Presenters:	**Joyce Rose**, ICF
	Spencer Wilder, IT Manager, Child Family Services Agency, District of Columbia
	David Elges, Chief Information Officer, Child Family Services Agency, District of Columbia
	Kamal Devabhaktuni, Lead Interface Developer, Child Family Services Agency, District of Columbia
	Angie Lindemann, IT Business Relationship Management Director, Department of Family and Protective Services, Texas
	Christie Mitschke, Director of IT Operations, Department of Family and Protective Services, Texas
	Dana Rickert, SAFE Business Analyst, Department of Technology Services, Utah
	Joseph Listello, SAFE Lead Developer, Department of Technology Services, Utah
	Subeera Singh, ICF
	David Baker, ICF
Operator:	Welcome. Thank you for standing by. Throughout today's conference, all participants will remain in a listen-only mode. During the Q&A portion of the call, you may press Star-1 on your touchtone phone, if you would like to ask a question. Today's conference is being recorded. If you have any objections, you may disconnect at this time.
	Now, I'll turn the conference over to Joyce Rose. Thank you. You may begin.
Joyce Rose:	Thank you so very much, and welcome to the Child Welfare Information Technology Systems Managers and Staff webinar series, brought to you on behalf of the Health and Human Services, Administration for Children and Families, Children's Bureau, and presented by ICF International. Today's roundtable features a distinguished panel, who will discuss their experiences and challenges of developing and implementing an interface to the courts for data exchange. I am Joyce Rose, your host and facilitator for today's discussion. Next slide, please.

Attendees are encouraged to participate in the roundtable with questions or comments. All of the participant lines are muted now, but we will open them for the Q&A session at the end of the discussion. However, please be aware that you can submit questions at any time using the GoToWebinar chat feature, and those will be queued up and addressed during the Q&A session. Once today's roundtable has ended, you may submit additional questions to the email address listed to your federal analyst.

I want to thank our panelists from Alabama for their time and effort in preparing for this roundtable. However, today's winter storm has forced the closure of all Alabama State offices; thus, they are not available. While they are not here in person, they did prepare written responses with my colleague, Subeera, who will share with you throughout the roundtable. However, our panelists from D.C., Texas, and Utah are more than ready to begin the discussions. So let's meet them, starting with D.C. D.C., please introduce yourselves.

Spencer Wilder:	Good afternoon, my name is Spencer Wilder, I'm the IT Manager here with the District of Columbia. I've been here for about six years now, and Mr. Elges, our CIO just stepped out for a minute, but he will be joining us shortly.
Joyce Rose:	Okay, how about Texas?
Angie Lindemann:	Good afternoon everyone, my name is Angie Lindemann, and I'm with the Department of Family and Protective Services out of Texas. I currently serve as the IT Business Relationship Management Director for the IT Division, with a focus on aligning any new IT requests with agency and business strategy, and business value. And then I'll let my colleague introduce herself.
Christie Mitschke:	Hi everyone, my name is Christie Mitschke, I also work for the DFPS here in Texas, and I am the Director of IT Operations over the group that does all of our interfacing.
Joyce Rose:	And finally, Utah.
Dana Rickert:	This is Dana Rickert, I am a SAFE Business Analyst with the Division of Child and Family Services. I've been here for about two years.
Joseph Listello:	My name is Joseph Listello, I'm the Lead Developer on the SAFE project here. I work for the Department of Technology Services and have been on the project for a little over 12 years now.
Joyce Rose:	Thank you so very much. So let's move to the next slide, and today's roundtable format is really quite simple in that I will pose a series of questions related to the subtopics listed, which I then trust will give rise to an informational as well as lively discussion. Following the wrap up portion of today's Courts Interface

Webinar, Terry Watt, the Director of the Division of State Systems Children's Bureau, will present information regarding cost allocation.

Now let's begin with question one, which is: Please describe the background and history of your data exchange, and let's start with Utah, please.

Joseph Listello: So the background for ours started altruistically. There was data in our system and the DCFS Child Management system, and then in the court system. It was kind of fortuitous. We got lucky that as we were both starting to talk about this at the same time, the courts in the state of Utah received a grant in the form of what is called The Court Improvement Project, and was able to partition some of that money to starting the interface. So it was kind of a luck of the draw there. So to answer part of that question with the "did we have support from the counterpart," we did. We had support of both – the full side of DCFS and the courts to start this improvement in getting data flowing between the two systems.

Joyce Rose: Great, Texas, can you add and please describe your background and history?

Angie Lindemann: Of course, so we have two methods of sharing data with the court systems. Christie will talk in detail about what exactly we are sharing with one entity in particular. In 2010, we began sending some information to what we call the Office of Court Administration, at their request. That is through an interface, where we send a file over to that entity. The other mechanism is we do have a small subset of court systems that have come to us directly and asked for information. DFPS does have a couple of counties in Texas that also provide county protective services. They have their court system that they deal with on the county level, and they like to have some of the information from our statewide IMPACT system. So there's a small subset, Harris County, which is where Houston is located. That's one of the largest counties. And then we also have the Supreme Court Children's Commission and then Family Drug Treatment Court System that we send to. DFPS, across the state, we would say that we're probably really invested in developing community partnerships. And so we often engage in pilots with community partners, other state and local entities. When there's a need to share some data, we'll certainly engage in those activities with them.

Joyce Rose: Thank you, and D.C. please describe the background and history of your data exchange.

Spencer Wilder: For the District of Columbia, we're kind of in a unique situation. We're both the state and local kind of jurisdiction. So we only have one court system to work with. The other thing about it is that I think we really needed to improve and stop the manual processes that we have in a lot of our court proceedings. So on

the one hand, we definitely had an urge from workers to stop having so much manual back and forth. We only had one D.C. Superior Court to work through. We here in the District have in-house developers who are able to support us in that endeavor. It was a little bit of a challenge on the court side. I think for D.C. there was a lot of up and down in terms of how the exchange would happen. But ultimately, both parties agreed that we needed to be able to figure out a way to automate court proceedings so that workers would go down to court and have everything already there in hand.

Joyce Rose:	Thank you, and Subeera, what about Alabama? Can we add something from them please?

Subeera Singh:	I will read their response. The data exchange between Department of Human Resources and Administrative Office of Courts was initiated, when DHR began designing and building the SACWIS system. At the time, DHR contacted the courts and discussions commenced on the details. The MOU [Memorandum of Understanding] was developed and work began on the interface within months of beginning SACWIS system development. The contact was initiated by DHR, which is the Department of Human Resources. Both agencies were on board, although the Administrative Office of Courts was somewhat limited because of their lack of development resources. They were in the midst of hiring new developers for their system during the time this interface was being developed.

Joyce Rose:	Thank you, and let's move on to question number two. And we're going to start with D.C. this time. The question is, what were the primary challenges faced from the perspective of A) governance; B) technical; or C) administrative?

Spencer Wilder:	For us, and this interface kind of predates most of the folks in the room, but I can tell you in terms of our recent enhancements. In terms of governance, I don't think we had too much of a challenge. I think both parties agreed that the interface was definitely needed, and so there was a willingness and a commitment to make that happen. We did not have to spend a lot of time trying to argue that point. The biggest challenge really came in being more of a Rosetta Stone to each other and trying to talk through a lot of the court procedures on their end. And knowing exactly what data they were looking for and exactly what they needed to do with it. We were dealing with true developers, so in a sense they don't really know a lot about the business processes and what happens to a lot of those documents. Again, on the CFSA side, we actually had in-house developers that were able to talk through a lot of those processes. So the governance wasn't an issue. The technical was really about learning how to speak the same language, and that's that whole Rosetta Stone comment. And making sure that we understood what the triggers were, how the data was going to be sent, how it was going to be received, and then for both parties to agree where the data would go and how it would be used. In

terms of the change management or the administrative process, it really was trying to make sure that we had different points that we would verify that the data was moving as smoothly as we want it to, and being sure that we put a process in place at the beginning so we could go back and revisit any kind of issues or challenges that we had. Because we were dealing with two government agencies, and there's always some miscommunication, so we had to be really clear and allow ourselves on the front-end to know that we were going to walk into a process that was going to need change over time.

Joyce Rose: That's excellent, and I wholly support the importance of the front-end piece so that both agencies understand the priorities and the processes. So thank you so very much. And Texas, is there something you can add here in terms of your primary challenges?

Angie Lindemann: I will talk about the governance part of this, Joyce. So like I mentioned before, DFPS partners really well with a lot of community partners. And so we were approached by these different entities to share information. And a lot of times it is because, you know in some instances, there's not a lot of discussion in terms of governance because of who the request may be coming from. I think we're all familiar with that kind of scenario, but we certainly want to be helpful where we can. The governance aspect of this – there really wasn't a lot to discuss in terms of providing the information to the Office of Court Administration, or to those local county and district courts. I'll let Christie talk about the technical aspect and how we got to that place. Of course we have what we call a Memoranda of Understanding between the agencies to kind of solidify the agreement. And in some instances, it truly depends on our program partner who's involved at the time when we do these types of interfaces. We have some MOUs that are very detailed in terms of what each agency will provide with each other or share, and there are some that are very high level. That's probably one of the challenges that we have. But also from a technical standpoint, I'm sure Christie can share with us some of the challenges that she sees, specifically in relation with the court data sharing that we do.

Christie Mitschke: When I'm researching back the history, it goes a little bit further back than 2010. Apparently it did start with a quick reporting need that our data warehouse at the time that was being built, started pulling that data. And the most challenges that we experienced was working through the differences between the application that was going to consume the data and the differences in our application and interpretation of the data. And so in that interface, we have placement data, of course, and the legal data where there are currently statuses and various other pieces of information. For example, when we use codes and store codes in our application, we had to then work with the other partner to figure out if they wanted us to take that code list and also use it, or actually get

the actual literals. I think we chose the path of giving them the actual literals. There were also challenges around dates because we had multiple dates, and they wanted one of a particular field. We worked through that. What's great about our relationships, as Angie mentioned, is that we always have a technical contact and so really, we let program help drive the requirements. But we let the technical folks work out all of those details. And we did a lot of serious, for a couple of years, of iterations of improvements to where it got us from 2008 to 2010 and we've been pretty stable since then. The only time we have issues is when we add a new value not going with the codes list and going with the actual literals, they just get the literal and they use that for what it means. That's better than having to provide them a constant codes list. So that was one thing I can say, it was a plus to the way we implemented.

Angie Lindemann: I would also add that we're starting to see more, as we exchange more information with other state agencies and community partners, the data governance aspect of this is something that continues to come up because it's a translation between the systems, and I think that's something we'll probably touch on later as we're going through the remainder of the topics.

Christie Mitschke: But technically, it's a file that we actually put on their server as opposed to them coming and grabbing it from us. That's one part of the implementation that we did. And I think that's it.

Joyce Rose: Great, and Utah?

Joseph Listello: I'll start with the administrative part because it sort of leads into the other stuff on the governance and the technical. So early on when the process first started of exchanging of information, we set up this recurring meeting that increases and decreases in frequency depending on what we're doing. So that was real key for us knowing that sometimes we'd be meeting monthly and all of us would be in the same room, which led really well into the governance because in that meeting we had lawyers from both sides representing DCFS, and of course the lawyers over at the court system so they could speak too as other states mentioned, the memoranda of understanding. So that all got set up with all the technical people, all the business people, and all the law people in the room, which really helped. And then in those same meetings is when we discussed the technical implementation, so we used web services, for example. We talk about, as others mentioned, I'll just piggy-back on what they said, what elements are going to be exchanging, what data is interesting to both parties, what we will store in our system. Again I'll echo whoever went prior to me that we don't store a whole heck of a lot. We usually just let it flow through the interface so that we don't have to keep synchronicity between flow tables and stuff like that. The only thing we do store are unique identifiers when we do exchanges, and it's mostly for maintenance purposes or auditing purposes. So if

	we need to back find something, we have a unique identifier in both systems to kind of link up the two exchanges. As far as testing, both of our environments, we have a development environment and a user-testing environment, and we just keep test data in both of those so that they can link up between those common unique codes.
Joyce Rose:	Great, simplicity is good, right? Subeera, can you please add what Alabama's challenges were please?
Subeera Singh:	I certainly can. I'm going to read the responses as provided by the state. The primary challenges faced as far as governance is concerned, the major challenge was in negotiating the kinds of information to be exchanged, as there are certain limitations based on confidentiality. B) For technical, there were some challenges in all three aspects because the Administrative Office of Courts Development Resources were not at capacity. They were building the interface and also maintaining their system at the same time. C) Administrative: The manager in charge of the development was also managing the current system. His time was in short supply in communication when there was an issue, which was a challenge. Although systems to report issues [were] put in place, issues were not always addressed timely due to the volume of work the AOC developers and managers were doing at that time.
Joyce Rose:	That's very interesting. It sounds like Alabama had several challenges, both administratively and technically, and I am sorry that they're not here to fully explain that. Again, I appreciate them writing responses to our questions.
	So let's move on to question number 3, and that is: How is data security addressed, and let's start with Utah.
Joseph Listello:	So all of our interfaces are done with web services and we use what's called WS Security, which sits at the header-level, so the entire packet is encrypted. And then we also, of course, talk over SSL, so we use the secure transport layer there. As far as the actual operations are concerned, the individual ones on the interface, we do sort of a role-based and then a user ID just for auditing purposes, just to say "this is the role from the court's perspective, and who's doing it, making this request." And visa-versa from our end. "This is DCFS making this request and this is the user that does it." It's validated at the role level, and then the user is more for an audit trail. And like I said, the rest of it is just done through all of our standard security exchange.
Joyce Rose:	Great, Texas?
	Hello?

Angie Lindemann:	I'm sorry, I was starting to talk. I was on mute, I apologize. So where are we at again, I'm sorry.
Joyce Rose:	How is data security addressed?
Angie Lindemann:	Yes, alright. The data security aspect of it – I'll let Christie talk to those details because she handles the technical pieces of it.
Christie Mitschke:	For the data warehouse, I'm not quite sure. But I do know we just use secure file transfer. Like I mentioned earlier, we put the file on their server and negotiate with them as to how they want to authenticate. It's a secure file transfer.
Angie Lindemann:	And we have a number of different other exchanges that we do outside of the court. The court information that we trade, we do have Web services, and we also have an outsourced foster care provider that we're sending information back and forth from. But specific to the courts, it's been a manual process, but we anticipate that they're likely going to be coming back and asking us to probably update and upgrade the way in which we trade data with them because, I'm sure as the rest of you on the call know, there are several partners and several other agencies that want access to our data for a lot of different reasons.
Joyce Rose:	Absolutely and Christie, what is the frequency that you update the data on their server?
Christie Mitschke:	We run it every night.
Joyce Rose:	Every night.
Christie Mitschke:	Daily job. Full dump of all kids in our conservatorship.
Joyce Rose:	Ok, thank you.
Christie Mitschke:	We didn't mention that as well. All kids that are in our conservatorship.
Joyce Rose:	Absolutely. Thank you very much, D.C.?
Spencer Wilder:	So I'm going to start from the program side first. All of our batch processes are really initiated first by an approval from the worker's supervisor. And then three times a day, we actually have a secure file transfer through a batch process where we upload all of our documents into the court system.
Joyce Rose:	And the data security issues?
Spencer Wilder:	So data security is handled through our secure file transfer process.
Joyce Rose:	Okay, great. Subeera, can you add something from Alabama?

Subeera Singh:	I will read the response as provided by the state. All metric traffic is within a private secured network controlled by the state. It is not accessible from the public domain.
Joyce Rose:	Okay, thank you. Let's move to question number four. And let's start with D.C., and the question is: What are the specifics of the data exchanged?
Spencer Wilder:	So now I'm going to have Kamal, he's our developer in-house that actually speaks to some of the data specifics.
Kamal Devabhaktuni:	For D.C. we are having four parts of an exchange. We do it as a hearing, court reports, court orders, and complaint forms. So for each segment we have 30 or 40 XML nodes, so our format that we use is XML. So we have a matching pattern with courts and CFSA.
Joyce Rose:	Are you still there?
Kamal Devabhaktuni:	Yeah, we are done, actually.
Joyce Rose:	You are done? Okay. Alright, Utah, what are your specifics of the data exchange please?
Joseph Listello:	First, I should preface by saying our stuff is all real-time. And for us, it's more like a window into each other's systems. So none of the data becomes resident and sorted in the opposite system. So from us, when they look into it, they get to see address information about their kid, placement information about their kid and dealing with the courts. Those are probably the two biggest. For us, we look at, as we mentioned before, hearing incidents with the courts and court orders. The flow is bi-directional. The frequency is at run time, ad hoc, whenever.
Joyce Rose:	Great, and Texas?
Christie Mitschke:	Hi this is Christie again. Similar to the gentleman who just spoke, our data is, of course all of the demographics data about the child, their legal status, their current stage of service that they're in here in Texas, and then placement data, data about their current child plan, and their service levels that they're at. I don't know if other states have that similar stuff, but it's also their service levels. How would you describe that, Angie?
Angie Lindemann:	It's what we call level of care, and so it's their level of care determines the rate at which they're paid.
Christie Mitschke:	If they're disabled or have special needs. It also gives employee information like who their current caseworker is. And then other stages of service that they're in as well as merge information. So one of the complications that we've

	experienced is dealing with when we merge people, and if there are any merges that have occurred, it also gives that indication as well in the file.
Angie Lindemann:	And in DFPS, we'll merge to reduce duplicate individuals in the system. We have a function or a mechanism that allows people to merge or combine records if it's the same individual. As with any process that you develop, sometimes there are errors when people are merging. So it does become complex when you merge an error and then you have to extricate all of that data that you pushed together. I'm glad you brought that up because we then have to make sure what we're sending over to our partners is complete because what they may have received the day before, may look different today because of some perhaps correction to a data record or a merge process may have occurred since the last time we sent the data. And as we mentioned, we do send those unique identifiers, like their person identifying information. In a merge situation, we would send them the closed person identifier and the forward person identifier. So they can make some decisions, and all of the decision-making is made then on their side. The court, OCA, when they receive the file, figures that out for themselves.
Joyce Rose:	Oh, that's interesting. Hopefully that doesn't happen very often, right?
Christie Mitschke:	Well, it happens much more than we would like it to.
Angie Lindemann:	As they're around longer, I think that it stables out. I think that's the beauty of it.
Joyce Rose:	Yes, yes, yes. Subeera, can you add information from Alabama please?
Subeera Singh:	Yes I can. So it seems pretty similar to what we've heard so far. The interface is bi-directional. It runs nightly Monday through Friday. Information is initially sent to the Administrative Office of Courts when a home removal is entered into the FACS system. After that, there is information added or a change made to the client record that was sent. Joyce, would you like me to elaborate on the elements exchanged?
Joyce Rose:	Yeah, at a high level please.
Subeera Singh:	Yes, so from a FACS to the courts, the exchange county case number, client demographics, parent information, living arrangements, petition information, client attorney, and social worker information. And then from courts to FACS, it's the courts' case number, court hearing information, juvenile probation officer name, officer phone, court order type, petitioner information. That's at the high level.
Joyce Rose:	Yes, yes, yes. And under each one of those high levels are significant subtopics. So, we can share that with you if you would like, just let us know.

	Okay, so on to question number five, and we're going to start with Texas. I'm going to ask you, how is the data used in both systems?
Angie Lindemann:	Unfortunately Joyce, on this one, our response would be that we would need to check in with our programmatic partner to make sure that we are providing the right information about how the courts are using all of the data. We're more than happy to provide that response after today's webinar once we reach our point of contact.
Joyce Rose:	Okay, and let me explain that Texas also was hit with some bad weather and folks from the courts and the programmatic side were unable to join us today. So, Angie you can provide that if you would like to at some point in time.
Angie Lindemann:	Sure, absolutely.
Joyce Rose:	Can you explain how the court information is used in the Texas system?
Christie Mitschke:	We have very little court information. We have the court and cause number. There's a couple of pieces of information that are stored with that legal status information that I mentioned earlier, but that's really it.
Angie Lindemann:	It's a very small subset of data. And our direct delivery field staff also get that information as well, but certainly if we can have more accurate information from our partner, then that's always better.
Christie Mitschke:	So it's the court number and cause number. Those are the two items that I know of because we get the updates from a website when a new court comes on. That doesn't happen that often. And then that's reported along with the legal actions and legal status information in our system.
Joyce Rose:	Okay, thank you. And Utah?
Joseph Listello:	So for us, the biggest thing that the courts probably use is a lot of the case planning that we do with the child clients that are involved. Probably the biggest initiative that we've had over the last couple of years is the process by which we file things with the courts relative to the cases we're working with. We switched over to being completely electronic. So that's probably one of the biggest day-to-day things that the caseworkers do as part of their case management is they now what the court has termed "e-file" all of their court planning documents and stuff that they need to have prepared for their next hearing in court. On the opposite side, that's probably the biggest thing. Our caseworkers get from the data in the court system is the orders that originated that we have rights to see outside of ECFS and hearings and incidents that any of the kids on their current caseload have upcoming with the courts. As far as timeliness, it's all real-time, so whenever it's updated in the court system and somebody pulls it into our

	SAFE system, or reads I should say from it in the SAFE system, it's live as of when it was last updated.
Joyce Rose:	Great, thank you. And D.C.?
Spencer Wilder:	Yeah, for D.C. I think our process is very much similar. I do know that in our exchange, we actually create PDFs, which we store of all of our documents, which includes the complaints, the court orders, and the court hearing. We get both the PDF and we actually get data that we can pull in to our application for workers to use. The main thing is that all of the information from the court is sent to the workers and they have access to read it. One of the biggest attributions is really keeping up with the dates. So all the hearing dates pull in to the actual calendar of the worker. For court orders, we actually use in part in making our IV-E determination. Outside of that, the court is just keeping the information so that we both have the most recent status of what's going on with the kids.
Joyce Rose:	Okay, and Subeera, Alabama?
Subeera Singh:	The response as provided by the state: The Department of Human Resources uses the information for case management. We generally use court information whether it is entered or comes via the interface on reports. Timeliness is an issue for both systems. FACS users don't always get information entered timely, which means the information is not sent timely. The same issue is present for both Administrative Office of Courts. The court clerks in each county are responsible for entering the data into the ALP system, and this information is not always entered timely. Thus, it doesn't come to FACS timely.
Joyce Rose:	So from Alabama's perspective, timeliness of the data is obviously an issue and a challenge. And so, moving on then to question number six: What are your current and future data exchange efforts and plans? Let's start with the District of Columbia, please.
Spencer Wilder:	So with the new CCWIS regulations coming out, I think we're looking at an opportunity to expand our relationship with the court and really improve our exchange. We will continue to get the court hearings, the court reports, and the court complaint forms. Ironically, at one point early in the process, we actually were doing case plan. But some issues on the court side arose, so we had to terminate that exchange. So we're definitely going to revisit that. I think after hearing from the court, they actually are no longer going to accept hand-delivered case plans from the workers anymore, so we have to automate that. The other benefit is that we're also going to be reaching out to Child Support so that we can actually get that income data on the kids and build an exchange with them, and it's all in the same building.

Joyce Rose:	Wow. Lots to do.
Spencer Wilder:	Yes.
Joyce Rose:	So Texas, what are your current and future data exchange efforts and plans?
Angie Lindemann:	Well, currently we're evaluating CCWIS to determine how number one, whether or not we're going to declare, but that certainly lends itself to opening up several exchanges with entities. But outside of CCWIS, DFPS was also in the process of planning to exchange data with multiple entities. Some of you may be aware that DFPS is outsourcing some of its foster care functions. And in order to allow the outsource provider to be able to have information about the children that we have in our care, it's required that we have to share as much information with them as possible. Not all of those outsource providers have the same types of system or their system may not have the same capabilities or same types of data in their respective system. So with that on the horizon, for the agency in general for foster care, we know that regardless of our CCWIS decision, we will have to develop some type of uniform exchange for cost containment purposes. And figure out how to do this in the most flexible, cost-effective way that we can do this. And so one of the bigger challenges that we see is the data governance around all of the data that will be shared back and forth. As I mentioned, anybody that we're sharing data with, they certainly don't have the same system set-up that you would. We're also internally talking and having discussions about setting up a data governance council. In fact, in our last legislative session, one of the bills that was drafted was that DFPS was to create this data governance council, but that requirement was removed along the way during various iterations of that particular bill. However, because of the outsourcing of the foster care, the agency does see a need to continue on without any, although there may not be the mandate in place, we do see it as a need because again, we want to be sending good data back and forth and see which rules are also going to also require that data quality aspect of it.
Joyce Rose:	That is certainly a perspective from the global data exchange effort. Is there anything specific to the courts' interface that you are going to do in the future?
Angie Lindemann:	Well, as Christie mentioned before, it's been pretty stable. They've not really inquired about expanding. Actually I take that back. We did have a bill this past legislative session that actually expanded on the amount of data that we would be sending in terms of the children that had been or had not been in our care previously. We're examining that right now to determine how we can achieve that. The program side has been in discussions with the court systems. The other bill requirement that we have from our last legislative session is around also sharing information potentially with the adult Texas Criminal Justice System. The court system for the criminal justice system here in Texas, they also

want to have an awareness of whether or not there are any adults that are about to be or currently are incarcerated, who have had any history within our agency as a child, or perhaps within a family that we served at some point. We do anticipate that the court systems, whether that be the Children's Court Commission or the Office of Court Administration, we do anticipate that they will be coming back and asking us to provide and expand more and more data, especially as we go down this path with exchanging data with other entities, specifically with outsource providers.

Christie Mitschke: We did have one meeting a couple years back where we talked about exchanging a lot of the court appointments, documents and all of that. And I think the biggest challenge with that is just the technology and doing that with all of the different county courts. It's just a challenge and so we have to develop some sort of central repository place, which is technically limiting.

Angie Lindemann: And that also stems from a need that originated from some of our caseworkers because they certainly have a challenge trying to continue to keep up with typing up the court reports and sending them to the right individual for the right court and the right county. Sometimes we have families that cross or sit on boundaries of multiple counties. So that was a need expressed to our IT division to eliminate some of the paperwork for the caseworker.

Joyce Rose: Continuing challenges, Utah? Future data exchanges.

Joseph Listello: So probably our biggest ones that are coming up hopefully in this calendar year, one of the aspects of case management that we don't currently send that the courts have expressed interest in getting is what we just call our Activity Logs, which [are] just narrative notes that the caseworker will do as part of their case management. And we're hoping we get to provide that to the court so that the judges or whoever can see part of the case planning and what's going on relative to helping the kid. The biggest thing that we're trying to get from the courts that our workers ask for is what we call the Court Calendar, which is a way of presenting the data when kids that are on the caseworker's caseload are supposed to appear in court, and when their hearings are, if it changes, so that they can get notified [more quickly]. So we're trying to get some of that information from the courts and present it at a high level in our system so that caseworkers know where they need to be. The biggest thing is if something changes, so if one is going to be a judge in one county, now it's a judge in a different county or different court building, they'll know before they get to the place that they shouldn't be.

Dana Rickert: There's one other thing. We're also doing an expansion of our document piece system. Historically, our DCFS workers were looking at court orders, and they only had access to official orders after the hearing and sometimes the timeliness

of receiving that was an issue, or they were looking for extra information. And courts structure their documents based on a lot more rules than Family Services have. They have limitations on timelines and when you can receive certain information – all of that extra stuff. So we had to coordinate with them to make sure that we are able to see all of the documents that we were privy to and at the appropriate time. So we're working on that interface hopefully within the first quarter of this year.

Joyce Rose: Great. Subeera, can you add the information from Alabama, please?

Subeera Singh: I will read the response. Currently, we are sending some data to AOC, which is the Administrative Office of Courts in the form of a query that was not included in the original interface. We would like to make changes to the current interface to include this. At the time that we have the discussion with the AOC, we will be looking at all changes/additions to the interface that would benefit each agency.

Joyce Rose: Thank you, and I must add that all of our participants and panelists have.

Subeera Singh: Operator?

Operator: Everyone is still connected.

Joyce Rose: Okay, that was my fault, I apologize. Moving on to question number seven starting with Utah. What were and are key lessons learned that you would like to share with other states?

Joseph Listello: From a non-technical side, the biggest thing we learned as I mentioned earlier on in the roundtable was that setting up regular meetings to discuss this with all the "right" people in the room, whether that needs to be whoever from the technical side, whoever from the business side, lawyers, project managers, and obviously we have the benefit of being able to do it in one room. But a conference call or some level of being able to communicate on a regular basis and not through chains of emails and stuff like that. Literally just being in a place where you're all communicating was probably the biggest thing from the non-technical side. From the technical side, a couple other states mentioned this earlier, but deciding what elements will be stored, how we're going to link them back. I think whichever state brought up the merge process, that's a big one for us too. Obviously just deciding how we're going to handle that. As a slightly more specific example, something that happens here with the way the courts store their unique identifiers versus the way we do. When a kid is adopted in the system, it's sort of like a merge but not really. It's like a new person but it started from another person, which sounds terrible but if you think about it in terms of data, it makes a lot of sense. So being able to handle those outliers or maintenance things and how they become resident in both systems so that if we update something that's a unique identifier for the courts, we make sure to tell

	them or have a process for communicating that change to them. That's about it for us.
Joyce Rose:	Okay, the District? What are the key lessons that you'd like to share?
Spencer Wilder:	I think in agreement that the number one thing for us is to always make sure you understand how your program, your agency and your front-end user are really going to use the data. I think you've got to start from that place initially. The whole thing about exchanging data back and forth becomes relatively easy, but you want to make sure that you're solving the right problem and you're meeting the right need. To that end, I would also say our theme around here is to "measure twice and cut once." So being able to have those conversations on a regular basis to really understand how the data is going to be interpreted, we use different terminology back and forth between the two agencies. So you really have to take the time necessary to make sure that you are speaking the same language. You really need to understand the development capacity of your partner. We were fortunate enough to have a set of developers through D.C. Superior Court, where we could actually have those conversations and figure out how to make their kind of antiquated system produce and receive the same information that we needed. Determine how you want to handle the data errors. I know we put in a number of things in place. We actually have an email notification that runs out daily around how many things that we've sent and received from the courts, but you have to think about things that are very, very simple. One of the things that I know recently we've been dealing with is just the names of judges and how frequently they change. And being able to have that in your application and being able to update that and send that information back and forth to the court to make sure it's accurate is important. Duplicate clients, you know, we have a pretty sophisticated merge capacity, but what does that mean in terms of: you've got two or three versions of a client in your application. How do you ensure that the court is dealing with the right one? And I think lastly, being able to forecast any changes within your child welfare system. I've been here just under six years and I think we've taken on, revised, and then case planned at least twice and we may be headed for a third. So how do you make sure that you can at least think down the road and figure out what your exchange is going to look like, not just today but tomorrow. I think the combination of those things is what I would advise any jurisdiction to do if they're looking to build or enhance any data exchange with the court system.
Joyce Rose:	Let me ask you, do you have court participants participate in your change management group?
Spencer Wilder:	Absolutely, yes. At its height and even now, we were having pretty regular conference calls. We had some in-house with the developers and court personnel, and we had regular weekly meetings with them to kind of keep the

	statuses of where we were going and talking about each individual processes in great detail to make sure that everybody's needs were met. But yeah, definitely could not have done it without court involvement.
Joyce Rose:	Great, thank you for that response. And Texas, what are your key lessons learned that you would like to share with your colleagues?
Christie Mitschke:	I would say ditto to the past two people who spoke because a lot of what they were saying, we've experienced and I would agree with all of those points. I think what Texas has done that's a little bit differently than others is we've used less of the data in our system so we don't have to keep up with so much of it. We rely on the caseworkers to take the court and cause numbers down, and we limit what we're sorting and having to keep accurate with other systems' data. We're really moving towards sharing more data more live than having so many data exchanges. Of course, we have a lot of limits with that, so we can't do that. Anyway, I think to the point of the agreements between the agencies and how we work together could be improved. We have a Memorandum of Understanding document that's kind of, you know, how are we going to work together, but I don't think that's visited enough and revisited when we do have changes to our system, as a part of change control. So although we've been very stable with what we have, I think the more interfacing we do, the more back and forth exchanges we do, we're going to have more issues with that type of thing. I do agree also with understanding how they're using – we don't have a clear understanding, as far as we believe, of how the courts are using our data that we send over there. We're kind of wondering if they use it [laughter], but I'm sure they do or we would have heard about it. I think not enough time to develop a good system and test it back and forth is probably the one thing I see from historical changes that we had to do those first couple of years. If we had spent more time maybe working out those kinks ahead of time, and we do a lot more of that now - more planning, more documenting, design, requirements. We're making a great improvement on our side of DFPS IT to gather requirements ahead of time and really make sure we've got that down and agreed upon before we move forward in the development process. I think we've learned those lessons over the year, would you agree Angie that we need to do that?
Angie Lindemann:	Yeah.
Christie Mitschke:	Because what ends up happening is you start developing something, and then the requirements change or somebody thinks of something new or different. So if we don't get that really nailed down from the front, we end up taking a lot longer to get it right. Anything else you want to add Angie?
Angie Lindemann:	No, I think you've covered it.

Joyce Rose:	Excellent. Subeera, can you add information from Alabama please?
Subeera Singh:	Joyce, these don't seem to be key lessons, they seem more like recommendations and questions to ask before maybe working on a data exchange. So I'm going to read the response that we have. I would recommend they ask themselves these questions: what do you need/want the user information for? What data measures will be affected? Will the information be added directly to the system? If it is added, how will users be able to identify the information that came over, as opposed to information that was added by the user? Will/should users be able to make changes to the information that came via the interface? Do reports need to be created from the information to identify discrepancies, errors, or provide information sent that cannot be added to the system? If there are, make that part of the initial development. Other recommendations: if you think you may need particular information in the future, go ahead and plan to send it or receive it. Listen to the counterpart and try to give them as much as possible. Find ways to get any information they will provide into the system, or at least into a report so that it is readily available. We have some limits in getting juvenile probation officer and guardian ad litem information into our system because our system doesn't create clients or collectables. Because of this, we're not getting this information enough to really be of benefit. That's all I have.
Joyce Rose:	And that was a lot. And I want to thank our participants because you have presented a lot of key lessons learned that will be a benefit to all of our colleagues who are attending this webinar. And that actually concludes the discussion portion of our roundtable.
David Baker:	Joyce, this is David, we have some questions that were submitted over the chat if you want me to read those now.
Joyce Rose:	Okay. Yes please. David Baker is going to run the Q&A session. David?
David Baker:	Okay, I just wanted to make sure I got through these. I want to remind folks if they have additional questions, they can type them in to the questions that you can find in the control panel on the right of your screen. If you don't see it, there should be an orange arrow at the top that you can use to expand it. Our first question for all the panelists was: Has anyone faced a situation where the court records' reporting system did not provide any exchange capability, and then the state had to resort to screen scraping technology?
Joyce Rose:	Utah, D.C., Texas?
Joseph Listello:	We never needed to resort to screen scraping where it was transmitted back through. But there are a few key Program Administrators, both at the state office and spread throughout the regions of Utah that had direct access to the

court system called CARE. So there's a handful of people that can log in for some reason to provide support, if for some reason the data isn't coming back through the SAFE system. But not screen scape. They'll still just directly log in to the court system. And then that governance is handled of course by contracts like Fair Use, they have to sign a sheet saying they know they're getting into the system so, we audited it that way.

Spencer Wilder: This is the District of Columbia. No, we've never had to do that. Like I said, fortunately the court initiated, at least the interface with us, so they had a small number of development resources that they could at least commit to this. And here again, I just think it made it easier on their end as well. So they came to the table committed, and we've been able to grow it over time. But no, we've never really dealt with the jurisdiction that did not have any type of development resource.

Christie Mitschke: And that would be the same for Texas. I don't think we've come across that challenge before.

David Baker: Okay, thank you. I also want to remind folks that, as the slide says, you may also press Star 1 on your phone to access the operator's assistance to speak to the group. And we'll check in with the operator now and again to see if there are any calls in the queue. The next question that was submitted is: Did any of the states use NIEM, the National Information Exchange Model, to implement their interoperability? If not, why was it not considered? Utah?

Joseph Listello: We don't, and as to the why, I would assume that this was not on anybody's radar to being used on either side at the time.

Angie Lindemann: When we, like Christie mentioned before, we were in the 2008 time-frame, and so that probably wasn't on our radar either until recent. That may not even have been in existence at that time, and you guys can certainly correct me if I'm wrong. Not an item for us.

David Baker: D.C., do you have anything to add?

Spencer Wilder: Sure, I was just about to weigh in. Alright here again, just like the others, I think our interface pre-dates NIEM. So we started our initial interface around 2003, so I think NIEM was a baby, if not anything else.

David Baker: Thank you all three. Operator, I just wanted to check to see if there are anything calls in the queue?

Operator: No, there are no questions in the queue at this time.

David Baker: Thank you Operator. Would the states or the district be willing to share the MOUs that they have developed? Texas?

Angie Lindemann:	We are certainly more than willing to go back to our program partners to access the most recent copy and discuss that with them.
Spencer Wilder:	District of Columbia. How much? [Laughter] No, we'd be more than happy to share any kind of MOU document that we have with any other jurisdiction.
Joseph Listello:	Yeah, for Utah the same thing. We can look at just sending a template of how we filled ours out or the structure we use to give to the courts.
Joyce Rose:	So, let me interject here. We are going to come up to a slide that has our state participants' emails. So if you want to request those MOUs directly from the state, you can use the emails that you will soon see. David?
David Baker:	Thank you, next question. Did anyone face an issue where an individual judge would not cooperate? Or does the court agency take care of that kind of objection or reluctance to participating in data sharing? D.C.?
Spencer Wilder:	No, I mean not to my knowledge. I mean, we can have some pretty hard-headed judges, but I don't think we face any opposition at that point.
Angie Lindemann:	This is Texas. I don't think we've come across that specific scenario. We've had some other very interesting ones, but not that one. [Laughter]
Joseph Listello:	From our perspective, it's definitely not filtered back to us, at least the Division of Child and Family Services. So either the courts are handling that internally, or it's not happening, which is my guess. That's not to say the judges don't certainly request features that impact both sides, but I have not been privy to any out and out, like objection or opposition to anything.
David Baker:	Okay thank you. Next question to all three again: How many court vendors are you engaging? Utah?
Joseph Listello:	For Utah, just one.
David Baker:	Texas?
Angie Lindemann:	For Texas, none. We're working directly with the court itself.
David Baker:	And then D.C.?
Spencer Wilder:	Just one for us as well.
David Baker:	Okay, thank you. Operator are there any questions in the queue?
Operator:	No there are no questions in the queue.
David Baker:	Thank you. This next one is specifically for Utah. It sounds like your exchange occurs in real-time, but data is not transferred or stored in your system. Do you

	expect this exchange to be CCWIS compliant? Or are you making changes to address CCWIS compliance?
Joseph Listello:	We'll be adding additional features depending on our declaration with CCWIS, and it will be mostly related to any of the data quality planning or reporting that we'll need. We'll just address those as it comes up relative to the interface.
David Baker:	Okay, thank you. This next question is addressed to Texas. Is your data exchange uni-directional? If not, what information do you receive back from your court partners?
Christie Mitschke:	Yes, we are only sharing the data with our Office of Court Administration. We're not receiving anything from them. The only thing that we do is we use information out on the internet to grab down the new courts, and we add those to our system through an operational process. Did that answer the question?
David Baker:	Yes you did, thank you. The next question is for D.C. Does the calendar integrate with Outlook for upcoming hearings?
Joseph Listello:	We wrap all of our calendar stuff in a Java script framework that we use called Full Calendar, it's in our web application. So we get the data back from the courts and then re-jigger the data and do some filtering and some formatting to put it in a format that is acceptable to that. So no, it is not integrated with our other calendars. It's basically, you can only see that calendar inside of the SAFE system.
Spencer Wilder:	And the same with D.C. Our calendar is within the application, so we have not at any point in time, pulled that to the Outlook calendar.
David Baker:	Okay, thank you D.C. Texas, this is a follow-up to the question about reluctance about participants in data sharing. You made a reference to "interesting issues". Is this something you can elaborate on?
Angie Lindemann:	Well I think when I made that reference, we certainly have some judges in our area who like to… we've had many instances where judges may order us to do something with our system, some of you may or may not be aware of the Federal Court Ruling that we're currently going through right now. That's just one example. Certainly we've had some judges and other jurisdictions that would like for DFPS to do many other things for them or engage in some other data sharing, as opposed to being resistant to sharing. But, again, we have judges that will approach our agency leadership or regional leadership to talk about those kinds of things and developing pilots. Bexar County is one where the courts, Judge Sakai in Bexar County has been very willing to come and talk with regional leadership about things that he wants to explore for his court's system. One of those things had to do with a type of filing system for some of

	the court reports, and that was specific just to that county. But we have had quite the opposite where we in fact may have judges wanting us to be more engaged and do some more work that the system clearly may not be capable of doing at the time. So we just have to talk those things through with our agency leadership, our general council and kind of get to what the root of the issue may be in instances where judges really want us to do more, provide more and in a particular way.
David Baker:	Thank you, another question. Can you speak to how confidentially issues have been resolved, meaning in what the courts have access to in the child welfare systems. What child welfare data courts may have access to? Utah?
Joseph Listello:	So that's all wrapped up inside of our Memorandum of Understanding - what specific documents and what parties contribute relevant to that.
David Baker:	Okay, thank you. D.C.?
Spencer Wilder:	Same here, it's in our MOU. Other than our court monitors, we don't allow child welfare information to be exchanged or to be accessible.
David Baker:	And Texas?
Christie Mitschke:	Yeah it's covered in our MOU as well. We do have PII data, so it's secure data but it's covered in the MOU.
Angie Lindemann:	But I will say that we do have a function within our case management system that allows us Court-Appointed Special Advocates [CASA]. The advocates for children and families when they go to court. We had built a special type of view for those particular individuals, so they certainly can take any information that we've allowed them to view from our system.
Christie Mitschke:	We are actually delivering it to them now. We just recently built a true data exchange with our CASA entity. So they can certainly take anything into that court room that they'd like to share, regardless of whether or not there may be some confidential or sensitive data that they should perhaps rethink about sharing.
Christie Mitschke:	But that data was passed through legal as well, so I think we're covered there, I hope. [Laughter]
David Baker:	Okay thank you. Just to let you know, because of that mention of confidentiality information, details of how it works, being in the MOU, there's even more interest in seeing MOUs. As Joyce had mentioned, there will be a slide up shortly for people to contact the participants. Operator, are there any questions in the queue? Operator?
Operator:	There are no participants in the queue at this time.

David Baker:	Thank you very much. Joyce, that's all the questions we have in the chat right now, so I'll turn it back over to you. Thank you.
Joyce Rose:	Thank you, David, for running the Q&A session, and I want to compliment our participants for the great discussion and roundtables, audio only are very impersonal, so your dialogue has been excellent and I really appreciate it, and I'm sure our attendees do also. Next slide please.
	Once again, I want to thank you. A shout out to our panelists, and as stated previously, if you'd like to contact them directly, their contact information is listed and this PowerPoint is available for you, so you will have their email addresses.
	This portion of the webinar has been recorded and will be made available online. When it is complete and posted, a message will be sent announcing its availability on the Children's Bureau website. Once again, a huge thank you to our panelists, and as we move forward with the series, the confirmed upcoming event is on February 14th. We are doing a webinar which will showcase State Genogram or Family Relationship Diagram functionality in systems from Indiana and Ohio. So thank you for attending, and that ends the roundtable discussion.

END