



Minnesota Counties Computer Cooperative

100 Empire Drive, Suite 201
St Paul MN 55103-1845

Phone (651) 917-6969

Fax (651) 917 6989

Website: mnccc.org

Corrections Standards Meeting Minutes March 23, 2010, 9:30 a.m.-11:45 a.m.

In attendance: Jennye Croft, Dakota; Paul Schroeder, Ramsey; Dan Traun, DOC; Nancy Tallman, Wright; Heidi Rademacher, Scott; Dan Pepper and Wendy Anderson, Washington; Brandy Christiansen, Goodhue; Tami Noble and Ardi Ihrke and Brenda Martini and Pat Jacobson, DFO; Lynn Rohlf; ARC; Jan Krugman, DOC; Jeanne Cook; Todd-Wadena; Barb King, STI

Electronic Manual Subgroup

Jennye announced that she, Barb, Carl, Dan and Paul met to discuss ideas around creating an electronic standards manual. The subgroup developed some ideas that will go to the enhancement committee for review and placement on the enhancement priority list.

Victim bucket in CSTS-Follow up item

Jan brought question to group at March meeting about whether there should be something in the standards document detailing how linked cases interact with victim data. It wasn't clear to group how that functionality worked in CSTS. Dan will research how it works and report back to group at next meeting.

Report back from Dan to group that the *edit victim* functionality allows a user to link a victim of a case to another client record in CSTS. Once linked, any other clients the victim was a victim of will be listed upon opening the victim record. The reason for entering claimant information, nor who would fit the definition of a claimant, is not clear and doesn't appear to be of great value for most current agency practices. The group agreed that some language should be added to standards manual regarding these features.

Condition coding

Question asked of group for input regarding how to code a family group decision making condition. There was uncertainty around whether it should be coded as a support group, an independent living skills group, or as counseling. Feedback from group was that it best fit as a support group.

In-state and out-of- state transfer out S3 coding

The committee was asked for clarification on the usage of the newly created coding by the DOC to differentiate between in state and out of state transfers. Agencies are not obligated to create codes to differentiate between the two types of transfers. However, if they want to differentiate between them, then they need to set up separate codes and map them to the correct S3 codes. Jennye will contact Deb at DOC to get written clarification on the exact process for coding this correctly.

Pre-defined facilities field

The group clarified that the pre-defined facilities field in the address module is conditionally required when the predatory placement check box is checked and data is entered for predatory placement. CSTS won't let a user save data if pre-defined facilities isn't populated after data is entered in predatory placement area.

Agent Work Standards

The committee was asked for input on standard practice for agent work when an agent work task has not been completed at time of case closing. Options discussed were leaving agent work task without a completion date, deleting the agent work task, or entering a completed date. The committee came to agreement that the issue was a business practice decision rather than a standards issues and thus agencies could choose the best approach for their business practices.

Standards manual review

The group continued its review of the standards manual. Reviewed and came to agreement on the standards values for data fields through supervision level on page five of the manual. Came to group's attention to the manual also needs to be updated to include standard language for the new "update client county of residence" check box field.

Next Meeting:

Tuesday, April 27, 2010

9:30-11:45 a.m. @ STI