Johanna Greenfield, David Iaccarino (facilitator and work group leader).

1. Welcome and introductions

The meeting was called to order at 4 p.m. Introductory comments were offered by Judge Munro. Judge Munro introduced the charge of the work group, which is to examine what challenges the population in family support magistrate court are facing and what tools are available to them. This requires a gathering of information regarding the various interactions they may have with different courts and strategies as to how to tap into the available resources. She also explained that the other work group will be looking at the inmate population in Family Support Magistrate court and what services are available to them.

Family Support Magistrate Sosnoff Baird indicated to the group that we are looking for things that do not involve funding and to keep in mind a goal of increasing child support payments.

2. Examine where population has overlapping experiences with the court

Identifying The Different Courts

- Family court (including divorce, custody, visitation, restraining orders)
- Family Support Magistrate court (including paternity, support, UIFSA, contempt, modification)
- Criminal court (including domestic violence, community court, motor vehicle court and drug court if any)
- Civil court

- Housing court
- Probate court (including termination of parental rights)
- Juvenile court (including child protection and delinquency)
- Small claims court

Identifying the Different Agencies/Units

- Department of Correction (DOC)
- Parole
- Department of Children and Families (DCF)
- Probation
- Rehabilitation facilities
- Family Relations
- Workers Compensation
- Department of Social Services (DSS)
- Department of Mental Health and Addiction Services (DHMAS)
- Department of Motor Vehicles (DMV)

3. Strategize methods of reaching that population effectively with services

Technology

It was discussed that there are many computer databases that might contain information regarding the people who have contact with the various courts and agencies. One possible approach might be that through a unique identifier (of which social security number is one) or data match (such as date of birth, inmate number, criminal docket number) the overlap might be found. Though it was noted that recent trends generally move away from personal identification information, there may be other

data matches that would suffice for purposes of identifying overlap. The group then had a brainstorming session regarding systems that might possibly be relevant to the discussion and whether the system was judicial, non-judicial or non-judicial with limited access to certain judicial employees.

Computer Systems Identified

Judicial

- Case Management Information System (CMIS)
- Protection Order Registry (POR)
- Forecourt
- Small Claims
- Civil/Family (CV/FA)
- Paperless Re-Arrest Warrant Network (PRAWN)
- Criminal/Motor Vehicle (CRMV)
- Child Protection (CP)

Non-judicial

- Chief Child Protection Attorney (CCPA)
- Connecticut On-Line Law Enforcement Communications Teleprocessing (COLLECT)
- National Crime Information Center (NCIC)
- Department of Motor Vehicles (DMV)
- Department Of Labor (DOL)
- Department Of Correction (DOC)
- Department of Mental Health and Addiction Services (DMHAS)
- Eligibility Maintenance System (EMS)

Non-judicial With Limited Accessibility

- Connecticut Child Support Enforcement System (CCSES)
- Offender Based Tracking System (OBTS)
- Federal Case Registry (FCR)

It was noted that it might possibly be easier to obtain name match information than case specific information from some of these different systems. It was also noted that a number of these systems are believed to be run through Department of Information Technology (DOIT).

Possible alternatives discussed that might facilitate the bridging of access to information contained in these systems could potentially be through the Chief Court Administrator (for systems internal to the Branch), by cooperative agreement or by memorandum of understanding.

Other strategies to look at include:

- Identification of services currently being provided and services that may be available, but are not yet provided.
- Coordination of court orders.
- Charting out links to identify who has access among the relevant agencies and systems.
- Coordinate the scheduling of court appearances.

4. Next meeting

The next meeting will be held on March 11th at 2:30 p.m. in the same location.

David Iaccarino adjourned the meeting at 5:20 p.m.