

Access and Service Delivery Committee

Report to

Minnesota Judicial Council

July 17, 2008



**MINNESOTA
JUDICIAL
BRANCH**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | |
|---|----|
| Access and Service Delivery Committee Members..... | ii |
| Future Challenges for the Courts | 1 |
| Committee Background | 2 |
| Committee Charge | 3 |
| Process for Identifying Options | 3 |
| Considered Options..... | 4 |
| A Vision of the New Court System | 4 |
| Strategy: Increasing Staff Productivity—Staffing to the Most Efficient Norm | 7 |
| Strategy: Re-engineer Workflow in an Electronic Environment..... | 8 |
| Strategy: Legislative and Court Policy Reform..... | 10 |
| Strategy: Structure/governance issues | 11 |
| Recommended Options..... | 11 |
| Recommended Priorities..... | 15 |
| Summary of Recommended Actions | 17 |
| Appendices..... | 18 |
| Appendix A NCSC Consulting Services | 20 |
| Appendix B Partial List of Sources for Potential Options..... | 24 |
| Appendix C Other Potential Options | 25 |
| Appendix D Best Practices | 29 |
| Appendix E Option Cost Assessment by Priority..... | 33 |
| Appendix F Option Time Horizon by Priority..... | 36 |
| Appendix G Stakeholders Assessment By Priority | 37 |
| Appendix H Policy Authority by Priority..... | 43 |
| Appendix I (MNET) | 45 |
| Appendix J Options Short Description By Priority | 46 |

Access and Service Delivery Committee Members

Honorable John Rodenberg, Chair
Honorable David Knutson
Jerry Winter
Honorable Gregg Johnson
Honorable Lucy Wieland
Honorable Chuck Porter
Judy Besemer
Honorable Mike Kirk
Tim Ostby
Honorable Jerry Seibel
Honorable Jon Maturi
Honorable James Florey
Sue Dosal, Ex Officio

Project Staff

Heidi Green, Consultant
National Center for State Courts
 Thomas Clarke, Vice President Research and Technology
 Daniel Hall, Vice President Court Consulting Services

**Report of the Access and Service Delivery Committee
to the
Minnesota Judicial Council
July 17, 2008**

This report describes the charge to the Access and Service Delivery Committee (ASD Committee), the background leading to the Committee's creation, the process the Committee used, the options it considered, the strategies that it identified, the options it recommends, and the priorities it recommends for implementing the options. A number of appendices provide extensive details in all of these areas.

Future Challenges for the Courts

Fundamental demographic shifts in the population present a long-term challenge for the courts that will extend well into the next decade. The baby boom generation is just now beginning to hit retirement age. Beginning in 2008 and extending into the next decade, Minnesota will see a 30 percent jump in workers reaching the average retirement age of 62. Seniors over the age of 65 will exceed the number of school age children for the first time in our history. The cost for government-funded social security, medical care, and public employee pensions for those aging baby boomers will put unprecedented financial pressures on local, state, and federal governments. These pressures will shift government spending priorities to issues of aging and health and away from other state services, including the courts.

As people retire, they tend to earn less taxable income and begin relying on retirement benefits and accumulated savings. As such and according to experts, they tend to pay less taxes and be more fiscally conservative than younger voters. As the percent of retired people in the population grows, tax revenues needed to pay for state and local government decline. Over the next decade, the baby boomers will change government spending priorities and their retirement will result in less tax revenue, putting the squeeze on all traditional state government spending—including the courts. Thus even in relatively strong economic times, the courts will face greater competition for tax dollars.

Moreover, as the baby boomers are retiring, the relative number of new workers in the state will be shrinking, creating competition for employees. The state demographer estimates that the Minnesota workforce will continue to shrink over the next two decades and at a rate that exceeds the national average.

The courts face twin challenges in the future:

- Significant budget constraints no matter how meritorious the needs of the judicial branch or how essential the government function we fulfill.
- Smaller available workforce with significant competition for a limited pool of workers.

Minnesota will not be alone in requiring their government to examine ways in which it does business. Other states are also struggling as our economy turns down and the baby boomers start retiring. But like the private sector, those who are able to adapt to the changing times are most likely to succeed.

Committee Background

The Judicial Council formed the Access and Services Delivery (ASD) Committee to begin the process of addressing a future of continuing revenue shortfalls and worker shortages. The Council's charge to the Committee in February was to develop options for restructuring delivery systems, redesigning business processes, expanding the use of technology and prioritizing functions to provide appropriate levels of access and services statewide at the lowest cost given the projected fiscal and demographic outlook.

As part of the early strategic planning process, the Strategic Planning Committee was aware and mindful of financial constraints that would be facing the judiciary in the coming years. As it developed, the onset of financial constraints was somewhat earlier and the severity greater, than originally anticipated. This was due, in part, to the changing state budget forecasts during the time period from the fall of 2007 to the winter of 2007-2008.

In one of the early drafts of the proposed strategic plan, the Strategic Planning Committee was considering inclusion of a goal something like the following:

Explore ways to gain efficiencies in the way some court business processes are handled. For example, process citations in central locations, process jury summons in central locations, use hearing officers in central locations through ITV.

Additionally, the Strategic Planning Committee was considering inclusion of a strategic goal something along the following lines:

Explore the appropriate level of service delivery necessary to provide access to justice throughout the state, including but not limited to, the number of court locations, services to be provided in each court location, the hours of operation, and the appropriate use of ITV.

As early as January 2008, it was evident that the judiciary was going to be experiencing financial constraints not previously anticipated—that the changing demographics and long-term fiscal decline predicted for the future had already started. Given that the Strategic Planning Committee was already exploring the issues set forth above, the Council decided on January 18, 2008 “to examine the appropriate level of service delivery necessary to provide access to justice throughout the state,” and decided that the initiative should be undertaken immediately.

Committee Charge

At its meeting on January 18, 2008, the Judicial Council authorized the formation of a committee to take a global look at the operations and structure of the judicial branch and develop recommendations for possible Council consideration and action. The Council provided that:

This examination would include, but not be limited to, the number of court locations, services to be provided in each court location, the hours of operation, the appropriate use of ITV, cost containment or reduction through technology and efficiencies to be gained in the way court business processes are handled through new methods (e.g. processing of citations and jury summons and use of hearing officers in central locations) and consideration of appropriate out-sourcing.

The Judicial Council requested the Chief Justice to appoint members to the newly created ASD Committee. See Appendix A for a list of the Committee members. Given the short time frame of the project, outside consultants from the National Center for State Courts (NCSC) were hired to assist the newly formed Committee. (See Appendix B, p. 19 for the NCSC proposal.) The Committee sought to create an evaluation environment that would encourage innovative thinking so that wide-ranging options could be gathered and considered regardless of how politically unpopular they might be. The Committee reviewed options for restructuring delivery systems, redesigning business processes, expanding the use of technology, and prioritizing functions to provide the greatest levels of access and service statewide at the lowest cost. The Committee was to report its initial findings to the Judicial Council at the July 2008 meeting.

Process for Identifying Options

The Committee considered options from a wide variety of sources, both historical and current. It solicited suggestions from a number of court groups and received several unsolicited communications from court staff and others. No idea was considered off-limits initially, up to and including those that would require changes in the state constitution. Attached as Appendix C, p. 24, is a partial list of the sources considered by the Committee.

The Committee initially decided to evaluate proposed options using four criteria: cost impact, feasibility, service impact, and time impact.

- *Cost impact* is the net savings to the court system after deducting implementation and operational costs from cost savings.
- *Feasibility* is an assessment of possible constraints to implementation from all sources, including political resistance from key stakeholders.
- *Service impact* describes any improvements or reductions in service levels to court stakeholders.
- *Time impact* assesses how long it will take to implement the option and gain any benefits.

Early in the process the Committee thought about identifying potential out-sourcing opportunities and identified several criteria for use in determining likely candidates. Ultimately, the Committee decided not to make any recommendations about out-sourcing.

The Committee considered ways to solicit input from various external court stakeholders on service impacts. By definition, this is hard to do, since many court users are just not very knowledgeable about the court system in general and court services in particular. It is especially difficult for users to imagine future business processes and services that do not currently exist. One suggested approach was to hold facilitated focus groups with targeted groups of court stakeholders to gather input only on those options that appeared to strongly affect public services. The Committee decided not to pursue this idea because of time and resource limitations. Instead, the Committee members assessed the perceived feasibility of adopting the various options by stakeholder group. Of course, these ratings reflect only the Committee's guess at how those stakeholder groups would react.

Considered Options

The Committee reviewed all submitted options from all sources. A list of options considered, but not recommended, is provided in Appendix C, p.25. Some options were screened out relatively quickly for the following reasons:

- Low impact on costs
- Long time to realize benefits
- Not feasible, especially politically

Past reports and suggestions from court personnel were so numerous that it was literally not possible to fully investigate all the suggestions. The Committee attempted only to perform a reasonable screening of the options that would sift out the most promising candidates. This sifting process turned out to be somewhat iterative, with some options being considered several times or in several forms as more information became available.

The Committee found a number of the suggested options to have significant merit as best practices, and should be encouraged by referral to the appropriate administrative committee for development, but are beyond the high-level perspective of the ASD Committee's charge. A list of the options identified as best practices, the options that the Committee studied, and the options that the Committee chose not to study are provided in Appendix E, p. 29.

A Vision of the New Court System

Although the Committee decided ultimately to focus as a first phase of the ASD Committee work on changes that could be made over the next several years, it clearly saw that a more fundamental long-term redesign of the court system is necessary. Recent initiatives already underway or completed in the Minnesota trial courts, such as state-funding and the new MNCIS

technology, provide opportunities for increased efficiencies through centralization¹ and greater public access to the courts through electronic service delivery. To take full advantage of the opportunities presented by these innovations, the court will need to re-invent itself: change the way it delivers services and provides access. If successful, the court may actually find itself in the position of providing improved and better service in spite of the predicted labor shortage and funding downturn.

An analogy may be drawn from the banking industry. The banking industry has experienced tremendous consolidation of companies in the last two decades, reducing costs through greater economies of scale, but at the same time adding electronic services so that today bank clients actually have greater access to their accounts and other banking services. Several other states, most notably Utah, have already begun such a project to examine the opportunities provided by the new technologies and have found that the desired and required changes in court structure and case processing are quite significant. In the future, the courts will provide an increasing proportion of their services using the telephone and Internet rather than provide them solely by court employees at physical court locations. Redesign of this sort may help improve service to the public while providing opportunities to save costs. Thus, in the longer term, the issue shifts away from current economic constraints toward desired service strategies. Looked at from this perspective, the options and recommendations made by this Committee are really just first steps toward the court system of the future.

The Committee was able to identify four major initiatives or strategies that will help shape the court of the future. The strategies are:

- Staff to the most efficient norm
- Re-engineer workflow in an electronic environment
- Legislative and court policy reform
- Structural and governance change (redistricting)

It is difficult to imagine the cumulative impact of the recommended strategies on the court system because some of the potential changes are quite dramatic. A major reconfiguration of the court that includes structural, policy, and workflow change goes beyond the immediate scope of this report, but it is clear to the Committee that some appropriate body should systematically consider such ideas and deliberately begin planning for and adopting strategies to achieve the needed changes. Using the example of the as yet unpublished Utah report on the redesign of their clerk duties, the Committee believes that a group other than this Committee should be convened to consider the long-term vision of service delivery in the Minnesota courts in a systematic way (see Recommended Action 3).

Examples of options that were considered by the Committee and then deferred to an analysis of the future court system by some other body include such ideas as:

- Redesign of the workflow in the court administrator's office.

¹ Centralization does not necessarily mean that such services will be located in St. Paul. In an "e-everything" future, centralized services, where appropriate, may well be located in other parts of the state or outsourced.

(e.g. Remaining work will need to be redesigned once significant changes in workflow occur from electronic filing, centralization, etc.)

- Redesign of the courtroom duties and processes.
(e.g. To take full advantage of the efficiencies derived from digital recording court room duties need to be examined and possibly re-deployed between staff groups, and is deferred for further study and comment as to details.)
- Redistricting and shifting of some functions out of the judicial branch (see Appendix D, p. 25. Redistricting needs to be considered so that the court’s structure supports the future methods of court services delivery.)

More detailed descriptions of the four strategies identified by the Committee follows.

Strategy: Increasing Staff Productivity—Staffing to the Most Efficient Norm

Staffing to the most efficient norm is more of an over-arching strategy than a single initiative. In fact, it will consist of multiple initiatives over a number of years including centralization of services, increased electronic access to the court, remote case processing, and more. Staffing to the most efficient norm implies that staff productivity will increase in all courts, regardless of court size, and that in the future technological and structural change will result in economies to even the smallest, most rural court locations. Several of the most promising, relatively short-term, options that will support the strategy of staffing to the most efficient norm are recommended and prioritized in this report. More significant changes in court business processes in support of the most efficient staffing norm will take longer to implement and should be investigated by a group appointed by the Judicial Council (see Recommended Action 3).

Achieving the most efficient staffing norm will take a mix of technical and business process innovations. The options recommended below include both types of initiatives. For example, the various “e-everything” options will provide a basis for allocating work in the most efficient way. Just as important, business process improvements like the various payments options and the most promising recommendations from the NEAC report (see below in section on Considered Options) will help the courts operate more efficiently.

The Minnesota Court Staff Workload Assessment, 2004 clearly demonstrated the economies of scale that occur with size. A subsequent analysis estimated that staffing to the most efficient norm could save up to \$7,200,000 annually. In general, larger courts are able to deploy staff more efficiently due to staff specialization. The smallest courts, where a limited number of staff need to engage in a variety of tasks and specialization is not possible, demonstrated the least staff productivity. This is not to say that staff in the smallest courts are not working hard, rather that the opportunity for economies to be gained by performing similar tasks repeatedly was not available. These economies through specialization were also seen in the training required for implementing MNCIS. Staff in the largest courts only needed to receive MNCIS training in the case type of their division. For example, criminal division staff only needed to be trained on criminal, while family court staff only needed to be trained on family matters. In contrast, staff from the smallest courts needed to be trained on all case types in MNCIS, as the daily variety inherent in their work included all case types.

The economies of scale that occur with specialization and repetitive tasks in the largest courts was recognized by the ASD Committee as it considered whether to recommend closing the state's smallest courthouses. The Committee found that savings from closing the smallest courts are relatively small while stakeholder opposition is expected to be high. At this time the ASD Committee recommends maintaining local county court locations, although operating within the parameters of the most efficient staffing norms may require limited hours and services in some locations. The ASD Committee found that some court administrators are already finding creative ways to achieve the staffing efficiencies of larger courts by managing resources more centrally. An example of this is the regionalization of juror summons and questionnaire processing as currently conducted in the 9th Judicial District. The 9th Judicial District recently coordinated the processing of all juror summons and juror eligibility questionnaires from its 17 counties under one centralized position. The number of staff involved in juror processing dropped dramatically and the increase in staff productivity matched that of the state's largest single-county districts.

The ASD Committee therefore endorsed in concept the strategy of assessing staff need and deploying court staff based on the most efficient staffing norms, regardless of court size. In other words the options considered would be evaluated in part by the degree to which they increase staff productivity.

Strategy: Re-engineer Workflow in an Electronic Environment

As much as the new technologies support the court's vision for the future by providing the potential for greater access and better service to the public through electronic media and on-line communication, the economic reality of constrained resources, due to the demographic and political change previously described, must be considered when planning for the future and implementing the new technologies. New technologies must support the court's vision of service delivery, but ideally must also increase staff productivity in such a manner so as to achieve the access and service goals of the court in the future with increasingly limited resources.

The Minnesota courts are better placed than many other institutions to face the challenges of the future in large part because of the recent implementation of MNCIS, the new statewide case management system that employs the latest technologies. The next phase of MNCIS implementation includes the integration of ancillary technologies, such as e-filing, that promise to increase worker productivity and allow the court to more efficiently communicate with its business partners. These efficiencies will be especially important to the smallest courts, that will need to dramatically increase staff productivity. However, in order to realize the greatest economies offered by the new technologies and maintain the highest level of service to the public possible, significant business process redesign is needed. Old, traditional processes cannot be maintained with just a window dressing of new technology overlaid.

Both private industry and the executive branch of state government have moved beyond the idea that every service location must actually perform all the services offered by the enterprise. This strategy offers an alternative, taking advantage of the new technologies, to offer **access** to all of

the court's services from every location or, in some cases, from non-court locations via the Internet, telephone, or other electronic means. Centralizing or regionalizing the provision of these services, such as centralizing payables, and providing back-up in the form of remote case-processing capabilities, will free up local court staff to focus on those services that cannot be entirely automated, such as walk-in pro se help for domestic abuse petitioners. The kind of economies that will come from re-engineering the court's business process in a new electronic environment may allow the physical courthouses in local communities to be maintained with minimal staff, making their continued presence in the community a viable option.

Re-engineering in the electronic environment will also need to include an objective examination of business processes in the courtroom. Capabilities like electronic minutes, electronic orders, in-court updating, digital audio recording, and virtual witnesses via videoconferencing should compel a reconsideration of who does what and how during hearings. For example, we know that in-court updates of documents and orders requires a practiced choreography between the judge and court staff to attain the same level of efficiency as traditional hearings, with the benefit of immediate generation of orders, elimination of duplicate back office data entry and processing that is now required following hearings. The redesign of courtroom processes should be role based, without regard initially for who fills the roles.

The Committee spent considerable time discussing duties of courtroom staff in the electronic environment and members made various suggestions for redeploying staff in a manner that takes advantage of the new technologies, best supports the needs of the courtroom, and achieves the economies promised by digital technology. For example, the Committee found that one of the most effective ways for the smallest courts to achieve "staffing to the most efficient norm" in the near-term is to efficiently divide the courtroom support duties between court administration and the judge unit staff.² In some counties in the 8th District this is already being done on many calendars. Digital recording is used in the courtroom which frees the court reporter and /or law clerk to record the courtroom minutes and produce the court orders. As part of Recommended Action 3, the designated new group should include within its scope the re-examination of courtroom business processes and roles.

Re-engineering court processes has the potential for the greatest transformation of court business beyond the individual changes effected by each individual option. For example, if e-citation is used in combination with other electronic options such as auto assess (to assess and disperse payments), auto referral (to automatically refer over-due cases to a collection agency), and automated payment (through the web or phone), approximately 1.2 million of the 2 million cases filed with the courts each year would be processed with little or no human intervention. Significant reductions in staff levels can then be made without a corresponding decline in service to the public. The NCSC estimates from the Minnesota e-PDQ data (data collected annually on staff duties and responsibilities) that workflow re-engineering promises an additional 30% savings in staff FTEs over and above the economies that are achieved from the individual initiatives. Confirming the potential significance of this transformation is a Utah study concluding that the bulk of clerical work in court administration can be automated.

² The committee discussed the fact that the judge unit is budgeted at 100%. Court administration has absorbed the majority of the budget shortfall and is operating at about 85% of need. The intention of this strategy would be to better balance workload across employee groups.

Recommended Action 3 describes the need for a group of the Judicial Council to immediately begin constructing a long-term service delivery plan. Such a plan should marry overall workload reengineering to the transformative options being considered. Under the long-term service delivery plan, each new technology or initiative would be required to contribute to the long-term service delivery strategy. Moreover the existence of an agreed upon strategy as to the direction in which the branch is headed will encourage near-term decisions and actions that align with and support movement toward that goal.

Strategy: Legislative and Court Policy Reform

In the course of reviewing options for consideration, the Committee examined the excellent report of the Non-Felony Enforcement Advisory Committee (NEAC, 1997).³ The recommendations made by that group were largely not acted upon after the report was issued. This Committee unanimously felt that the NEAC recommendations needed to be seriously reconsidered as soon as is possible. The Committee also directed staff to ascertain the extent to which the judicial branch is able to effectuate changes in policy and practice without action or involvement of the legislature or others outside of the judicial branch (see Appendix I). It appears to the Committee that at least one major initiative, the expansion and creation of uniformity in the payables list, is both consistent with the NEAC recommendations and within the authority of the judicial branch to implement in the near-term.

The court will also need to help the legislative branch prioritize the work of the court and shift those disputes that are administrative in nature to an executive agency for resolution. Adjudicatory priorities must be identified and alternative adjudicatory processes for non criminal cases must be considered. For example, the courts need to show their support for the Department of Vehicle Services (DVS) efforts to upgrade their technology, and will also need to help re-educate the legislature that oversight of administrative matters, such as proof of insurance, registration, and driver's licenses, not only is best administered by DVS, but is also the most effective and efficient use of scarce tax resources.

³ The Non-felony Enforcement Advisory Committee ("NEAC") was established by the 1993 Legislature in response to concerns about the proportionality, prosecution, and enforcement of non-felony offenses. The Committee's specific mandate, as amended in 1995, was to:

- analyze relative penalty levels for non-felony crimes against the person, low-level felony property crimes, and crimes for which there are both felony and non-felony penalties; and
- recommend any necessary changes in Minnesota law to achieve the following:
 - proportionality of penalties for gross misdemeanors, misdemeanors, and petty misdemeanors;
 - effective enforcement and prosecution of these offenses; and
 - efficient use of criminal justice system resources.

The Committee consisted of a broad cross section of the criminal justice community, including legislators, city and county attorneys, judges, criminal defense attorneys, probation officers, law enforcement, law professors, and public members. Appointments to the Committee were made by the chairs of the senate crime prevention and house judiciary committees. The Committee was chaired by Sue Dosal, the State Court Administrator.

Other portions of the NEAC report will require legislative action and consultation with the other branches of government. The Committee believes that those recommendations should also be pursued vigorously.

Strategy: Structure/governance issues

Although some of the fundamental changes will continue to be driven by new technological opportunities, other forces in the larger environment are equally important in driving the courts toward new business strategies and processes. One such strategy that began with state funding and continued with the creation of the Judicial Council, is for the court to redesign itself in the model of a single enterprise, rather than 89 or 10 separate organizations. Policy, management structure, and service delivery designs that support the “single entity” model not only promote consistency throughout the state, but are also necessary to achieve the kind of large-scale cost savings needed in the future.

The Committee agreed that ten judicial districts are probably not needed and briefly reviewed proposed criteria for determining the optimal number of judicial districts. The Committee also listened to ideas for multi-county administrative management units, based on judicial assignment areas. The Committee strongly supports work underway in the 5th, 8th, and 9th Judicial Districts to move toward multi-county court administrators overseeing a judicial assignment area. It is clear that if future service delivery is provided from both centralized locations as well as local facilities, then a new management structure will be required that supports both the new hybrid system of service deployment and also promotes the “single business entity” concept .

The Committee decided to recommend that a separate group be tasked to consider the need for structural changes as part of a larger redesign of the court overall.

Recommended Options

The strategies outlined above served as guideposts, helping the Committee select options that were consistent with a vision of a high-functioning court of the future, one that is successful through innovation and deliberate planning, despite the twin challenges of impending work force declines and long-term funding reductions. On a more prosaic level, the Committee generally selected options that would support staffing to the most efficient norm (increase staff productivity, particularly in the smallest courts), were relatively easy to implement, provided large cost savings, and would achieve savings in the short term. (An option was considered “short term” if it was believed that savings from that option would occur within two years.)

The potential for cost savings was not necessarily the determining factor as to whether the Committee chose to recommend an option. For example, centralizing probate annual reviews which include the hiring of specialized staff, such as auditors, was identified as a low savings option, but was regarded by the Committee as a good business practice, relatively easy to adopt.

The recommended options are shown summarized and categorized by long-term strategy in Table 1 below. Also included in this table are promising options that the Committee referred for further study.

Table 1 – Recommended and Referred Options by Strategy
(Options highlighted in italics were referred for further study.⁴ See Appendix D, p. 25.)

Strategy: Staff to the most efficient norm

- Centralize payables processing
- Centralize/regionalize mandated services
- Centralize probate annual reports
- Expand use of subordinate judicial officers

Strategy: Work flow re-engineering in the electronic environment

- Implement traffic citation and criminal electronic filing
- Implement in-court updating
- Implement civil electronic filing
- Implement document scanning
- Upgrade the WAN to support e-documents statewide
- *Re-engineer workflow and service delivery throughout the courts*

Strategy: Legislative & court policy reform

- *Increase payables*
- *Pursue NEAC initiatives*

Strategy: Structural/governance issues

- *Redistricting*

⁴ Options shown in italics were recommended for further study. Re-engineering workflow and service delivery will take a concerted effort to imagine and design the court of the future; to change workflow to take optimal advantage of the new technologies while promoting the court's strategic priorities. Similarly, additional study is needed to consider the structural and governance issues required to support the court of the future. Redistricting needs to be considered along with re-engineered workflow. See Recommended Action 3. The Committee recognizes that staffing to the most efficient norm will require that we continue to study issues of hours of counter operations, etc., in the near-term, but until a long-term strategy is developed, these items should at this time be left to the districts for determination. Similarly, while successfully pursuing NEAC initiatives is a long-term initiative, some work may begin immediately. Therefore, the Committee recommends that the legislative strategy options be referred to the COPS committee for development of a legislative strategy and immediate work on the state payables list.

More detailed descriptions of the recommended options follow.

- A. Centralize payables processing.** This option consists of three sub-options.
- i. Process payments centrally. Payments for payables are sent to a central location by mail, IVR (interactive voice response or phone payments), or IWR (interactive web response or web payments) and processed on one location.
 - ii. Implement Auto Assess. MNCIS automatically splits the payments to the appropriate recipient.
 - iii. Implement automated referral to collections. Cases are automatically and electronically referred to a collection agency when the payer date is exceeded or when a payment plan payment is missed. No clerk action is involved in referring the case. Collected payments are automatically received into MNCIS.
- B. Centralize/regionalize mandated services.** This option begins with jury services. Centralize and out-source processing of jury summons. Regionalize processing of juror qualification questionnaires.
- C. Centralize probate annual reports.** Centralize the processing of probate annual reports for conservatorships and guardianships including annual accounting and well-being reports. Hire qualified staff to do the work.
- D. Increase payables.** This option consists of four sub-options.
- i. Establish a fine schedule for all petty misdemeanors that are payables to minimize or eliminate staff time in setting fine amounts.
 - ii. Expand the list of misdemeanors that are payables.
 - iii. Expand the list of ordinance violations that are payables.
 - iv. Eliminate multiple fines (Some statutes are payable only in part and need staff intervention in order to be properly assessed thereby interfering with any economies that could be gained through automated processing. An example of this is 169A.35 sub. 2 or 3, an open bottle violation. A citation issued to a passenger is payable, but a citation issued to the driver requires a mandatory appearance.)
- E. Expand use of subordinate judicial officers.** This option consists of four sub-options.
- i. Use hearing officers for all fine mitigation hearings (payable petty misdemeanors and non-traffic misdemeanors, traffic citations, parking citations).
 - ii. Centralize processing of fine mitigation services online and/or with regionally located hearing officers, using ITV where appropriate.
 - iii. Use pro tem attorneys for conciliation, housing and some mental health hearings.
 - iv. Regionalize referees, using ITV where appropriate.
- F. Implement traffic citation and criminal electronic filing.**
- i. Receive traffic citations from law enforcement agencies in electronic form and process them into MNCIS as digital documents and/or data.
 - ii. Receive criminal complaints electronically and process them into MNCIS as digital documents and/or data.

- iii. Support electronic charging and electronic signatures as required to implement electronic filing of adult criminal cases into MNCIS.
- G. Implement civil electronic filing.** Electronically file all case initiation filings and subsequent case filings for all civil case types into MNCIS. Combined with electronic document storage and paper document scanning (where necessary), this option replaces the paper case file with the electronic case file.
- H. Implement document scanning.** All paper documents are scanned immediately after filing and attached to the MNCIS case record as an object. This creates an electronic case file.
- I. Implement in-court updates.** This option consists initially of three sub-options.
- i. Make MNCIS minute entries in the courtroom.
 - ii. Produce an electronic sentence order that can be printed out in the courtroom.
 - iii. Produce additional electronic orders in the courtroom where appropriate.
- J. Upgrade the wide area network (WAN) to support electronic documents statewide.** The electronic case files are available at all court locations. This extends the capability in the civil electronic filing option to access electronic case files regionally, allowing for remote case processing. See Appendix J for a map of current WAN locations

Recommended Priorities

The Committee prioritized its recommended options into three levels of decreasing importance as follows.

Priority 1

- A. Centralize payables processing
- B. Standardize collections processing and referral
- C. Expand and standardize payables and, as needed, change corresponding statutes
- D. Implement traffic citation and criminal electronic filing
- E. Implement in-court updates

Priority 2

- A. Centralize/regionalize mandated services
- B. Centralize probate annual reviews

Priority 3

- A. Expand use of subordinate judicial officers
- B. Implement civil electronic filing
- C. Implement document scanning
- D. Upgrade the wide area network to support electronic documents statewide

In general, the recommended options were prioritized according to how well they promoted the vision for the court’s future, increased staff productivity, were consistent with the court’s business priorities, and were perceived as relatively easy to implement. The following Table 2 attempts to graphically depict the priority preferences of the Committee.


Priority level 1 options tend to be relatively easy to implement and promise to yield significant savings in the short term. A notable exception to this concerns the “Expand Payables” option. This option was viewed as being partially “easy” (increasing payables on the state payables list, which can be done immediately by court action) and partially “hard” (it contains components that would require statute change). To indicate this split, the option is listed twice in Table 2.

Priority level 2 options involve the centralization of mandated services and probate annual reports. Although both of these options are thought to result in relatively moderate cost savings, it is believed that centralization of these services will result in higher quality service delivery because of the staff specialization that will occur through centralization.

Priority level 3 options tend to be either lower in savings and/or longer to achieve savings than other options. But mostly, although still recommended by the Committee, Priority level 3 options were just viewed as being less compelling than the Priority 1 and 2 options.

Finally, the Committee found that while individual projects may yield some cost savings, the largest potential cost savings would come when business processes were re-engineered to take advantage of the new technologies. The Committee recognized that an effort to re-engineer the court’s work processes in total would be a long-term initiative with many obstacles.

Table 2



Summary of Recommended Actions

1. The Judicial Council should select four or five initial options to implement statewide.
2. The Judicial Council should establish a group to formulate a high-level work plan (sequence, schedule, resources) to implement the selected options as soon as practicable.
3. The Judicial Council should immediately establish a group to study the longer range options implied by the vision for future service delivery (redistricting, reengineering of back office and courtroom duties and processes, etc.)
4. The Judicial Council should formulate a communication plan no later than August 2008 that directs a small team to visit every district to discuss the Judicial Council recommendations, the ASD Committee report, and the FY09 budget.
5. The Judicial Council should review and approve any new appointments of district administrators if vacancies occur until an appropriate group (Recommendation 3 above) considers possible redistricting or consolidation proposals.

Appendices

Appendix A – NCSC Scope of Work document

Appendix B – Partial Source List for Options

Appendix C – Other Potential Options; Other Options Studied

Appendix D – Best Practices

Appendix E – Cost Data; Cost Notes

Appendix F – Implementation Time Horizon

Appendix G – Stakeholders

Appendix H – Authorization

Appendix I – Electronic Infrastructure Map of Minnesota

Appendix J – Short Descriptions of each Option

Notes on Appendices

Appendices E, F, G, H, and J document the information gathered on the recommended options. The information in the appendices should not be viewed as complete nor exhaustive, but rather reflective of an effort to collect readily available information in a relatively short time frame. Moreover, assessments of cost and time to implement were often necessarily guesses, with fairly wide ranges in some cases. Lastly, it was also recognized that the manner and speed of implementation will also determine start-up costs. Options accepted by the Judicial Council will therefore require more detailed analysis, especially as to how an option is to be implemented (e.g. statewide or county by county) to accurately determine reliable implementation costs and expected net savings. Appendix E documents the cost information gathered, followed by cost notes that describe the assumptions used in costing the option. It should be noted that the estimated costs found in Appendix E generally do not include implementation costs for new projects. The “next step” to any option accepted by the Judicial Council should be a detailed implementation plan that includes implementation costs.

Appendix F shows the estimated time horizon to achieve cost savings of each option. The most common current implementation status described for each option is either “none,” meaning there is not currently a specific roll out plan for implementation of the option, followed by “county by county.” In a “county by county” implementation plan there is no overall time line for statewide implementation, rather the project is implemented as local jurisdictions become willing and/or able to participate in the project. Implementation costs will increase if an option is viewed as requiring an accelerated time horizon to statewide implementation.

Appendix G describes the Committee members' perceptions of stakeholder support for an option. A low score (near one) indicates a perception that a stakeholder would support an option. A high score (near three) indicates a perception that a stakeholder would NOT support an option. In general, the more stakeholders viewed by the Committee as likely to oppose an initiative, the more likely the Committee viewed the option as difficult to achieve or "hard." But the Committee was also likely to view an option as "hard" to achieve if a key stakeholder with significant policy authority was perceived as being likely to oppose an option. For example, if judges were likely to oppose an option within their authority to change or the legislature was likely to be opposed to an option that required a statute change, then the option tended to be classified as "hard" to achieve, regardless of the number of other stakeholders who might support it.

Appendix H indicates the policy authority needed for the option, such as a change in statute. Most of the options considered were within the authority of the Judicial Council to enact. Lastly, Appendix J provides a short written description of each recommended option.

Appendix A NCSC Consulting Services

Scope of Work Minnesota Access and Service Delivery Redesign Project

General Approach

The following approach will be used to identify a new strategy for service delivery and a set of redesigned business processes to support a more efficient provision of court services to the public:

1. Perform a quick high-level assessment of costs, service capabilities, service requirements and potential reengineering business process targets and strategies.
 - a. Describe high-level cost allocations.
 - b. Disaggregate high-level allocations by major business process.
2. Document and prioritize *current* service capabilities.
 - a. Determine which capabilities are consistently in scope as court services statewide.
 - b. Describe high-level capabilities.
 - c. Disaggregate key capabilities.
 - d. Rank current capabilities.
3. Document and prioritize *desired* service capabilities.
 - a. Identify criteria for ranking capabilities.
 - b. Define customer-desired service capabilities and service levels.
 - c. Adjust current capabilities list to add or delete as required.
 - d. Adjust current service levels to increase or decrease as required.
 - e. Rank desired capabilities.
4. Prioritize business processes to deliver required service capabilities.
 - a. Identify criteria for ranking business processes to redesign.
 - b. Segregate target business processes by time and resources required to implement.
 - c. Rank target business processes.
5. Develop a phased implementation plan for the new business processes.
 - a. Develop a process for deciding which options to implement first.
 - b. Select business processes for redesign.
 - c. Document business cases for successful implementation.
6. Document repeatable process for maintaining service delivery strategy.

The approach distinguishes *current* business capabilities and processes from *customer-desired* capabilities. It also distinguishes *internal* capabilities and processes that are hidden from customers and provide intermediate outputs from *customer-facing* capabilities that deliver business value to end users. Finally, it distinguishes business *capabilities* that provide customer value from business *processes* that the court system uses to deliver the capabilities. This

distinction is important because a given capability can be delivered to customers in multiple ways using multiple business processes. The capability is “what” is delivered. The business process is “how” it is delivered.

Tasks and Deliverables

Task 1: Perform an initial assessment of service improvement opportunities. The NCSC project team will spend three days on-site making an initial assessment of the services delivery situation. The team will document the current high-level business cost allocations. The largest cost allocation categories will then be disaggregated into business processes (cost of judges trying cases, etc.) where possible. On-going infrastructure costs will be included in the analysis and allocated to specific business processes as required. Key cost assumptions will be documented (courthouse in every jurisdiction, etc.).

Interviewees will include internal court staff with knowledge of and expertise in the detailed budgets, business processes and project business cases.

Task 1 Deliverable: A short and informal oral assessment report describing (1) the current cost allocation structure, (2) future service delivery requirements and (3) targets of opportunity for business process reengineering to reduce costs.

Task 2: Document and prioritize *current* service capabilities. If courts across the state vary in what array of services they provide, it can be a difficult exercise to make the initial determination of what is within scope for formal statewide service capabilities. For example, some courts may offer restitution or mental health assessment services and others may not. Once the courts define what high-level service categories will be provided statewide, it becomes progressively easier to tease out what the current service capabilities are. As with the overall project, it is critical to describe all capabilities in terms that do not make implicit assumptions about delivery mechanisms or technology.

The NCSC project team will then work with the Minnesota project team to prioritize current service capabilities from an internal point of view. The key step will be to facilitate the decision-making process of the Judicial Council Access and Service Delivery Committee. The ranking of capabilities will be done using the best available data on associated costs.

Task 2 Deliverable: A description of (1) prioritized current service capabilities and (2) their costs.

Task 3: Document and prioritize *desired* service capabilities. The identification of desired and/or required service capabilities should proceed along two paths. With the help of the project teams, the Judicial Council Access and Service Delivery Committee will look at internal business processes that support customer services, apply a budget constraint based on expected funding levels to prioritized current capabilities, and determine what capabilities can be supported and delivered without any redesign. The project teams will facilitate a small focus group of court customers to specify what desired capabilities should exist from the viewpoint of the public, litigants and funding agencies without reference to current funding constraints or

delivery mechanisms. These two approaches will then be reconciled as a single ranking of desired service capabilities.

Task 3 Deliverable: A reconciled and prioritized set of desired and/or required service capabilities from both internal and customer points of view.

Task 4: Identify business processes to deliver the required service capabilities. This is the core of the project. The selection of target business processes will depend on several criteria: impact on cost structure, required resources to implement, implementation timing, impact on desired customer services, impact on desired customer service levels, and other factors.

Task 4 Deliverables:

- A process for prioritizing and choosing business process and service options
- A target set of business processes and resulting service capabilities to redesign
- A ranking of target business processes and resulting service capabilities based on a tradeoff analysis
- High-level cost estimates for target business processes and resulting service capabilities
- Typical timelines to realize savings from target service capabilities
- Presentation on Task 4 Findings to Judicial Council

Task 5: Develop a phased implementation plan for the new business processes. It will be important to both deliver solid and real business value (increased service levels with decreased costs) in the short-term and put in place the ability to incrementally improve the entire system in the long-term. A balance between these two objectives will help the court show immediate progress while avoiding the creation of roadblocks to even more significant improvement.

Task 5 Deliverable: A high-level implementation strategy for the prioritized target service capabilities and business processes.

Task 6: Document a high-level process for maintaining the service redesign and delivery strategy. This deliverable will enable Minnesota court staff to update the strategy in the future as needs and circumstances change.

Task 6 Deliverable: A high-level process for updating service delivery strategy.

Project Team

The NCSC project team should consist initially of staff with the following skill sets:

- Extensive knowledge of court budgets and funding processes
- Extensive knowledge of court business process redesign methods
- Ability to facilitate identification and documentation of business requirements (capabilities and service levels)
- Ability to identify opportunities to better utilize technology

These staffing requirements can be met with a three-person team:

- Dan Hall, Vice President Court Consulting Services (budgets, funding)
- Tom Clarke, Vice President Research and Technology (business process redesign, technology support)
- Heidi Green, a consultant with the Minnesota courts (court business process and business requirements).

In later phases of the project, business processes experts can be used in short-term iterations to work on the details of new best practices for service delivery for specific capabilities.

Project Schedule

| Task | Schedule | Task End Date | On-Site Trip | Tele/Video Conference |
|--|-----------------|---------------------------|-------------------------------|------------------------------|
| 1 | Weeks 1- 3 | February 29 th | Feb 27 - 29 | |
| 2 | Weeks 4 - 6 | March 21 st | | |
| 3 | Weeks 7 - 10 | April 18 th | Week of April 4 th | |
| 4 | Weeks 11 – 20 | July 30 th | Week of July 13 th | Week of May 19 th |
| 5 | Week 2 | | | |
| 6 | Week 1 | | | |
| Project team will meet with the Judicial Council in July at a date to be determined to present and discuss the project findings. | | | | |

Note: The schedule assumes a start date of February 11, 2008

Detailed tasks by week will be provided to the Minnesota project team lead (Heidi Green) during the first week of the project.

Appendix B

Partial List of Sources for Potential Options

- Minnesota Judicial Workload Assessment Report, 2002
- Minnesota Court Staff Workload Assessment Report, 2004
- ePDQ data, 2006
- Minnesota District Court Transformation Project Report, 2003
- Working Group on Criminal Justice System Efficiency Report, 2003
- Non-Felony Enforcement Advisory Committee Report, 1997
- Budget Contingency Working Group Report, 2003
- Project Staff Meetings
 - AOC staff
 - District Administrators and staff
- Utah Comprehensive Clerical Committee Draft Report, 2008 (confidential)
- Solicited suggested from district court administrators
- Solicited suggested from key AOC staff
- Solicited suggested from ASD Committee members
- Unsolicited suggestions from court system staff (anonymous letter)

Appendix C

Other Potential Options

1. Mandate pre-court diversions statewide.
2. Eliminate pre-sentence investigations for misdemeanors.
3. Give probation officers authority to impose sanctions for violations subject to court review at the request of the violator.
4. Consolidate judicial districts from ten to six or four.
5. Eliminate some civil case types.
6. Decriminalize various categories of misdemeanors or redefine non-violent misdemeanors as petty misdemeanors.
7. Increase the list of offenses that may be resolved by the administrative payment of a fine without a court appearance.
8. Handle a first failure to appear to provide proof of insurance with an administrative process.
9. Handle juvenile petty offense as administrative payables.
10. Make mandatory use of non-court ADR in all civil and family cases.
11. Encourage increased use of private courts.
12. Out-source pro se services.
13. Out-source mediation services.
14. Convert to virtual state law library.
15. Standardize on best calendaring and case flow practices (combined omnibus, pre-trial and settlement hearings).
16. Standardize on best jury management practices (one day one trial, etc.).
17. Use one law clerk for every two judges.
18. Pay executive branch agencies to operate ITV remote facilities.

19. Increase use of remote telephone or video interpreting (use of in-person interpreters for trials only).
20. Increase use of ITV for hearings, judges' meetings, and other routine events.
21. Handle conciliation court administratively (possibly with hearing officers).
22. Eliminate civil jury trials.
23. Transfer name change and civil administrative licensing hearings to executive branch.
24. Eliminate misdemeanor orders in favor of court minutes.
25. Move various driver privilege functions from courts to DPS and law enforcement.
26. Use voluntary placement of juveniles without court involvement if not contested.
27. Regionalize, centralize, and put online as much pro se materials and support as possible.
28. Provide a centralized online database of standard rulings for use by law clerks and judges.
29. Eliminate reporting and recording for juvenile and traffic matters.
30. Eliminate the right to a jury trial for misdemeanors.
31. Combine the Rule 5 and 8 appearance hearings in all criminal cases.
32. Require binding arbitration, paid for by parties, for property disputes in marriage dissolution cases.
33. Fund only two ADAs per district.
34. Make in-court updating mandatory for all case types, especially orders in juvenile delinquency and child welfare/dependency cases.
35. Standardize all policies, procedures, and practices statewide.
36. Merge EOD and Court Services.
37. Automate the referral of all delinquent accounts to the collection agency statewide (ACS to MNCIS passback).
38. Eliminate the GAL program.
39. Eliminate the Race Census Data program.

40. Eliminate the Self-Help program.
41. Reduce the number of Pro Se forms available.
42. Use business volunteers to analyze and redesign court processes.
43. Improve scheduling of court appearances to reduce continuances (defendants, defense attorneys, prosecutors, interpreters).
44. Reduce the list of offenses required to have a bail study and allow the court discretion in ordering bail studies.
45. Make pre-sentence investigations for felonies discretionary.
46. Standardize CMS codes for case events and outcomes statewide.
47. Train judges regularly on basic caseflow management best practices for criminal cases (omnibus date set at Rule 8 appearance, omnibus hearing 14 days after appearance, preliminary discovery to defense at first court appearance).
48. Schedule an omnibus hearing only if the attorneys indicate the need for a contested hearing.
49. Venue for all proceedings in a juvenile delinquency case will be with the residence county.
50. Juvenile delinquency diversion should be a pre-filing program that involves no court appearances.
51. Consolidate detention and arraignment hearings for juvenile delinquency cases.

Other Options Studied

| Options | | SHORT DESCRIPTIONS |
|----------------|---|--|
| 1 | Re-engineer workflow and service delivery throughout the courts | <i>The ASD committee saw this option as a thorough re-engineering of court business practices that would capitalize on the increase in staff productivity derived from the new technologies and appropriate centralization and produce the highest level of quality service possible given significantly constrained future resources. The committee recommends that a separate work group be formed to study re-engineering in depth.</i> |
| | a Re-configure duties of judge unit and courtroom support | The judge unit provides additional court room support producing minutes and/or orders to assist Court administration. A new skill set is also provided to the judges, possibly including paralegal skills. Cost savings to court administration in terms of FTEs saved could be significant. This assistance would be particularly needed in the smallest courts if staffing to the lowest norm is to be achieved without a significant reduction in counter service. <i>The ASD committee recognized that this option, while already being done in part in some counties because of the availability of digital recording, would need further study in the context of workflow re-engineering to determine the optimal configuration of court room support and judicial assistance.</i> |
| | b Redistricting | Judicial districts are combined to reduce the number of districts statewide and more efficiently and effectively deliver district services. Election districts are also combined to reflect the combined administration of the courts and will allow for more policy consistency and flexibility in judicial assignments. <i>The ASD committee recommendations that this option be studied further and in the context of a larger re-engineering initiative.</i> |
| 2 | Expand volunteer programs for pro se litigant support. | Promote volunteer programs, such as dissolution clinics by the local bar and use of domestic violence advocates, to assist pro se litigants with filings and preparation for court; hire pro tem attorneys to process conciliation ct cases. <i>The ASD committee considered this option to be too variable as a stand alone initiative and classified it as a "Best Practice".</i> |
| 3 | Shift Functions to Department of Public Safety, Driver and Vehicle Services (DVS) | <i>In general, the ASD committee found these initiatives to be largely out of the court's control, except as noted below.</i> |
| | a Driver's records updates | DVS responsible for identifying speeding convictions to not be placed on drivers records [Minn. Stat. ¶ 171.12, subd.6] |
| | b Automated data transfer & update from MNCIS to DVS | DVS to accept and use more data from MNCIS |
| | c DVS administratively processes some citations | Statutory amendments to create an administrative process for first DL, vehicle registration and no insurance within a specified period. Criminal offense for subsequent violations only |
| | d Appeal procedure changed | Amend statutes to eliminate judicial review procedures and add appeal to Ct of Appeals [Minn. Stat.¶¶ 169A.53 and 169A.60] |
| | e Plates/tabs require fines & fees paid | Amend vehicle registration and renewal provisions to require all vehicle fines, fees and surcharges to be paid in full before new plates or tabs are issued |
| | f Proof of insurance procedure standardized | Adopt uniform court practices for acceptance of proof of insurance. <i>The ASD committee characterized this option as a "best practice" to be referred to an administration group such as COAW or CATS.</i> |
| | g Create Insurance database | Create vehicle insurance database by amending Minn. Stat. ¶ 169.791 |
| | h Plates/tabs requires current insurance | Propose statutory amendment to prohibit issuance of plates or tabs if vehicle insurance database doesn't show active insurance. |
| | i Ct does not check proof of insurance | Amend Minn. Stat. ¶¶ 169.791 and 169.72 to eliminate later production of proof of insurance to court administration. |

Appendix D Best Practices

1. Refer practice of staff intervention in payables to COPS.
2. Refer proof of insurance process review to COAW.

Options Studied, Not Studied, and Identified as a "Best Practice"
to be referred to COPS or COAW

| Item | Additional Options | Studied? | Comments |
|------|---|----------------|--|
| 2 | Eliminate pre-sentence investigations for misdemeanors | Best Practice | Except for Domestic |
| 10 | Make mandatory use of non-court ADR in all civil and family cases | Best Practice | Rule 114 |
| 16 | Standardize on best jury management practices (one day one trial, etc) | Best Practice | |
| 31 | Combine the Rule 5 and 8 appearance hearings in all criminal cases | Best Practice | Eliminate rule 8 --legacy from municipal court |
| 43 | Improve scheduling of court appearances to reduce continuances (defendants, defense attorneys, prosecutors, interpreters) | Best Practice | |
| 45 | Make pre-sentence investigations for felonies discretionary | Best Practice | |
| 47 | Train judges regularly on basic caseflow management best practices for criminal cases (omnibus date set at Rule 8 appearance, omnibus hearing 14 days after appearance, preliminary discovery to defense at first court appearance) | Best Practice | |
| 48 | Schedule an omnibus hearing only if the attorneys indicate the need for a contested hearing | Best Practice | |
| 49 | Venue for all proceedings in a juvenile delinquency case will be with the residence county | Best Practice | |
| 51 | Consolidate detention and arraignment hearings for juvenile delinquency cases | Best Practice | |
| 15 | Standardize on best calendaring and case flow practices (combined omnibus, pre-trial and settlement hearings) | Best Practices | Sequestration-change rule; psi-change rules; waive arraignments on all misd except domestics |

| Item | Additional Options | Studied? | Comments |
|------|---|----------|---|
| 1 | Mandate pre-court diversions statewide (not feasible in rural areas?) | No | |
| 3 | Give probation officers authority to impose sanctions for violations subject to court review at the request of the violator | No | Done informally |
| 11 | Encourage increased use of private courts | No | |
| 12 | Out-source pro se services | No | |
| 13 | Out-source mediation services | No | |
| 18 | Pay executive branch agencies to operate ITV remote facilities | No | |
| 20 | Increase use of ITV for hearings, judges' meetings, and other routine events | No | Consolidate into previous option |
| 22 | Eliminate civil jury trials | No | |
| 23 | Transfer name change and civil administrative licensing hearings to executive branch | No | Consolidate into previous option |
| 26 | Use voluntary placement of juveniles without court involvement if not contested | No | |
| 27 | Regionalize, centralize and put online as much pro se materials and support as possible | No | |
| 28 | Provide a centralized online database of standard rulings for use by law clerks and judges | No | |
| 33 | Fund only two ADA's per district | No | Part of previous option |
| 34 | Make in-court updating mandatory for all case types, especially orders in juvenile delinquency and child welfare/dependency cases | No | |
| 35 | Standardize all policies, procedures, and practices statewide | No | Much laughter |
| 37 | Automate the referral of all delinquent accounts to the collection agency statewide (ACS to MNCIS passback) | No | Already investigated in another option |
| 38 | Eliminate the GAL program | No | Move out of the courts--Being examined separately |

| Item | Additional Options | Studied? | Comments |
|------|---|----------|---|
| 39 | Eliminate the Race Census Data program | No | |
| 40 | Eliminate the Self-Help program | No | |
| 41 | Reduce the number of Pro Se forms available | No | |
| 44 | Reduce the list of offenses required to have a bail study and allow the court discretion in ordering bail studies | No | |
| 46 | Standardize CMS codes for case events and outcomes statewide | No | typo - CSM |
| 50 | Juvenile delinquency diversion should be a pre-filing program that involves no court appearances | No | |
| 4 | Consolidate judicial districts from ten to six or four | Yes | Two options--a. Administrative and b. Election districts |
| 5 | Eliminate some civil case types | Yes | Implied consents (administrative?) name change |
| 6 | Decriminalize various categories of misdemeanors or redefine non-violent misdemeanors as petty misdemeanors | Yes | Radically expand payables--make all ordinances payables |
| 7 | Increase the list of offenses that may be resolved by the administrative payment of a fine without a court appearance | Yes | |
| 8 | Handle a first failure to appear to provide proof of insurance with an administrative process | Yes | Administrative disposition --give to the commissioner |
| 9 | Handle juvenile petty offense as administrative payables | Yes | |
| 14 | Convert to virtual state law library | Yes | |
| 17 | Use one law clerk for every two judges | Yes | Reconfigure judicial staff unit |
| 19 | Increase use of remote telephone or video interpreting (use of in-person interpreters for trials only) | Yes | Eliminate cert interpreters at pretrial misd; low level offenses done by phone interpreter ditto arraignments |
| 21 | Handle conciliation court administratively (with hearing officers?) | Yes | Pro tems |

| Item | Additional Options | Studied? | Comments |
|------|---|----------|--|
| 24 | Eliminate misdemeanor orders in favor of court minutes | Yes | In court updating may make this point moot |
| 25 | Move various driver privilege functions from courts to DPS and law enforcement | Yes | |
| 29 | Eliminate reporting and recording for juvenile and traffic matters | Yes | Substitute electronic recording |
| 30 | Eliminate the right to a jury trial for misdemeanors | Yes | 1st offence misd. E.g. bad checks; prostitution--Look up NEAC report |
| 32 | Require binding arbitration, paid for by parties, for property disputes in marriage dissolution cases | Yes | Estimate with dissolutions w/o children |
| 36 | Merge EOD and Court Services | Yes | Outsource EOD? Eliminate CLE's? provide \$ per judge |
| 42 | Use business volunteers to analyze and redesign court processes | Yes | How much do outside consultants cost us? |

Appendix E Option Cost Assessment by Priority

Option Cost Assessment by Priority

| Options | | Chg in # of Filings | # of Filings (cases) Impacted | Costs | Economies | Quality Impacts |
|---|---|-----------------------------------|---------------------------------------|---|------------------------|--|
| Priority 1 | | | | | | |
| A. Centralize Processing of Payables | | | | | | |
| i. | Develop centralized processing center | No change in filings | 800,000 statewide | Hiring, training, office space, IVR/WR, check scanner, central post box | 39 FTEs \$2,535,000 | Increase staff productivity; reduce local staff time on cases. |
| ii. | Auto assess | No change in filings | 320,000 payables outside of 2nd & 4th | 120 hr + 160 hr local config time 9,000 citations to break even | 8 FTEs \$520,000 | Fewer split mistakes-- greater accuracy in payments to designee. |
| iii. | Standardize collections-- auto referral | No change in filings | 64,000 referred outside of 2nd & 4th | Training Possible MNCIS Dev. | 19 FTE \$1,235,000 | Promotes rule of law. Statewide consistency and predictability Orders enforced; decreased staff time on case |
| B. Expand Payable Offenses | | | | | | |
| i. | All petty misd made payable | None | | | | Lessens costs to public of coming to court Lessen staff time |
| ii. | Make more misd payable, instead of requiring court appearance | None | | | | Lessens costs of coming to court Jury trials decreased somewhat-- staff/judge time decreased |
| iii. | Ord violations made payable | None | | | | Lessens costs of coming to court Jury trials decreased somewhat-- staff/judge time decreased |
| iv. | Eliminate multiple fines | None | | | | Lessens staff time/makes auto assess less complex |
| v. | Amend statute to make misd into petys | Petys +; misd - | | | | Lessens costs of coming to court Jury trials decreased somewhat-- staff/judge time decreased |
| vi. | Eliminate enhancement of petys | Petys +; misd - | | | | Lessens costs of coming to court Jury trials decreased somewhat-- staff/judge time decreased |
| vii. | Misd with fines <\$300 are petys | None but lessens ct & jury trials | | | | Lessens costs of coming to court Jury trials decreased somewhat-- staff/judge time decreased |
| C. Implement petty & criminal e-filing | | | | | | |
| i. | e-citation | No change in filings | 901202 | | 25 \$1,625,000 | Fewer charging mistakes/expedited workflow Increased staff productivity for both court and law enforcement |
| ii. | e-complaint | No change in filings | 63825 | | 2 \$130,000 | Fewer ct admin mistakes/expedited workflow Increased staff productivity for both court and prosecutor |
| iii. | e-charging/signature | No change in filings | 63825 | | Minimal | Fewer charging mistakes/expedited workflow Increased judge productivity; increased staff productivity for court, LE, & prosecutor |
| D. In-court updating /Sentencing order | | | | | | |
| | In-court updating /Sentencing order | No change in filings | 400,000 | | 21 \$1,300,000 | Partes leave court with correct information May increase order compliance; eliminated duplicate MNCIS entry |

| Options | | Chg in # of Filings | # of Filings (cases) Impacted | Costs | Economies | Quality Impacts |
|-------------------|---|------------------------------------|--|---|---------------------------|--|
| Priority 2 | | | | | | |
| A | Centralize mandated services | | | | | |
| i | Centralized/regionalized juror services | No change in filings | NA | 1 new position | \$75,000 | 9 \$585,000 Improved |
| B | Centralize Processing of Probate Annual Reviews | No change in filings | Approx 5,600 annual acct reports statewide | Hire accts (@ \$15k more), train, office space | \$180,000 (more for acct) | 1 FTE Greater oversight Economies of scale may offset cost of hiring auditors; fewer law suits |
| Priority 3 | | | | | | |
| A | Expand use of Subordinate Judicial Officers | May increase filings | non-metro 160,600 | Hiring, training, office space | | HO replace judges Would you actually decrease AJN? Increased access to fine mitigation services Decrease judicial time on lower priority cases |
| B | Centrally store electronic docs/upgrade WAN | No change in filings | 1.5 million docs | Scanning equipment WAN, additional server space | \$1.5 mil | scanning time off set by records mgmt saving Net0? C records become more accessible and readily available Staff resources may be deployed remotely - allowing greater staffing flexibility |
| i | Scan documents into MNCIS | No change in filings | 12 million | Scanning equipment | \$ 700 per work station | scanning time off set by records mgmt saving Net0? C records become more accessible and readily available Fewer lost files, easier to retrieve |
| ii | Civile-filing | May increase conciliation filings? | All non crim & juv--253,299 (118,798 conciliation) | front-end to work with OA | \$300,000 | 9 \$585,000 Turbo C may increase conciliation ct filings; may decrease costs to filigants esp. outstate Increased productivity for both court staff and bar |

Options Cost Notes by Priority

| Options | | Cost Notes & Assumptions |
|-------------------|---|---|
| Priority 1 | | |
| A | Centralize Processing of Payables | |
| | i. Develop centralized processing center | Estimated 113 FTEs statewide on payables processing at cost of \$6,800,000 annually. Assume staff deployment double 2nd & 4th as they do 1/2 parking, traffic & non traffic misd in state. Savings 113-74 = 39 FTEs, \$2,340,000 Additional economies to come from IVR, MWR & auto assess |
| | ii. Auto assess | Estimate 1 min per citation. 1 million payable. 320,000 payable outside of 2nd & 4th. Auto assess also available post case initiation for non payables (ordered mandatory fine.) |
| | iii. Standardize collections-auto referral | Estimate 2 min per citation- Approx 320,000 payable outside of 2nd & 4th. 80% pd within yr (20% referred?) Docketing FTE savings of 1 FTE; additional savings comes from suspension of local collection activity. 18 scenario collector FTEs working on finance/acct-assume all are eliminated. |
| B | Expand Payable Offenses | |
| | i. All petty misd made payable | Referred to COPS for analysis |
| | ii. Make more misd payable, instead of requiring court appearance | Referred to COPS for analysis |
| | iii. Ord violations made payable | Referred to COPS for analysis |
| | iv. Eliminate multiple fines | Referred to COPS for analysis |
| | v. Amend statute to make misd into pettys | Referred to COPS for analysis |
| | vi. Eliminate enhancement of pettys | Referred to COPS for analysis |
| | vii. Misd with fines <\$300 are pettys | Referred to COPS for analysis |
| C | Implement petty & criminal e-filing | |
| | i. e-citation | Savings based on 3.5 minutes per case initiation only; subscription notching, etc. not included. |
| | ii. e-complaint | Savings based on 3.5 minutes per case initiation only; subscription notching, etc. not included. |
| | iii. e-charging/e-signature | Savings mostly come from electronic records storage and management if paper complaint is eliminated. Savings in case docketing (key strokes) minimal; some minimal savings on judge signature; |
| D | In-court updating/sentencing order | Eliminates duplicate entry of minute information into order. Time savings 5 min. Estimate 400,000 cases w/ sentence. Shifts work from outside ctm to inside ctm. No net effect. |
| Priority 2 | | |
| A | Centralized mandated services | |
| | i. Centralize jury service | Economies would accrue to districts 1,3,5,6,7, 8 & 10. Districts 2,4, and 9 are already centralized. Add one mgr position to oversee centralized position. |
| B | Probate annual reviews | 1,631 filings statewide: (81 Ramsey)-5% of state-15 acct statewide? Personal Well Being Reports: 38,017 (1,833 from Ramsey 5%, est avg 5 min) Final Periodic (Annual) Accounting: 5,600 (326 6% from Ramsey (.75 FTE) est 13 FTE statewide) 2007 Total Probate Staff: 110 (Ramsey 12-.75 FTE on Annual reports) roughly 11 FTEs statewide Conclude: need for centralized annual review personal well being staff 11-15 FTEs Additional cost of hiring accountants approx \$15,000 per FTE annually |
| Priority 3 | | |
| A | Expand use of Hearing Officers | Savings is minimally estimated at \$400,000 for replacing 5 judges with 15 HO outstate if current programs in 2nd & 4th duplicated. Replacement would occur thru attrition or in judges not added to current complement. Additional savings anticipated if the fine mitigation process is re-engineered to increase efficiencies. |
| B | Centrally store electronic documents/ Upgrade WAN | Significant costs for wide area network-IT plans to write up RFP Fall 2008; 1.5 million docs filed per year |
| | i. Scan documents into MNCIS | Equipment costs may be significant, but also re-engineering workflow to ensure everything is scanned. Extra time to scan minimal; estimates by 2nd offset by savings in records mgmt, retrieving files, etc. Approx 1.2 million docs (excluding Ramsey) filed per year. |
| | ii. Civil e-filing | Savings based on case initiation docketing eliminated, and additional savings come when combined with editable e-docs (motions, proposed orders, etc.) What percentage would use e-filing? 50%? Assume 3.5 min/filing |

Appendix F

Option Time Horizon by Priority

Option Time Horizon by Priority

| Implementation Time Horizon | | | | | |
|---|---|---------------------------------------|--|--|---|
| Options | Project Status | Current Implementation Strategy | Implementation Issues/ Dependencies | Time to Statewide Implementation - Assumes Dedicated Staff | Time to Achieve Statewide Efficiencies |
| Priority 1 | | | | | |
| A Centralize Processing of Pavables | | | | | |
| i. Develop centralized processing center | Not started | None | Establish central location; need check scanning; possible venue issues; IVR/MWR desirable | <= 2 years | FTE economies of scale expected immediately. |
| ii. Auto assess | Reliable/repeatable guide Available Aug 08; need to add data automatically to finance tab | County by county | # of agendas and splits variable by co.; implementation exceeds 280 hrs | 2 years - assumes standardization of splits | Approx 9,000 citations to currently break even; after savings of approx 1 minute per citation |
| iii. Standardize collections - auto referral | Under development testing summer 08; pilot fall 08; ready Feb 09 | None | Standardize time from due date to referral - suggest 45 days; accept payment after referral at court; 3rd party vendor contact | <= 1 year | Difficult to assess given wide variation in current practice. For those currently processing collections manually, efficiencies would be achieved immediately. |
| B Expand Payable Offenses | | | | | |
| i. All petty misd made payable | Referred to COPS; new payables list due Aug 08 | Changes Statewide Jan 09? | DNR, State Patrol, USDOT | 6 months | Immediate |
| ii. Make more misd payable, instead of requiring court appearance | Referred to COPS; new payables list due Aug 08 | Changes Statewide Jan 09? | DNR, State Patrol, USDOT | 6 months | Immediate |
| iii. Ord violations made payable | Referred to COPS; new payables list due Aug 08 | Changes Statewide Jan 09? | Municipalities | 6 months | Immediate |
| iv. Eliminate multiple fines | Referred to COPS | None | DNR, State Patrol, USDOT; important to initiative 1: auto assess and IVR/MWR | | |
| v. Amend statute to make misd into pettys | Not started | | | | |
| vi. Eliminate enhancement of pettys | Not started | | | | |
| vii. Misd with fines <\$300 are pettys | Not started | | | | |
| C Implement petty & criminal e-filing | | | | | |
| i. e-citation (batch processing) | Pilots in Anoka, Washinton by June 2008; reliable/repeatable guide available July 2008 | County by county | Law enforcement needs software | <= 2 years | Immediate ct admin FTE savings |
| ii. e-complaint | Available in Carver, Hennepin and Ramsey Counties | County by county | Prosecutor needs software | <= 2 years | Immediate ct admin FTE savings |
| iii. e-charging/e-signature | Testing July 2008. Pilot Nov 2008: Carver, Olmsted, Kandiyohi, St. Louis (w/e-complaint); R Rules comm. Okays 6 mo pilot | Available Mid 2009 | Prosecutor & law enforcement needs software | <= 2 years | If paper complaint is eliminated staff savings is accrued in records mgmt; some minimal judge savings |
| D. In-court updating/sentencing order | Currently in updating in use in Olmsted, Virginia, Wright, Cass & Ramsey; reliable/repeatable guide available Jul 2008; sentencing order available Nov 08 | Advisory group to plan implementation | Training/bench will to standardize sentencing format | <= 1 year | Unclear of net savings - defendant leaves ct m with order; studies suggest greater compliance with order which may have future savings. Eliminates duplicate entries in MNCIS |
| Priority 2 | | | | | |
| A Centralize Mandated Services | | | | | |
| i. Centralize/regionalize juror services | Implemented 9th District 2007 | None | Contact with 3rd party for summons mailing | <= 1 year | Immediate FTE savings of ct admin on jury |
| B Centralize Processing of Probate Annual Reviews | | | | | |
| | Not started | None | Establish central location; web report needed | <= 1 year | Hire auditors to review - economies not clear but increased oversight provided. |
| Priority 3 | | | | | |
| A Expand use of Hearing Officers | | | | | |
| | Not started | None | Need web and/or ITV expansion | <= 1 year | Savings in judicial FTE time on traffic; do not expect any real declines in judicial FTEs, may have immediate savings in ct m support |
| B Centrally store electronic documents/Upgrade WAN | | | | | |
| i. Scan documents into MNCIS | Available; 2nd & 4th scan but store docs locally; docs attached to MNCIS record as object | None | Scanning equipment; 3rd party e-doc vendor; server storage space | 3 year minimum | Unknown - balance between extra time scanning and saved time on records mgmt |
| ii. Civil e-filing | RFP for front end vendor Sep 08; 2nd judicial district uses e-filing in asbestos cases using Lexis/nexus | None | Needs to be researched e.g. Turbo court for conciliation cases | Long-term fore-filing across all non-criminal case types | Immediate ct admin FTE savings |

Appendix G Stakeholders Assessment By Priority

STAKEHOLDERS ASSESSMENT BY PRIORITY *

Each Initiative should be rated for each stakeholder as follows: 1=supportive; 2=neutral or not affected; 3=expected opposition

| Options | | Stakeholders | | | | | | | | | | |
|-------------------|--|--------------|----------|-------------|-------------------------|-----------|-------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------|-------------------------------|-----------|
| | | Judges | Staff | Legislature | Local Elected Officials | Bar | Prosecutors | Public Defender | Law Enforcement | DPS-DVS | Non Institutional Court Users | Taxpayers |
| Priority 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| A | Centralize Processing of Payables | 1.43 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.43 | 1.14 | 1.14 | 1.14 | 1.29 | 1.43 | 1.14 | 1.00 |
| | | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| | | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 |
| | | 2 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 |
| | | 2 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 |
| | | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| | | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| | | 2 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 |
| | Total | 10 | 7 | 7 | 10 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 8 | 7 |
| | ii. Auto assess | 1.57 | 1.00 | 1.43 | 1.43 | 1.57 | 1.43 | 1.57 | 1.43 | 1.43 | 1.57 | 1.43 |
| | | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| | | 2 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| | | 2 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| | | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 |
| | | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| | | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| | | 2 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| | Total | 11 | 7 | 10 | 10 | 11 | 10 | 11 | 10 | 10 | 11 | 10 |
| | iii. Standardize collections-- auto referral | 1.43 | 1.00 | 1.43 | 1.43 | 1.57 | 1.29 | 1.71 | 1.29 | 1.43 | 1.57 | 1.43 |
| | | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| | | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| | | 2 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| | | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 |
| | | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| | | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| | | 2 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| | Total | 10 | 7 | 10 | 10 | 11 | 9 | 12 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 10 |

Note: This is the Committee's assessment of probable stakeholder positions.
Ratings represent assessments by members of the ASD Committee of probable stakeholder positions.

| Options | Stakeholders | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|--------------|-------|-------------|-------------------------|------|-------------|-----------------|-----------------|---------|-------------------------------|-----------|
| | Judges | Staff | Legislature | Local Elected Officials | Bar | Prosecutors | Public Defender | Law Enforcement | DPS-DVS | Non Institutional Court Users | Taxpayers |
| B Expand Payable Offenses | | | | | | | | | | | |
| I. All petty misd made payable | 1.00 | 1.00 | 2.29 | 2.14 | 1.71 | 2.57 | 1.29 | 2.29 | 2.14 | 1.14 | 1.43 |
| | 1 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 2 |
| | 1 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 2 |
| | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 1 |
| | 1 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 1 |
| | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 2 |
| Total | 7 | 7 | 16 | 15 | 12 | 18 | 9 | 16 | 15 | 8 | 10 |
| ii. Make more misd payable, instead of requiring court appearance | 1.00 | 1.00 | 2.43 | 2.43 | 1.57 | 2.43 | 1.29 | 2.71 | 2.29 | 1.29 | 1.43 |
| | 1 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 2 |
| | 1 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 2 |
| | 1 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 1 |
| | 1 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 1 |
| | 1 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 |
| | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 2 |
| Total | 7 | 7 | 17 | 17 | 11 | 17 | 9 | 19 | 16 | 9 | 10 |
| iii. Ord violations made payable | 1.00 | 1.00 | 2.14 | 2.57 | 1.86 | 2.86 | 1.57 | 2.57 | 1.71 | 1.29 | 1.71 |
| | 1 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 2 |
| | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| | 1 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 1 |
| | 1 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 3 |
| | 1 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Total | 7 | 7 | 15 | 18 | 13 | 20 | 11 | 18 | 12 | 9 | 12 |
| iv. Eliminate multiple fines | 1.71 | 1.29 | 2.43 | 2.43 | 1.86 | 2.57 | 1.57 | 2.86 | 2.00 | 1.29 | 1.57 |
| | 1 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 2 |
| | 1 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 1 |
| | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 1 |
| | 3 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 2 |
| | 2 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 2 |
| | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| | 3 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 2 |
| Total | 12 | 9 | 17 | 17 | 13 | 18 | 11 | 20 | 14 | 9 | 11 |

Ratings represent assessments by members of the ASD Committee of probable stakeholder positions.

| Options | | Stakeholders | | | | | | | | | | |
|---------|--|--------------|-----------|-------------|-------------------------|-----------|-------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------|-------------------------------|-----------|
| | | Judges | Staff | Legislature | Local Elected Officials | Bar | Prosecutors | Public Defender | Law Enforcement | DPS-DVS | Non Institutional Court Users | Taxpayers |
| v. | Amend statute to make misd into pettys | 1.57 | 1.43 | 2.71 | 2.43 | 1.86 | 2.86 | 1.43 | 2.71 | 2.71 | 1.43 | 1.86 |
| | | 1 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 2 |
| | | 1 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 2 |
| | | 1 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 1 |
| | | 1 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 2 |
| | | 3 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 |
| | | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 1 |
| | | 3 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 2 |
| | Total | 11 | 10 | 19 | 17 | 13 | 20 | 10 | 19 | 19 | 10 | 13 |
| vi. | Eliminate enhancement of pettys | 1.43 | 1.14 | 2.57 | 2.57 | 1.71 | 2.57 | 1.14 | 2.86 | 2.29 | 1.57 | 1.71 |
| | | 1 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 2 |
| | | 2 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| | | 1 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 1 |
| | | 3 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 2 |
| | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 2 |
| | | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| | | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| | Total | 10 | 8 | 18 | 18 | 12 | 18 | 8 | 20 | 16 | 11 | 12 |
| vii. | Misd with fines <\$300 are pettys | 1.67 | 1.33 | 2.83 | 2.67 | 1.83 | 2.67 | 1.17 | 2.83 | 2.50 | 1.50 | 1.83 |
| | | 1 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 2 |
| | | 2 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| | | 1 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 1 |
| | | 3 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 2 |
| | | 2 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 2 |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| | Total | 10 | 8 | 17 | 16 | 11 | 16 | 7 | 17 | 15 | 9 | 11 |
| C | e-filing initiatives | | | | | | | | | | | |
| I. | e-citation | 1.29 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.14 | 1.43 | 1.14 | 1.43 | 1.57 | 1.29 | 1.57 | 1.29 |
| | | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 |
| | | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 2 |
| | | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| | | 3 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| | | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| | | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| | | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 |
| | Total | 9 | 7 | 7 | 8 | 10 | 8 | 10 | 11 | 9 | 11 | 9 |

Ratings represent assessments by members of the ASD Committee of probable stakeholder positions.

| | | Stakeholders | | | | | | | | | | | |
|------------|------------------------------------|-------------------------|-----------|-------------|-------------------------|-----------|-------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------|-------------------------------|-----------|-----------|
| Options | | Judges | Staff | Legislature | Local Elected Officials | Bar | Prosecutors | Public Defender | Law Enforcement | DPS-DVS | Non Institutional Court Users | Taxpayers | |
| ii. | e-complaint | 1.29 | 1.00 | 1.14 | 1.43 | 1.43 | 1.71 | 1.43 | 1.71 | 1.57 | 1.57 | 1.29 | |
| | | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 1 | |
| | | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 1 | |
| | | 1 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | |
| | | 3 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 1 | |
| | | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | |
| | | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | |
| | | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | |
| | | 9 | 7 | 8 | 10 | 10 | 12 | 10 | 12 | 11 | 11 | 9 | |
| | | Total | 9 | 7 | 8 | 10 | 10 | 12 | 10 | 12 | 11 | 11 | 9 |
| iii. | e-charging/e-signature | 2.14 | 1.29 | 1.29 | 1.57 | 1.57 | 1.71 | 1.71 | 1.86 | 1.71 | 1.71 | 1.57 | |
| | | 3 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | |
| | | 3 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 2 | |
| | | 3 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | |
| | | 3 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 1 | |
| | | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | |
| | | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | |
| | | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | |
| | | 15 | 9 | 9 | 11 | 11 | 12 | 12 | 13 | 12 | 12 | 11 | |
| | | Total | 15 | 9 | 9 | 11 | 11 | 12 | 12 | 13 | 12 | 12 | 11 |
| D | In-court updating/Sentencing Order | 2.14 | 1.71 | 1.57 | 1.71 | 1.57 | 1.00 | 1.14 | 1.14 | 1.43 | 1.57 | 1.43 | |
| | | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | |
| | | 3 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | |
| | | 3 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | |
| | | 3 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | |
| | | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | |
| | | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | |
| | | 2 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | |
| | | 15 | 12 | 11 | 12 | 11 | 7 | 8 | 8 | 10 | 11 | 10 | |
| | | Total | 15 | 12 | 11 | 12 | 11 | 7 | 8 | 8 | 10 | 11 | 10 |
| Priority 2 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| A | Centralize jury service | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | L | Centralize jury service | 1.86 | 1.29 | 1.71 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 1.86 | 1.43 |
| | | | 2 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 |
| | | | 2 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| | | | 3 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| | | | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 |
| | | | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 |
| | | | 2 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| | | | 2 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 |
| | | | 13 | 9 | 12 | 14 | 14 | 14 | 14 | 14 | 14 | 13 | 10 |
| | Total | 13 | 9 | 12 | 14 | 14 | 14 | 14 | 14 | 13 | 10 | | |

Ratings represent assessments by members of the ASD Committee of probable stakeholder positions.

| Options | | Stakeholders | | | | | | | | | | |
|------------|--|--------------|-------|-------------|-------------------------|------|-------------|-----------------|-----------------|---------|-------------------------------|-----------|
| | | Judges | Staff | Legislature | Local Elected Officials | Bar | Prosecutors | Public Defender | Law Enforcement | DPS-DVS | Non Institutional Court Users | Taxpayers |
| B | Probate Annual Reviews | 1.14 | 1.14 | 1.43 | 1.57 | 1.43 | 1.86 | 1.86 | 1.86 | 1.86 | 1.43 | 1.14 |
| | | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 |
| | | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 |
| | | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| | | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 |
| | | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| | | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 |
| | | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 |
| | Total | 8 | 8 | 10 | 11 | 10 | 13 | 13 | 13 | 13 | 10 | 8 |
| Priority 3 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| A | Expand use of Hearing Officers | 1.86 | 1.29 | 1.17 | 1.43 | 1.29 | 2.00 | 1.57 | 2.00 | 1.71 | 1.29 | 1.00 |
| | | 3 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 |
| | | 3 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 1 |
| | | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 1 |
| | | 3 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 |
| | | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| | | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| | | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 |
| | Total | 13 | 9 | 7 | 10 | 9 | 14 | 11 | 14 | 12 | 9 | 7 |
| B | e-documents to move work around (separate from e-filing) | 1.71 | 1.29 | 1.29 | 1.57 | 1.86 | 1.86 | 1.86 | 1.57 | 1.71 | 1.57 | 1.29 |
| | | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 |
| | | 3 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| | | 1 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| | | 2 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 |
| | | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 1 |
| | | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| | | 2 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| | Total | 12 | 9 | 9 | 11 | 13 | 13 | 13 | 11 | 12 | 11 | 9 |
| | Centrally Store Electronic Docs | 1.50 | 1.83 | 1.33 | 1.50 | 1.67 | 1.67 | 1.67 | 1.67 | 1.83 | 1.67 | 1.50 |
| | | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| | | 3 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| | | 1 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| | | 2 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 |
| | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | |
| | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | |
| Total | 9 | 11 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 11 | 10 | 9 | |

Ratings represent assessments by members of the ASD Committee of probable stakeholder positions.

| Options | | | Stakeholders | | | | | | | | | | |
|---------|----|---------------------------|--------------|-----------|-------------|-------------------------|-----------|-------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------|-------------------------------|-----------|
| | | | Judges | Staff | Legislature | Local Elected Officials | Bar | Prosecutors | Public Defender | Law Enforcement | DPS-DVS | Non Institutional Court Users | Taxpayers |
| | i. | Scan documents into MNCIS | 1.86 | 1.71 | 1.43 | 1.71 | 1.71 | 1.71 | 1.71 | 1.71 | 1.86 | 1.71 | 1.71 |
| | | | 2 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| | | | 3 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| | | | 1 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| | | | 2 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| | | | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 |
| | | | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| | | | 3 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| | | | Total | 13 | 12 | 10 | 12 | 12 | 12 | 12 | 13 | 12 | 12 |
| | | ii. | Civil-filing | 1.86 | 1.29 | 1.29 | 1.71 | 1.29 | 1.71 | 1.57 | 1.57 | 1.57 | 1.71 |
| | | | 3 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| | | | 3 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| | | | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| | | | 3 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 |
| | | | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| | | | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| | | | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| | | | Total | 13 | 9 | 9 | 12 | 9 | 12 | 11 | 11 | 12 | 11 |

Ratings represent assessments by members of the ASD Committee of probable stakeholder positions.

Appendix H Policy Authority by Priority

Policy Authorization by Priority


| Options | | Source of Authorization | | | |
|-------------------|---|---|--------------------|------------------|------------|
| | | Legislative | Supreme Court Rule | Judicial Council | Local Rule |
| Priority 1 | | | | | |
| A | Centralize Processing of Payables | | | | |
| | i. Develop centralized processing center | | | X | |
| | ii. Auto assess | | | X | |
| | iii. Standardize collections--auto referral | Statutory--eliminate 6 yr rule | | X | |
| | | | | | |
| B | Expand Payable Offenses | | | | |
| | i. All petty misd made payable | | | X | |
| | ii. Make more misd payable, instead of requiring court appearance | | | X | |
| | iii. Ord violations made payable | | | X | X |
| | iv. Eliminate multiple fines | New legislation | | | |
| | v. Amend statute to make misd into pettys | New legislation | | | |
| | vi. Eliminate enhancement of pettys | Amend Minn Stat 169.89 sub 1 (Note: didn't pass this session) | | | |
| | vii. Misd with fines <\$300 are pettys | Amend Minn Stat 169.89 sub 2 | | | |
| | | | | | |
| C | e-filing initiatives | | | | |
| | i. e-citation | | | X | |
| | ii. e-complaint | | | X | |
| | iii. e-charging/e-signature | | X | | |
| | | | | | |
| D | In-court updating/sentencing order | | | X | |

| Options | | Source of Authorization | | | | |
|-------------------|-----|--|--|------------------|------------|--|
| | | Legislative | Supreme Court Rule | Judicial Council | Local Rule | |
| Priority 2 | | | | | | |
| | A | Centralize mandated services | | | X | |
| | I. | Centralize jury service | | | X | |
| | B. | Probate Annual Reviews | Annual reports mandated by Minn. Stat. 524.5-316 and Minn. Stat. 524.5-420 | | X | |
| Priority 3 | | | | | | |
| | A | Expand use of Subordinate Judicial Officers | | | X | |
| | B | Centrally store electronic documents/ Upgrade WAN | | | X | |
| | I. | Scan documents into MNCIS | | | X | |
| | ii. | Civil e-filing | | | X | |

Appendix I (MNET)

MNET Minnesota's Network for Enterprise Telecommunications

A Public-Private Partnership Delivering an Integrated Statewide Network for Education, Local Governments and State Agencies



Map Key

The network portrayed on this map is the current and proposed plan as of December, 2007. However, the Statewide Network is an evolving infrastructure and this map may not be all-inclusive. This map shows representation of each city that has a connection to MNET. Multiple connections may occur within a city, but are not shown here.

| Map Features | Color/Icon |
|-------------------------------|-----------------------|
| MNET High Capacity Backbone | Red line |
| T1 Private Line | Green line |
| DSL Access | Blue line |
| OC3 | Light blue line |
| Gigabit Ethernet | Dark blue line |
| Frame Relay Service | Black line |
| Hub City | Red star in a circle |
| Other Cities | Black star |
| County Seat | Black star with a dot |
| County Boundary | Black outline |
| Quint | Light green area |
| Embarq | Yellow area |
| Frontier | Light blue area |
| Coops/Municipals/Independents | Light purple area |
| Exchange Outside MN | Light pink area |
| Unassigned | Light grey area |
| LATA Boundary | Orange outline |


- In operation since 1993, MNET supports Minnesota's
 - Public Safety
 - Learning
 - Governmental Operations
- MNET has grown to about 900 locations today
- 34 Regional Network Hubs aggregate capacity
- Minnesota State, Colleges and Universities and University of Minnesota Campuses host most regional network hubs
- Over 50 private sector providers furnish services
- Over 1,000 leased line circuits are purchased
- Services are in place in over 300 cities across Minnesota
- Approximately 375 public sector entities are MNET partners
- MNET partners include:
 - Many cities and governmental units
 - Many schools, libraries and private colleges
 - All Minnesota counties
 - All state government
 - All public higher education

This map is provided 'as is', without express or implied warranties, including warranties of merchantability and fitness. In no event will InterTech be liable for any consequential, incidental or special damages, including any lost profits or lost savings, even if an OET representative has been advised of the possibility of such damages or any other claims by a third party.

This map was prepared for the Office of Enterprise Technology, State of Minnesota by the Land Management Information Center, Minnesota Department of Administration, Project Code: OETMNET1
Prepared: December, 2007.



Twin Cities Metropolitan Area



- MNET has three main purposes:
1. Procurement, aggregation and integration of private sector telecommunications services for use by government and education
 2. Support for secure, reliable and seamless intra- and inter-organizational networking of data, video and voice services among Minnesota's branches and levels of government
 3. Provision of high-speed, reliable and secure access to the worldwide Internet, national networks, and private provider networks, to enable public access to e-learning and e-government services
- The purpose of this map is to illustrate the current statewide telecommunications network connecting Minnesota's branches and levels of government and the extent to which private sector telecommunications service providers are involved in providing the core infrastructure. This integrated statewide network enables converged data, video and voice communication services to be delivered to Minnesota's public sector in an effective, timely and cost-effective manner. This statewide network is comprised of network hardware and management systems that have been purchased through competitive bidding and with leased network facilities competitively bid and purchased from telecommunication service providers working throughout Minnesota. The statewide network is managed by the Office of Enterprise Technology, State of Minnesota.

For more information, see www.oet.state.mn.us or send an email to service.center@state.mn.us.

Appendix J
Options Short Description By Priority
OPTIONS SHORT DESCRIPTIONS BY PRIORITY

| <i>Options</i> | | <i>Short Descriptions</i> |
|--|---|--|
| Priority 1 | | |
| A | Centralize Processing of Payables | Payables are centrally processed, possibly outsourced. An assessment would need to be made whether there is benefit to including payables from the 2nd and 4th judicial districts. |
| | i. Develop centralized processing center | Payments for "payables" are mailed to a central location and processed; alternatively IVR/IWR is used for payment. Fine mitigation and payment plan processes may be centralized as well. The price of outsourcing payment processing should be researched. |
| | ii. Auto assess | Logic is entered into MNCIS that automatically "splits" the payment to the appropriate recipient (e.g. the state, local law enforcement, etc.) Note that if payments are to be centralized, it is highly desirable for |
| | iii. Standardize collections--auto referral | Cases are electronically and automatically referred to a collection agency when the payer date is exceeded or when a payment plan payment is missed. No clerk action is involved in referring the case. Collected payments are automatically receipted into MNCIS. |
| B | Expand Payable Offenses | |
| | i. All petty misd made payable | Expand payable offenses to include more or all petty misdemeanor offenses |
| | ii. Make more misd payable, instead of requiring court appearance | Expand payable offenses to include more misdemeanor offenses on the payable lists |
| | iii. Ord violations made payable | Expand payable list to include all ordinance violations |
| | iv. Eliminate multiple fines | Eliminate multiple fine amounts for some offenses |
| | v. Amend statute to make misd into pettys | Amend statutes to change offense level to petty misdemeanor offenses |
| | vi. Eliminate enhancement of pettys | Amend Minn. Stat. § 169.89 sub. 2(2) to delete enhancement of petty misdemeanor offenses to misdemeanor offenses. |
| vii. Misd with fines <\$300 are pettys | Amend Minn. Stat. § 169.89 sub. 2, to include persons charged with payable misdemeanors where payable fine is not more that \$300 w/ no right to jury trial | |
| C | Implement petty & criminal e-filing | |
| | i. e-citation | Electronic filing of citations from law enforcement; populates MNCIS with initiating case data; replaces the |
| | ii. e-complaint | Electronic filing of criminal complaints from the prosecutor; populates MNCIS with initiating case data. |
| iii. e-charging/e-signature | Charging document with electronic signature is electronically sent between law enforcement, the prosecutor, and the courts. Coupled with e-complaint it replaces the paper complaint. | |
| D | In-court updating/sentencing order | Coupled with in-court updating of the minutes, an automated sentencing order is produced, allowing the defendant to leave the court room with his/her court order. |

OPTIONS SHORT DESCRIPTIONS BY PRIORITY

| <i>Options</i> | | <i>Short Descriptions</i> |
|-------------------|--|--|
| Priority 2 | | |
| A | Centralize mandated services | |
| | I. Centralize juror services | Juror qualification questionnaires are centrally processed by district for at the state level; juror summons (the mailing) is outsourced. |
| | | |
| B | Centralize Probate annual reviews | Centralize the processing of probate annual reviews for conservatorships and guardianships including the annual accounting and well-being reports. Hire qualified accountants to do the work. |
| | | |
| Priority 3 | | |
| A | Expand use of Subordinate Judicial Officers | The public has access to fine mitigation services, either on-line (as in the Washington State example) or thru a centrally located hearing officer. Outstate, hearing officers may be available via ITV. Additionally per diem attorneys process conciliation court cases. |
| | | |
| B | Centrally store electronic documents/upgrade WAN | E-documents are scanned or word processed documents that accompany a filing. E-documents are separate from "e-filings" as the information on an e-doc does not automatically populate data fields in MNCIS. While initiating documents such as petitions and/or complaints may be filed with the court electronically in a "smart document" format (e.g. the fields on the document populate MNCIS data fields) e-docs do not populate MNCIS data fields unless they are accompanied by an electronic index. Instead e-docs are attached to the MNCIS record as an "object". Examples of e-docs are: letters, proposed orders, motions, etc. Ideally, e-docs replace the paper files. e-documents (scanned or word processed) are stored centrally so that they are available to be accessed by users outside of the county creating the |
| | I. Scan documents into MNCIS | Scanned documents are attached to the MNCIS case record as an object. This technology is currently available and is in wide use in the 2nd District. |
| | ii. Civil e-filing | Initiating documents are e-filed in a manner that populates MNCIS data fields. Combined with e-docs, all documents on the case are stored electronically eliminating the need for a paper file. |
| | | |