

## Time Line for processing records in Wood County Clerk of Courts

### Prior to April 1977

- ❖ Appearance docket (O.R.C. 2303.12) - typed or handwritten
- ❖ Judge's docket books (O.R.C. 2303.12) – typed or handwritten
- ❖ Indexes (O.R.C. 2303.12)—typed or handwritten
- ❖ Journals (O.R.C. 2303.12) judgment entries were being hand-written or typed word for word from the original court order into a blank page in a journal book
- ❖ Paper files were maintained in Legal Size (8.5 x 14); judge's staff would check case files out when needed by the court.
- ❖ Retention: Very little microfilming was being done; paper was being retained for all records (Note: first microfilm for the Wood County Clerk of Courts created in Clerk's office in the summer of 1974)
- ❖ Cases were assigned by "roll of the dice" Even numbers were one judge; Odd numbers were the other judge.

### After April, 1977

- ❖ Journals-copies of all journal entries were copied and placed in a binder and indexed in each book—this became the updated Journal Books, replacing the handwritten/typed journal books
- ❖ Appearance dockets-sheets typed on
- ❖ Judge's docket books-all pleadings/court order information and dates for hearings that was also placed on the Clerk's Appearance docket was then typed in the judge's docket books; if the judge had his docket book then the clerk placed the information on "Pink sheets". The Clerk typed the same information that they typed on the Appearance docket including case number and date on the "pink sheets" and these sheets were held in the Clerk's office until the judge's docket book was returned to the clerk's office. The clerk copied all of the information off the "pink sheets" to the judge's docket books; therefore, the clerk was typing the same information three times.
- ❖ Paper files were maintained in Legal Size (8.5 x 14); judges staff would check case files out when needed by the court
- ❖ Retention: Some microfilm of the records was being done after the case was completely final, most papers were still being retained. Record retention was directed according to Ohio Historical Society guidelines.

### After 1986

- ❖ Clerk's office invested in the first electronic case management system called "Fortune". Although this project was determined to be a non-user friendly system and was abandoned, it did pave the way for the Clerk's second computer system investment (in 1990) called "WRITS"
- ❖ Journals-copies of all journal entries continued to be copied and placed in a binder, indexed in each book; as well as, entries into the electronic system, "Fortune" (dual data entry occurring)
- ❖ Judge's Docket books (eliminated in November, 1987)
- ❖ Appearance Dockets—information continued to be typed in books, along w/entry into electronic system "Fortune" (triple data entry occurring)
- ❖ Indexes—information continued to be typed in books

- ❖ Paper files were still being maintained (8.5 x 14), judge's staff would check case files out when needed by the court.

#### 1990

- ❖ Clerk's office went "live" with a more advanced Case Management Software package called "WRITS". This investment allowed clerk staff to not have to record information in duplicate/triplicate processes.
- ❖ Indexes and Appearance docket information was entered in case management software (WRITS) and maintained in one process (manual appearance & indexes processes were eliminated after a short verification process happened –lack of trust of computers) (July, 1990)
- ❖ Judge's staff would check case files out when needed by the court but Clerk files were no longer able to be checked out by the parties and/or attorneys of record.
- ❖ Facsimile filings were permitted by Court; faxes no longer than 10 pages in length permitted. Clerk filed the facsimile filing and docketed it indicating that the document was a fax filing; within three (3) business days the filer was responsible to filing the original document bearing original signatures and the clerk was to docket said filing indicating that it was the original filing. (09/12/1990)
- ❖ Retention—Due to the increase of the number of cases being filed, more microfilming was being processed, cases files were being destroyed after microfilm was completed and verified; according to Ohio Historical Society guidelines.

#### 1997/1998

- ❖ Supreme Court distributed Superintendence Rule 26. A retention schedule specifically for court records management, which the Clerk's office follows for all case related matters.

#### Year 2001

- ❖ Wood County Website created with Clerk of Courts participating.
- ❖ Random Judge Selection changed to electronic through computer system instead of paper cards;

#### September 2, 2002

- ❖ Clerk's office continues to enter information for Appearance dockets into an electronic case management computer system, new database of "WRITS"
- ❖ Began scanning all documents digitally into Document Management System "Onbase" as documents were submitted to the clerk's office.
- ❖ Paper files were still being kept but not shared with the Court staff, kept directly in the Clerk's office. Parties filing were ordered to provide a "judges" copy at time of filing.
- ❖ Retention: microfilming being done from paper; cases destroyed after microfilm was completed and verified; according to Superintendence Rule 26

## November 5, 2006

- ❖ Office moved to updated Case Management System, which is a Windows-Based System “CourtView”

## Late 2008

- ❖ Electronic image of documents and the court appearance docket tied together through portal
- ❖ Clerk’s Office signed first Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) with Ohio Supreme Court to become a partner to establish the SCO’s Ohio Courts Network (OCN)

## 2009

- ❖ Clerk’s office continues to enter information for appearance docket into electronic case management computer system-CourtView
- ❖ Scanning all documents electronically
- ❖ Retention—Records being sent from digital version to microfilm, cases shredded after accuracy verified according to Superintendence Rule 26
- ❖ Prior records that had been microfilmed, and additional documents had been filed, microfilm and files are not being scanned into OnBase (digital image software); and then images added or deleted, whatever the case may be; is dumped electronically back into microfilm.
- ❖ Clerk’s office integrated an automated redaction software package to work with CourtView and OnBase software. The original documents are available to court personnel and a redacted copy of the original is presented for public use. Redaction of personal identifying information became statute under the Ohio Revised Code in October, 2009.
- ❖ Clerk’s office resigned MOU with Ohio Supreme Court for “Ohio Courts Network”

## 2010

- ❖ Initial start w/Auditor FinQ allowing electronic access to Auditor's Office to process purchase orders
- ❖ Launched acceptance of “Credit cards” for both Legal and Title Office

## 2011

- ❖ Collaborated w/Records Center/Commissioners/Probate/Recorders to purchase SMA51 Archive Camera
- ❖ Posted first “legal notices” on the Clerk of Courts website
- ❖ Installed NeoPost—electronic Certified Mail mailing solution
- ❖ Access for 6<sup>th</sup> District Court of Appeals for electronic filing of “WD” case types is provided.
- ❖ Dual monitors for Deputy Clerks allowing access to several programs at the same time.

## 2012

- ❖ Received first sales tax liens from the Attorney General's office via FTP through CourtView.
- ❖ Eliminated paper documents being filed into Case file folders; instead filing into a box system
- ❖ Introduced and started "ScanFirst" a workflow within Onbase –staff working off the electronic image to process documents instead of off the paper documents.

## 2013

- ❖ Started Debt Collection process through CourtView for Attorney General Collections
- ❖ Stopped creating physical case folders for Divorce and Civil cases. Created "Box Filing System" filing documents by file-stamped date

## 2014

- ❖ Stopped creating physical case folders for Criminal cases. Created "Box Filing System" filing documents by file-stamped date

## 2015

- ❖ "Sheriff's Project"-built workflows into OnBase to allow documents to flow electronically between the Sheriff's Office and the Clerk of Courts Office that was formerly all processed by paper and the Sheriff's office picked up on a daily basis. Summons on Indictments, Summons on Complaints, Warrants to Arrest, Warrant to Convey, Notice to Serve's, and Order of Sale. Once the Sheriff performs the service as requested then the Sheriff provides the return back electronically. Form is automatically stored in OnBase without rescanning from paper.

## 2019

- ❖ 03/19/2019—Went "Live" for electronic filing (e-filing) with CourtFileNow (CFN) for Domestic Relations & Civil case types only.

## 2020

- ❖ April 2020—started processing bonds via e-mail with defendants at Wood County Justice Center due to COVID-19 and the Courts doing Video arraignments.