

---

---

# WISCONSIN CIRCUIT COURT ACCESS OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE

## FINAL REPORT

November 2017

### Committee Members

J. Denis Moran, Chair, Director of State Courts (until July 2017)  
Hon. James Babler, Barron County Circuit Court  
Hon. Thomas Gritton, Winnebago County Circuit Court  
Hon. Everett Mitchell, Dane County Circuit Court  
Hon. Richard Sankovitz, Milwaukee County Circuit Court  
Hon. John Storck, Dodge County Circuit Court  
Hon. Derek Mosley, City of Milwaukee Municipal Court  
John Barrett, Milwaukee County Clerk of Circuit Court  
Beth Bennett, Executive Director, Wisconsin Newspaper Association  
Jean Bousquet, Chief Information Officer, Wisconsin Court System  
Patrick Brummond, District Court Administrator, 7th Judicial Administrative District  
Raymond Dall'Osto, Gimbel, Reilly, Guerin & Brown, LLP  
Reserve Judge Jean DiMotto, Of Counsel, Nistler Law Office, S.C.  
Bill Lueders, President, Wisconsin Freedom of Information Council  
Taavi McMahon, Trempealeau County District Attorney  
Gregg Moore, President, Wisconsin Counties Association President  
Sheriff Brent Oleson, Badger State Sheriffs' Association President, Juneau County Sheriff  
Theresa Owens, District Court Administrator, 5th Judicial Administrative District  
Adam Plotkin, Legislative Liaison, Office of the State Public Defender  
Theresa Russell, Washington County Clerk of Circuit Court  
Kate Spitz, Assistant Attorney General, Wisconsin Department of Justice  
Michelle Vetterkind, President, Wisconsin Broadcasters Association  
Speaker Robin Vos, Wisconsin State Assembly, District 63  
Senator Van Wanggaard, Wisconsin State Senate, District 21  
Kimberly Walker, Executive Director, Legal Aid Society of Milwaukee (until May 2017)  
Sara Ward-Cassady, Deputy Director of State Courts, Office of Court Operations

---

---

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

<a href="#">Introduction</a> .....	3
<a href="#">WCCA Oversight Committees</a> .....	3
<a href="#">Topics for Consideration</a> .....	4
<a href="#">Committee Deliberations and Recommendations</a> .....	4
<a href="#">Conclusion</a> .....	11
<a href="#">Appendix 1 – Supreme Court Rule 72</a> .....	12
<a href="#">Appendix 2 – Director of State Courts Policy on Disclosure of Public Information Over the Internet</a> .....	13
<a href="#">Appendix 3 – WCCA Oversight Committee Final Report, March 2006</a> .....	16
<a href="#">Appendix 1 – WCCA Oversight Committee Action Plan, March 2006</a> .....	17

## INTRODUCTION

The records of Wisconsin circuit court cases are created and maintained by the clerks of circuit court, registers in probate, and juvenile clerks in each county. In the early 1990s, circuit courts began keeping electronic records in a custom-developed case management system administered by the Consolidated Court Automation Programs (CCAP). Court personnel use the case management system to create each case, make a record of all parties, filings, proceedings, and orders, and record the final judgment or disposition of the case.

Records, documents, and other data entered into the CCAP case management system by court personnel are electronically stored and may be viewed by court personnel. Most court records are public, particularly in civil, small claims, criminal, traffic, and family cases. Within these case types, certain records may be confidential due to a statutory mandate or sealed by court order to protect specified information from public view. Public court records for each county, including documents, are available to view or copy in each courthouse. In addition, basic case information may be viewed online via the Wisconsin Circuit Court Access (WCCA) website. The basic case information generally includes the names of parties, the nature of the case, court record events, criminal charges, and judgments or case dispositions.

The WCCA website was initiated in response to an increasing number of requests for court records from district attorneys, sheriffs' departments, and other court business partners. Title companies, abstractors, members of the media, and the general public have also benefited from WCCA. Currently the site averages about a million page views a day. Cases are viewable on WCCA for the length of time that the records are retained by the court system as per Supreme Court Rule 72, attached as Appendix 1.

In addition to the WCCA website, the circuit courts make the same information available on a subscription basis to subscribers who wish to download information in bulk. This service is used by state and local agencies and commercial ventures that extract information from the database and repackage it for research, news, credit reporting, employment, housing, and other purposes.

## WCCA OVERSIGHT COMMITTEES

The first WCCA Oversight Committee was convened in 2000, shortly after WCCA was launched in April 1999. That Committee helped draft the Director of State Courts' Policy on Disclosing Public Information on the Internet, attached as Appendix 2.

In 2005, a second WCCA Oversight Committee was convened in order to evaluate the WCCA website and determine the efficacy of the policies informing the website's operation. The 2005 Oversight Committee examined, in particular, issues surrounding content and access (i.e., what information is displayed on WCCA and which persons may have access to the information), and retention and accuracy (i.e., how long information is displayed on WCCA and how to ensure that the information displayed on WCCA accurately reflects the court record). In March 2006, the WCCA Oversight Committee submitted its final report and an action plan for each of the 11 recommendations put forth by the Committee. The report and action plan are attached as Appendices 3 and 4.

The third WCCA Oversight Committee was convened by the Director of State Courts Office in September 2016. The Director's Office once again sought multi-disciplinary representation to help

balance the private and public interests raised when court information is placed on the internet. Committee members included judges, clerks of circuit court, law enforcement, attorneys, legislators, journalists, and court administrators. The Committee met six times during 2016-17.

### TOPICS FOR CONSIDERATION

Although every policy and procedure previously established for WCCA was a potential topic for review and revision, the Committee at its first meeting identified the following issues on which to focus:

1. Whether and how to remove information relating to dismissed cases from WCCA;
2. Whether and how to provide accountability and prevent inappropriate use of information gleaned from WCCA;
3. The need for guidelines relating to sealing a court record or certain information within a court record;
4. The need for guidelines relating to in-court processing of court minutes in order to promote uniformity in WCCA court records;
5. Whether to allow documents filed in a court case to be viewable on WCCA; and
6. Whether and how to change the nature of contracts between CCAP and bulk data subscribers in order to discourage improper use of WCCA data.

### COMMITTEE DELIBERATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

On February 14, 2017 and on March 21, 2017, the Committee voted to recommend the following:

- 1. The Director of State Courts should, in its contracts with bulk data subscribers, require the subscribers to update data and should restrict resale of data. The Director of State Court should also consider increasing the cost of bulk subscriptions to reflect the cost of the infrastructure needed to operate and to include an auditing function and oversight.**

The Committee considered testimony from the Chief Information Officer regarding how bulk data subscribers obtain information from WCCA and what they do with the information. In addition to legitimate business uses, members discussed how a small number of bulk data subscribers may be reselling court information to other businesses that publish the information on the internet and offer to remove the information from the internet for a fee.

The Committee stated its concern that these acts constitute a misuse of court data. Additionally, the Committee expressed its concern that the information published on the internet by the websites may contain false, outdated, or misleading information.

The recommendation adopted by the Committee reflects its desire to require bulk data subscribers to update information they receive as it is updated on the WCCA website and to restrict the resale of bulk data in order to protect the privacy and other interests of persons whose information is obtained by a bulk data subscriber and viewable on the internet.

The Committee determined that an audit function and associated staff is warranted to ensure that bulk data subscribers are complying with the terms of their contracts. The recommendation adopted by the Committee reflects its intent that the amounts charged to bulk data subscribers should

represent the cost of the infrastructure necessary to operate the service, including the auditing function and oversight.

**2. The Director of State Courts should create display periods on WCCA for certain case types that differ from the retention period for those case types under Supreme Court Rule 72.**

The Committee spent considerable time debating whether the display periods on WCCA should, in all cases, match the retention periods set forth under Supreme Court Rule 72. The Committee considered the argument that the online display should match the time period for which an individual could view the case file within a courthouse because to the extent there is value in retaining the court file, the same value exists in allowing easy public access to the file. The Committee considered the counter argument that court records may be maintained within CCAP for important business and legal needs, but there is little value in maintaining access to the records online for the same time period.

The Committee expressed its concern that individuals are subject to discriminatory or otherwise adverse treatment if potential employers, landlords, and members of the general public are able to view records of their court cases. The Committee agreed that this was particularly true in the case of individuals whose criminal or civil cases were dismissed or who were acquitted of criminal charges.

The Committee discussed that, under current law, a person who is convicted of a crime may be eligible to have the record of the crime expunged, but a person whose criminal charges are dismissed or who was acquitted of the charges is not eligible to have that record expunged. The Committee discussed pending legislation that may change the expungement statute, and decided that it would leave any statutory changes on expungement to the legislature. The Committee also agreed that individuals who were subjected to meritless civil lawsuits are stigmatized when their cases are viewable on WCCA.

The Committee acknowledged that there is a public value in maintaining online access to criminal cases ending in acquittal or dismissal for a certain period of time, because the public display of the court record accurately reflects an historical event and the general public has a right to know how many cases are dismissed or end in acquittal. Additionally, the public has a right to view public records regarding civil suits brought by or against a particular individual and, even when a case is dismissed, is entitled to draw conclusions from the public record.

The Committee also acknowledged that dismissed cases relating to the four major types of injunctions (domestic abuse, child abuse, harassment, and individual at risk) require a different policy than other civil or criminal case types. The Committee discussed the potential for harm to an individual who was the subject of a meritless action for these 4 types of injunctions and agreed that these types of cases carry significant stigma. However, the Committee also acknowledged that an action for these injunctions may be dismissed or abandoned for reasons other than a lack of merit, including victim intimidation, a reluctance to force a firearm restriction, and myriad issues surrounding domestic abuse.

The Committee's adoption of the recommendation to create shorter display periods in certain case types reflects its desire to balance the public's right to have access to an online display of public court records with concerns of potential harm to individuals whose dismissed cases remain on

display on WCCA for an extended period of time. Specific recommendations for criminal, civil, and civil cases involving some injunctions are below.

**a. The Director of State Courts should create a display period on WCCA of two years or less for dismissed felony cases, including deferred prosecutions, and felony cases that resulted in acquittal.**

The Committee discussed various motions recommending display periods of one year, two years, less than five years, and less than two years for these cases. The Committee's decision to recommend a display period of two years or less reflects its desire to balance the right of the general public to online access to public records with the potential for harm to individuals who may experience discrimination or other adverse treatment as a result of their cases being viewable online.

**b. The Director of State Courts should create a display period on WCCA of six months to one year for dismissed misdemeanor cases, including deferred prosecutions, and misdemeanor cases that resulted in acquittals.**

The Committee discussed a motion to recommend a display period on WCCA for dismissed misdemeanor cases, including deferred prosecutions, and misdemeanor cases that resulted in acquittals of one-half of the period the Director of State Courts creates for similarly disposed felony cases. This time period reflects the Committee's determination that misdemeanor cases should have a shorter display period on WCCA than felony cases. It reflects the same desire expressed in its recommendation for felony cases to balance the right of the general public to online access to public records with the potential for harm to individuals who may experience discrimination or other adverse treatment as a result of their cases being viewable online.

**c. The Director of State Courts should create a display period on WCCA of two years or less for dismissed small claims cases.**

The Committee discussed a motion to recommend a display period on WCCA for all dismissed small claims cases of two years or less. The Committee's adoption of the amended motion reflects its determination that there is little public value and much potential harm to individuals to maintain a prolonged online display of dismissed small claims cases.

**d. The Director of State Courts should create a display period on WCCA of two years for dismissed and for denied injunction cases.**

The Committee considered several motions regarding the display on WCCA for dismissed and denied injunction cases for domestic abuse, child abuse, harassment, and individual at risk: keep the display period at 20 years, the same as under current policy; create a display period of two years; and create a display period of two to four years.

The Committee's adoption of the motion to create a display period on WCCA of two years reflects its acknowledgement that an individual may be harmed by a prolonged online display of a dismissed or denied action for the four major types of injunctions, but that these types of cases may be dismissed or denied for reasons other than a meritless claim.

**3. The Director of State Courts should not change the display period on WCCA for family cases.**

The Committee considered a motion to change the current display period on WCCA from 30 years, which matches the retention period required by Supreme Court Rule 72, to 20 years. The Committee expressed its concern that many parties to family cases are displeased that their cases appear on WCCA at all, and that in-court processing of minutes and notes in family cases sometimes contains sensitive material that may not be suitable for public display.

The Committee voted against changing the display period. Its vote reflects the Committee's acknowledgment that family cases often have significant post-judgment activity that may persist for 25 or more years after judgment and that many parties who are not represented by attorneys rely on the information displayed on WCCA in order to monitor their cases. In addition, the Committee recommended further training and oversight of the minute-taking function. See recommendation 13 below.

**4. Case documents and digital audio recordings should remain unavailable on WCCA.**

The Committee considered a motion to keep court documents and audio recordings unavailable on WCCA. The Committee discussed whether making court documents and audio recordings available online would promote a public interest and could be a source of revenue, noting that the federal court system and 10 states allow online access to documents for a fee.

The Committee decided that case documents and audio recordings should remain unavailable on WCCA. The Committee acknowledged that documents are accessible within each county courthouse. Audio recordings are common in proceedings held in front of circuit court commissioners and are also available for proceedings in front of a small number of circuit court judges. These recordings are available to the public if the requester pays a fee to the digital court reporter who made the recording.

However, the Committee determined that there were risks of harm that outweighed the positive aspects of online access to documents and audio recordings. The Committee's decision reflects its acknowledgement that pro se litigants often file documents without redacting protected information as required by court rule, that online access to court documents may poison a potential jury pool if a criminal complaint is viewable online before a jury is seated, and that documents may contain particularly sensitive information, especially in criminal and family cases.

The Committee acknowledged, however, that it might be amenable to recommending that certain documents, such as dispositional orders, be available online in order to increase public access to court records. See recommendation 5.

**5. The Director of State Courts should study the feasibility of making dispositional orders available on WCCA and make a projection of the possible revenue generated by this action.**

The Committee adopted this recommendation after it considered that offering certain types of dispositional orders for a fee may promote the general interest in obtaining information from WCCA and may generate revenue for the courts. The Committee acknowledged that certain types

of dispositional orders, such as marital settlement agreements, should be excluded from public purchase.

The adoption of this recommendation reflects the Committee's desire to allow increased ease of public access to information that may be of public interest while protecting from general public view certain types of orders that carry an increased interest in privacy for the parties involved. The Committee noted that other courts make documents available online for a reasonable fee and that it makes sense for the Director's Office to explore this option.

On May 2, 2017, the Committee continued its deliberations and voted to recommend the following:

**6. The Director of State Courts should provide additional educational opportunities to judges on the topic of sealing court documents but should not otherwise make changes to its policy on sealing.**

The Committee discussed when and how items are sealed, or concealed from public view, in a court record. The Committee noted that the Wisconsin Supreme Court recently passed three rules protecting information in court records: protection of certain information (social security, employer and tax identification, financial account, driver license, and passport numbers) from public view, identification of information made confidential by statute, rule or case law, and sealing other sensitive information in the discretion of the court. The Director's office provided parties with forms and procedures to request that information be protected under the new rules. A party to a case may make a motion to seal other information that the party believes is not appropriate for public view, and a court may, on its own motion, order certain information sealed from public view.

The Committee discussed the relative newness of the Supreme Court rules and a certain lack of consistency throughout the state as to how often items are sealed by courts. The Committee determined that sealing is not, generally, a large or particularly controversial part of the court's workload, and that the current rules appear to address the topic adequately. The Committee felt additional opportunities for judicial education on the topic would be helpful.

**7. The Director of State Courts should add an informational disclaimer on its Wisconsin Circuit Court Access website to inform the public that a single case may appear multiple times if a party to the case used different names in the case.**

The Committee considered the potentially confusing scenario wherein a person may have multiple listings appear on the WCCA website for a single case. This happens when the person used an alias or used his or her full name at certain points of the case and the diminutive form of his or her name at other times. Under those circumstances, each alias or version of the person's name will be listed as a separate item, although the case number remains the same.

The Committee noted that using only one name and not listing the case under each name used by a party may cause a user who conducts a search on the WCCA website to miss the case if the user does not use the name chosen for display on the website. The Committee acknowledged, however, that multiple listings for the same case may confuse a user who does not look closely at the case number on the cases by leading him or her to believe that a party was involved in multiple court actions.



The Committee voted to recommend continuing to list each variant of the party's name, but to add a disclaimer that the same case may appear multiple times if a party to the case used more than one name or variants of the same name.

**8. The Director of State Courts should continue to include individuals' addresses on the Wisconsin Circuit Court Access website.**

The Committee considered whether addresses should be removed from the WCCA website, noting that this is a common request from the public. The Committee considered that state law requires certain addresses to be protected, such as the address of a person who seeks a restraining order, and that the question of whether to protect additional information may be best left to the legislature.

The Committee noted that many people have the same name and that providing addresses may assist a WCCA user to ascertain whether a named party is the person on whom he or she seeks information. The Committee further discussed that if a person has a particular need for his or her address to be hidden from view, the person could petition the court for an order that seals the address. The Committee determined that certain interest groups, such as law enforcement or social service workers, could lobby their legislators for a statutory change, but that this Committee would not recommend changes to the policy at this time.

**9. The Director of State Courts should display criminal charge modifiers on the executive summary of each case and on the display where charges are listed.**

The Committee voted to recommend changing the potentially misleading display currently in use that lists a person's criminal charges or convictions without mention that the charge was "modified" to a lesser severity by virtue of it being an attempt or a conspiracy. The modifier is included in the WCCA display, but the user will not see the modifier unless he or she clicks through the first two display screens on the case. The Committee would like to see the modifiers listed in an easy-to-understand manner in the executive summary and included wherever a charge against a person is listed.

**10. The Director of State Courts should include, in its Frequently Asked Questions section on the WCCA website, hyperlinks to statutory cites or other easy-to-understand definitions for commonly used words in court proceedings.**

The Committee noted that many WCCA users are not familiar with the court system and do not understand terms like case status, disposition code, or severity of charges. The Committee acknowledges that these terms are useful for case administration and should be retained for use in CCAP, but believes that as a public service to users of WCCA, an easily accessible FAQ that explains some of the more commonly used terms will be helpful.

**11. The Director of State Courts should include class codes used in criminal cases on the WCCA website.**

The Committee discussed whether the WCCA website should include class codes used in criminal cases. The Committee noted that class codes used in civil cases are displayed on the website and users may conduct searches for cases using those codes. The Committee further noted that commercial subscribers to bulk data collected by CCAP are able to search criminal cases by class

code, but the general public using the WCCA website cannot. The Committee concluded that, as a public service, the WCCA website should also display class codes used in criminal cases.

**12. The Director of State Courts should not delay displaying case information after a case is filed with the court but before service is made upon all parties.**

The Committee considered a suggestion to delay displaying case information until all parties in the case have been served. The Committee considered whether members of the public may be at risk if a person who has not yet been served with a case becomes aware of the case because the case was displayed on the WCCA website. The Committee discussed a case where an attorney contacted a party to a case before the party was served, but also noted that a person could find himself or herself by conducting a search on the WCCA website. The Committee acknowledged that there may be a public safety concern but noted that delaying display of a case until service is complete may cause other harm or allow people to manipulate the court system by avoiding service or delaying filing affidavits of service with the court. The Committee voted to recommend no changes to the current practice of displaying case information on the WCCA website when the case is filed.

**13. The Director of State Court should not remove minutes kept on the court record from view on the WCCA website, but should continue to train clerks on how to keep minutes in order to promote standardization.**

The Committee discussed whether the court record that is displayed on the WCCA website should include all of the minutes kept by the clerk, should include only some of the minutes, or should not include any minutes. The Committee agreed that minutes are important to understanding the court record events and serve an important purpose in informing the parties to a case and the general public about the judicial process for a particular case. The Committee noted that there is a variety of approaches to minute keeping, with some clerks keeping extensive and detailed minutes and other clerks taking more sparse minutes. The Committee determined that it would be beneficial for minutes to be as standardized across the state as possible, but declined to recommend any changes as to how minutes are displayed on the WCCA website.

**14. The Director of State Courts should include, on the WCCA website, information on how to request a correction to minutes kept on the court record.**

The Committee acknowledged that minutes may be inaccurate or incomplete in some instances, and that parties should know that there is a procedure available to them to request correction. The Committee voted to request that this procedure be explained on the WCCA website.

**CONCLUSION**

In its deliberations, the Committee strove to balance the interests of fair treatment for people who participate in the court system, efficient court records management, and the public's interest in having free and easy access to information regarding the court system. The fourteen recommendations advanced by the Committee reflect its determination of the best practices to promote the balance of interests. The Committee's recommendations do not affect the availability of case files for review in the clerk of court's office for each county. Court case files remain available for the full period of time they are retained pursuant to Supreme Court Rule 72.

Supreme Court Rule 72  
Retention and Maintenance of Court Records

This rule is posted online:  
[https://www.wicourts.gov/supreme/sc\\_rules.jsp](https://www.wicourts.gov/supreme/sc_rules.jsp)  
Click on the link for [Chapter 72](#).

## Director of State Courts Policy on Disclosure of Public Information Over the Internet

1. Definitions:
  - a. The definitions contained in the Open Records Law, Wis. Stats. §§ 19.21-.39, shall apply to this policy.
  - b. *Consolidated Court Automation Programs (CCAP)*. The case management system created by the Wisconsin Director of State Courts consisting of a database of case information from Wisconsin circuit courts. References in this policy to actions to be taken by CCAP refer to the CCAP Steering Committee or the Director of State Courts.
  - c. *Circuit court*. All offices and branches of a circuit court, including but not limited to judges, the clerk of circuit court, the clerk's deputy, or deputies; probate court; juvenile court; or other specialized court or court office that uses CCAP as a case management system.
  - d. *Open records*. Those records that are by law accessible to an individual making a records request in the circuit court.
  - e. *Confidential records*. Those records that are not by law accessible to an individual making a records request in the circuit court.
  - f. *Wisconsin Circuit Court Access (WCCA)*. A public-access internet website containing open record information compiled by CCAP. References in this policy to actions to be taken by WCCA refer to the WCCA Oversight Committee.
2. Information on WCCA available to the general public:
  - a. WCCA shall contain information from only those portions of the case files generated by the Consolidated Court Automation Programs (CCAP) that are open records and otherwise accessible by law to an individual.
  - b. WCCA shall not contain information from closed records that would not otherwise be accessible by law to an individual because of specific statutory exceptions, such as juvenile court records, guardianship proceedings, and other such case types or records.
  - c. CCAP shall not be required to make available on WCCA all information in a case file that may be public record, nor is CCAP required to generate new records or create new programs for extracting or compiling information contained on WCCA.
  - d. The Open Records Law does not allow record custodians to demand either the identity of a requester or the use to which a requester intends to put the information gathered [Wis. Stats. § 19.35(1)(i)]. Accordingly, WCCA shall not require identification or an intended purpose before allowing public access to the WCCA website.
  - e. WCCA shall not charge for accessing information through the website. However, WCCA may impose a service charge or assess user fees for requests for bulk distribution or for data in a specialized format.
  - f. WCCA may limit the number of records searched on any single request.
  - g. WCCA contains information as it exists at a specific point in time in the CCAP database. Because information in the CCAP database changes constantly, WCCA is not responsible for subsequent entries that update, modify, correct or delete data. WCCA is not responsible for notifying prior requesters of updates, modifications, corrections or deletions. All users have the responsibility to determine whether information obtained previously from WCCA is still accurate, current and complete.
  - h. WCCA shall not contain:

1. the record of any criminal conviction expunged by the circuit court (Note: When a court orders expunction of a record, the underlying CCAP database is modified to remove the record. When database updates are transferred to WCCA, the previous record will no longer appear. WCCA makes no reference to records that have been expunged (or otherwise altered). Requests for such records report only that no record has been found, in the same manner that WCCA would otherwise report "null" searches. WCCA is not responsible for the fact that requests made before the expunction will show the conviction, while requests made after the expunction will not show the conviction.)
    2. the "day" from the date of birth field for non-criminal cases
    3. the driver's license number in traffic cases
    4. "additional text" fields for data entered before July 1, 2001, in all cases.
  - i. WCCA contains only information from the CCAP database from those counties using all or part of the CCAP system. Because extraneous actions are not normally reflected in the CCAP database or the circuit court files, WCCA does not include information on them. Examples of extraneous actions are gubernatorial pardons, appellate decisions, and administrative agency determinations.
3. Correcting information on WCCA:
- a. Neither CCAP nor WCCA creates the data on WCCA. Circuit court employees in counties using CCAP create the data. Neither CCAP nor WCCA is responsible for any errors or omissions in the data found on WCCA.
  - b. An individual who believes that information on WCCA is inaccurate may contact the office of the clerk of circuit court in the county in which the original case file is located to request correction.
  - c. The clerk of circuit court in the county in which the original case file is located shall review requests for corrections and make any appropriate corrections so that records on WCCA reflect the original case records.
  - d. Corrections shall be entered on CCAP and will be made available on WCCA in the same manner in which information is otherwise transmitted to WCCA.
4. Privacy for victims, witnesses and jurors:
- a. The data fields that contain the names of victims, witnesses and jurors are not available on WCCA.
  - b. Various documents completed by court personnel using CCAP occasionally require the insertion of names of victims, witnesses or jurors. Examples include:
    1. court minutes that provide the names of witnesses called to testify or jurors who have been considered for jury duty;
    2. judgments of conviction that may provide "no-contact" provisions concerning victims;
    3. restitution orders that may contain the name of a victim;
    4. restraining orders/injunctions that may provide victim identities.

These data elements are normally inserted into "additional text" fields by circuit court personnel based on the individual county's policies and procedures on the amount, detail, or type of data inserted. CCAP and WCCA recommend that court personnel entering information concerning crime victims into court documents use initials and dates of birth rather than full names whenever doing so would not defeat the purpose of the court document.
  - c. Because the "additional text" fields contain information critical to the understanding of many of the court record entries, denying access to those fields because of the occasional

inclusion of the name of a victim, witness or juror would be contrary to the public interest in providing meaningful access to open court records.

5. Public access to electronically filed documents, scanned documents or imaged documents contained in circuit court files:
  - a. WCCA shall evaluate whether to provide access to documents that have been filed electronically, scanned or otherwise imaged by the circuit court so long as those documents would otherwise be fully accessible under this policy.
  - b. The electronic filing, scanning or imaging of some documents in a court file does not require that all other documents in that file be scanned or imaged.
  - c. The electronic filing, scanning or imaging of some documents in files in a case type does not require that all documents in all other files in the same case type must be scanned or imaged.
  
6. Non-public access to closed records available on CCAP:
  - a. CCAP may maintain a non-public website that contains information that would otherwise be a closed record.
  - b. CCAP may authorize an appropriate law enforcement agency, prosecutor's office or other individual or agency electronic access to those closed records to which they would otherwise be entitled to access.
  - c. CCAP may require an appropriate security screening mechanism that limits the accessibility to closed records to those who are lawfully entitled to such access.
  - d. Authorization to access closed records for legitimate purposes is not authorization for redisclosure beyond that which is lawfully allowed. The individual or agency to which disclosure has been allowed is solely responsible to ensure that no further unauthorized redisclosure of closed records occurs.

WCCA Oversight Committee  
Final Report, March 2006

This report is posted online:

<https://www.wicourts.gov/courts/committees/docs/wccafinalreport.pdf>

WCCA Oversight Committee  
Action Plan, March 2006

This report is posted online:

<https://www.wicourts.gov/courts/committees/docs/wccaactionplan.pdf>