

**From:** Thompson, Lorrie  
**Sent:** Tuesday, April 19, 2016 4:16 PM  
**To:** Happold, Stephanie <Stephanie.Happold@courts.wa.gov>  
**Cc:** Ferrell, Wendy <Wendy.Ferrell@courts.wa.gov>  
**Subject:** RE: JISC Data Dissemination Policy Draft review

Hi Stephanie – Here are my comments regarding the draft policy for responding to requests for JIS court financial data:

#### H. Financial Data.

1. Requests to courts or county clerk's offices will be handled by that individual office in the same manner as all other requests for court data.

2. Requests to the AOC for statewide financial court data or for an individual court's data will be handled in the following manner:

a. Requestor will provide as much detail as possible regarding specific financial information requested. Explanations may include such information as specific codes, accounting or non-accounting needs, statewide aggregate, court aggregate or case-by-case data, and court levels.

I don't know if it should be part of the policy, or perhaps part of an implementation plan, but because this can be much more confusing than requesting case data, I'd like to see if we can provide explanation and guidance on our DD web page regarding how to clearly request financial data so as to expedite the process and reduce costs. Things like explaining what 'codes' and 'aggregate' and "non-accounting" refer to in this section of policy, and any other tips for crafting requests to help with accuracy. Our doing so will help us appear more transparent and helpful in providing this information to the public and the media.

b. The AOC will review the request and submit any clarifications to the requestor. Communications may need to take place between the AOC staff and the requestor so the parties know what is being asked for and what can be provided. The time taken for clarifications and meetings will be in addition to any time estimates given for compiling the data. Further, the requestor will be charged for the staff time under the approved cost recovery fee for research/programming.

It's unclear here whether the requestor will be charged for all time needed for clarifications and meetings (is that considered 'research?'), and whether there will be any effort to expedite the clarifying process. Without more detail, this could be considered particularly onerous in cost and time, and make us appear to be less than helpful.

Although I know it's not wise to promise any kind of timeframe for providing data, since requests vary so much, would it be possible to add a sentence such as, "The AOC (or Data Dissemination Committee) is committed to providing requested data with both timeliness and accuracy." (It re-states the commitment to timeliness but includes 'accuracy' by way of explaining the need to take the time to get it right).

c. Prior to release of the report, the data will be reviewed by delegated court and/or county clerk representatives.

To what purpose does the court/clerk review the data from the JIS inquiry? Do they get to oppose its release or ask that it be changed? How would they justify this (based on the fact that it came from the

data system)? What would WE do if they asked for changes? Can they just hold onto it for as long as they want before 'reviewing' it? There is not much detail included in this part of the policy and I think it needs more clarification and direction. I think this would be the main question reporters and others would have of this policy.

*Lorrie Thompson* | **Office of Communications and Public Outreach**

Administrative Office of the Courts | 360.705.5347

Twitter: [@WaCourts](https://twitter.com/WaCourts) | [Facebook.com/WashingtonCourts](https://facebook.com/WashingtonCourts)

