

**MINUTES  
WORK GROUP 2 – OVERLAP  
PROBLEM SOLVING IN FAMILY MATTERS COMMITTEE  
MAY 27, 2009**

The Overlap work group met in room 204 at 225 Spring Street, Wethersfield, CT at 2:30 p.m.

Those in attendance: Chief Family Support Magistrate Sandra Sosnoff Baird (ex-officio); Family Support Magistrate John Colella; Mr. Patrick Deak, Ms. Dalia Panke (ex-officio); Atty Joseph Del Ciampo; Mr. Joseph Greelish; and David Iaccarino (facilitator and group leader)

The meeting was called to order by David Iaccarino at 2:34pm.

**1. Review and Approval of minutes**

The minutes from the April 15, 2009 meeting were approved unanimously.

**2. Discuss “Agency Computer Systems”**

The document was revised and will be emailed to all members. Currently, it contains 11 systems. More will be added. The document is broken down into 4 sections. The first section is the “Primary Data Elements that May Help Connect Computers Systems.” These data elements are the priority and have been the focus of the group throughout the process to this point. David Iaccarino asked if all elements were included in the diagram or more were needed. The second section is the “Primary Data Elements that May Be Useful to the Judicial Authority in Decision Making.” The third section is “Access to the Civil/Family Computer System.” The fourth section is “Agreements Providing Access to the Computer System.” It contains any restrictions or prohibitions.

Joe Greelish stated that a representative from DMHAS will provide him with a dictionary that includes all fields contained in their database. DMHAS already has staff stationed in some courthouses to evaluate people. It is unclear which courthouses and which matters they are covering. The group will find out more about it as this can be applied to the Problem Solving Model without duplicating the work.

It was discussed that Magistrate Wihbey met with Judge Norko from Community Court. She also spent a lot of time with Chris Pleasanton, Program Coordinator discussing how Community Court puts all the resources together. Perhaps, Judge Norko’s informal suggestion to Magistrate Wihbey to send criminal cases to community court would be a solution. Not by transferring the cases, but by having the defendants physically go next door to use the tools and resources available there. The challenge, however, is to figure out how the logistics would work to make sure someone reports back to the Magistrates. It was suggested that perhaps using a mechanism similar to Instant Messaging or Email would help track and ensure that the person goes and the Magistrates get a report. Another concern is that the large volume of work may not be anticipated and the resources at Community Court may become overwhelmed. An item to be decided on is if the referrals will be for substance abuse, mental health or non-specific. Therefore, the group will look at DMHAS’s presence in Community Court and will make a general recommendation. Ms. Dalia Panke will follow up with the extent of the work they are willing or able to take.

It was discussed that Drug Court would also be a good place to observe, since all the players involved in a case sit down together to walk through the plan of action for the specific client.

Community Court and Drug Court provide a good structure to be used as a starting point for Problem Solving. Even though they are different in how assessments are done and they depend on the intake vehicles available, the group can look at what already exists. Hartford

would be an ideal recommendation for a pilot program because the criminal court and Community Court are located next door to each other.

*[This paragraph pertains to Item 4 of the agenda as well]* A conversation ensued regarding statutory rules and how they apply to an agency's computer system and how to identify what statutes a user may be violating when connecting to a system. A solution would be to ask each agency what statutes govern their actions and have the agency point them out. The group also agreed that this question may not need to be answered right now, but perhaps later when the Committee's recommendations are accepted and implementation begins. Attorney Joe Del Ciampo has already begun to gather Memoranda of Understanding between agencies. The group discussed the possibility of using an alternative method to accomplish the same as with the Memoranda such as disclosures signed by the parties allowing the release of information. This legal analysis of what is disclosable must be focused. The group considered the possibility that an ongoing work group may be needed to continue smoothing out the technological part of this initiative.

A question was brought up regarding the need to provide statistics as part of item 1 of the Group's charge. The group members agreed that providing statistics would help justify the need for a Problem Solving Court and would provide a basis to identify overlap within the Judicial Branch system. This may be useful later on when the Branch seeks to find out what overlap exists amongst other agencies' systems. In order to accomplish this task, Mr. Joe Greelish and Mr. Patrick Deak will meet to figure out how to come up with a sample population to show overlap. The overlap sought is between the following systems: Department of Correction, Criminal and Motor Vehicle, and Family. Attorney Joe Del Ciampo expressed concern regarding the use of the data beyond what it was intended for stating that the statute provides a very specific purpose of when the information should be disclosed. Mr. Iaccarino, Ms. Panke, and Attorney Del Ciampo will meet to look at the statutes before the criteria for the sampling group is created. However, it was agreed by all that the results will not involve any names, simply raw data.

### **3. Follow-up Discussion of Surveys Regarding Useful Data Elements**

The survey was sent to 4 people, of which only 3 replied. The members agreed the survey format should be altered to contain a 1-5 option, where 1 means "Least Useful" and 5 means "Most Useful." After the revisions are done, the survey will be sent to all magistrates. Magistrate Sosnoff-Baird will ask Judge Munro if it is appropriate to mail it to the Judges as well.

Mr. Iaccarino will attend the Family Magistrate Quarterly Meeting scheduled for June 22 in the event the magistrates need further explanation about the survey.

### **4. Access and Legal Agreements to Systems**

As mentioned under Item 2 of the agenda, the group agreed that there is no need to be specific at this time.

### **5. Discussion of Relevant Computer Systems**

Mr. Patrick Deak explained that there already is a simplistic mechanism in place and its features can be expanded (if allowable) to track information. It could be made accessible to the magistrates. He explained the data is there, it is just a matter of relating it together. Mr. Deak will update the document titled "Tracking Family Magistrate Cases" dated 3/11/2009.

### **6. Next Meeting**

There will be no additional meetings unless necessary. The group will communicate via email. Mr. Iaccarino will put together a document in bullet form with the group's recommendations.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:40 p.m.