This document outlines key scenarios and functional requirements for a comprehensive guardianship case management system, segmented into five essential categories: 1. User Roles/Access, 2. Record/Document Management, 3. Report Filings, 4. Aggregate Information/Queries, and 5. Correspondence. By detailing these aspects, we aim to provide courts with a clear framework to communicate their needs effectively to vendors. This structured approach, informed by the guardianship capability model, user stories, and specific data elements, ensures that the system will support the diverse and complex tasks involved in guardianship case management. The primary goals are to establish business and technical requirements for long-term reporting and monitoring of guardianship and conservatorship cases, and to encourage vendors to provide necessary functionality. Ultimately, this will help courts effectively use technology for monitoring, reporting, and oversight, leading to improved service delivery, compliance, and efficiency. While the list is not exhaustive, it encompasses the critical functionalities necessary for a robust and user-centric guardianship management solution.

## **1.0 User Roles/Access**

**Scenario 1:** System Administrator logs into the guardianship application and accesses user management. From there, they assign login credentials to court staff members, ensuring each user has a unique username and password. The system prompts the administrator to generate a unique profile for each user. The administrator configures access levels for different user roles, such as granting Interested Parties read-only access and Guardians permission to file reports. If a guardian is removed from a case, the system automatically revokes their access to prevent unauthorized access.

**Scenario 2:** A court staff member encounters a situation where a user forgets their password. They navigate to the user management section of the guardianship system and initiate a password reset for the affected account. The system sends a password reset link to the user's registered email address, allowing them to create a new password following the court's password policy.

**Scenario 3:** When court staff members attempt to access the guardianship system, the application verifies their identity and permissions. Only users with the appropriate role settings can view or modify case information, ensuring data security and confidentiality. Staff members without relevant permissions are restricted from accessing sensitive data.

**Scenario 4:** A guardian logs into the guardianship system to access case information for the person under guardianship they represent. The system verifies their identity and permits access to all cases assigned to them, allowing them to view relevant details and file necessary reports.

**Scenario 5:** An attorney logs into the guardianship system using their user account linked to their bar number. They are granted access to cases based on their representation role (representing the guardian, the person subject to guardianship, or guardian ad litem), ensuring they can view and manage information related to their clients' guardianship matters. The attorney can file motions on behalf of their clients.

Requirements (Not an Exhaustive List):

1. The system must allow court staff to assign and authenticate login credentials for users.
2. Court staff should have an administrative screen to assign users and permission settings.
3. The system should allow users to create accounts and access cases based on roles and permissions.
4. Court staff should be able to invite users and grant access based on roles and permissions.
5. Court staff should be able to manage user accounts and initiate password resets, enforcing strong password policies.
6. Users should be able to verify their identity and change passwords for secure access.
7. Password recovery should be supported after authenticating a person's identity.
8. Access to the system should be verified based on permission levels and role settings, ensuring authorized users can view relevant case information.
9. Guardians, attorneys, and other authorized users should be able to access case information relevant to their roles.
10. The system should provide a customized experience for users, displaying information based on their job responsibilities.
11. Judicial officers and attorneys should be able to delegate access to their cases to designated staff members.
12. The system should facilitate auditing of access and edits for monitoring and incident purposes.

## **2.0 Record/Document Management**

**Scenario 1:** Upon logging into the guardianship system, court staff members are greeted with a customized dashboard tailored to their job responsibilities. The dashboard prominently displays relevant information such as upcoming court dates, pending tasks, and case summaries, enhancing efficiency and productivity.

**Scenario 2**: An attorney logs into the guardianship system and navigates to the search record/document management function. The system displays a list of cases assigned to the attorney, allowing them to select a specific case to access detailed information and documents relevant to their representation.

**Scenario 3:** A guardian accesses the guardianship system and utilizes the search function to identify and access all cases assigned to them. They input their guardian credentials and perform a search, which generates a list of cases they are responsible for. The guardian selects a case from the results to review case information, reports, and other relevant documents necessary for fulfilling their duties.

**Scenario 4:** A court staff member or judicial officer needs to identify all cases statewide to which a specific attorney is assigned. They log into the guardianship system and initiate a search, entering the attorney's details. The system retrieves a comprehensive list of cases associated with the attorney across all jurisdictions, enabling the court staff member or judicial officer to access relevant case information as needed.

**Scenario 5:** Similarly, a court staff member or judicial officer seeks to identify all cases statewide to which a specific guardian is assigned. They use the search function to input the guardian's information, prompting the system to display a list of cases assigned to that guardian across different regions. This allows them to access case details and documents related to the guardian's responsibilities.

**Scenario 6**: A judicial officer requires access to all cases assigned to them within their jurisdiction. They utilize the search function within the guardianship system, specifying their jurisdiction details. The system presents a list of cases within the designated jurisdiction, allowing the judicial officer to review case information, status, documents, and proceedings relevant to their duties.

**Scenario 7:** A court staff member logs into the guardianship system to identify and access all cases assigned to their jurisdiction. They use the search function to filter cases by jurisdiction and further refine the search by specifying the assigning authority (judicial officer, reviewer, attorney, or guardian). The system provides a list of relevant cases within their jurisdiction, categorized based on the assigning authority, facilitating efficient case management and oversight.

**Scenario 8:** A judge logs into the guardianship management system and navigates to a specific case. The system displays a summary of relevant information, including bond details, total assets, a link to prior court orders, and monitoring notes. The judge can review this to quickly grasp the essential details of the case before proceeding with a hearing.

**Scenario 9:** Before starting a hearing, a judicial officer logs into the guardianship system and selects a case. The system prominently displays key information such as the person's name, age, anniversary date of the guardianship, and the relationship of the guardian to the person. This concise display ensures that the judicial officer has essential facts readily available at the beginning of the hearing, facilitating efficient proceedings.

**Scenario 10:** During a hearing, a judicial officer uses the guardianship system's interface, which features intuitive icons designed to help them quickly locate relevant information. These icons are strategically placed within the interface and represent different categories of information, such as financial details, reports, or legal documents. By clicking on these icons, the judicial officer can access the most pertinent information with ease, streamlining the hearing process.

**Scenario 11:** While presiding over a guardianship hearing, a judicial officer needs to issue various court orders efficiently. They navigate to the "Generate Court Orders" section of the guardianship system. The system provides options to create common court orders such as Order of Appointment, Order Approving Accounting, and Order Terminating Guardianship. The judicial officer selects the desired order type, and the system automatically populates the document template based on the information entered into the system. The judicial officer can then review and finalize the court order directly from the system, eliminating the need for duplicate data entry and ensuring accurate and expedited order generation.

Requirements (Not an Exhaustive List):

1. The guardianship system application should include a search engine feature accessible from the main interface.
2. The search engine should allow users to enter keywords, such as case numbers or parties' names, in a search bar.
3. The search engine should support wildcard, proximate, and fuzzy logic to find party names.
4. Upon initiating a search, the application should display a list of relevant search results based on the entered keyword.
5. Search results should include case numbers and parties' names associated with each result for quick overview.
6. Clicking on a search result should allow users to access detailed case information and documents related to the selected case based on their user role and permissions.
7. The search functionality should be robust and capable of handling a large number of cases and parties' names.
8. The search engine should provide accurate and reliable results, ensuring relevant case information is consistently retrieved.
9. The user interface of the search engine should be intuitive and user-friendly, with clear instructions and feedback.
10. The guardianship system application should be securely accessible to authorized users, ensuring confidentiality and data protection.
11. The search engine should be fast and responsive, providing search results in a timely manner.
12. The search engine should support advanced search features such as partial matching, filters, and sorting options to enhance the search experience.
13. Integration with the court's existing case management system may be required to retrieve case information accurately.
14. The guardianship management system should include a summary for each case, containing bond information, total assets, case status, and links to prior court orders. Also, key information such as the person's name, age, anniversary date of the guardianship, and the relationship of the guardian.
15. The system interface should incorporate user friendly interface to help judicial officers quickly locate relevant information during hearings.
16. The system should facilitate the generation of common court orders, including Order of Appointment and Order Terminating Guardianship, based on the information entered into the system.
17. Court orders should be generated in a format to allow for easy review, editing, and printing by judicial officers.
18. The system should allow judicial officers to add, view, and edit confidential judicial notes, where applicable by jurisdiction.

## **3.0 Report Filings**

**Scenario 1:** A guardian logs into the guardianship system and navigates to the reporting section. They have the option to manually enter income and expenses or import data from their accounting system or bank accounts. The system allows them to categorize transactions, add descriptions, and upload supporting documentation. Once all information is entered, the guardian submits the report, and the system generates a summary document containing income and expense details, ensuring compliance with court orders and responsible management of the person's resources.

**Scenario 2:** A guardian prepares to submit a report for the current year but needs to refer to the previous year's accounting information. They access the guardianship system and utilize the import function to retrieve data from the previous year's report. The system seamlessly imports the necessary information, allowing the guardian to review and compare data before finalizing the current report submission.

**Scenario 3:** As the due date for a report approaches, a guardian receives a plain language reminder notification via email, text, or mail from the guardianship system. The reminder includes the due date and instructions for submitting the report. The guardian can also specify their preferred method of receiving reminders, ensuring they receive timely notifications according to their preference.

**Scenario 4:** After submitting a report, a guardian receives acknowledgment from the guardianship system confirming successful submission. This acknowledgment provides assurance that the report was received by the court and is under review. Additionally, the system sends notifications if any changes or additional information are required, ensuring transparent communication between the guardian and the court.

**Scenario 5:** Court management reviews the workload distribution among staff members for reviewing guardianship reports. They notice that some reports require reassignment to ensure timely review. Using the guardianship system, the court has the ability to reassign reviews to different staff members based on workload and expertise, ensuring efficient management of the review process.

**Scenario 5:** A judicial officer reviews reports filed by guardians using the guardianship system. They have the ability to view the anniversary date of the guardianship, current reporting status, monitoring notes from staff, and any overdue reports. The system displays this information prominently, allowing the judicial officer to efficiently track compliance and take necessary actions if reports are overdue or incomplete.

Requirements (Not an Exhaustive List):

1. The guardianship system should allow guardians to import income and expenses from their accounting system or relevant bank accounts.
2. Guardians should be able to import information from the previous year's accounting report.
3. Guardians should have the option to upload required supporting documentation along with their reports.
4. The system should send reminders to guardians when reports are due and provide acknowledgment upon successful submission.
5. Judicial officers should have access to view anniversary dates of guardianships, current reporting statuses, and overdue reports.
6. Guardians should be able to receive reminders via email, text, or mail and specify their preferred method of reminder communication.
7. The guardianship system should send notifications via text, email, and mail to relevant parties about the status of submissions and provide confirmation and updates through preferred communication channels.
8. The system should allow guardians to view previously submitted reports and upload edited versions if necessary.
9. The system should maintain all previously submitted reports for reference and auditing purposes.
10. The system should be capable of extracting key data from uploaded documents, such as PDFs of bank statements.
11. Guardians should have access to sample or form reports and instructional videos to assist with report preparation.
12. Court staff should have the ability to flag cases for action, enter the status of flags, and remove flags once concerns are resolved.
13. Court staff should be able to generate physical reminder letters and overdue notices as necessary.
14. The system should identify if a final report is due upon the conclusion of a guardianship and adjust due dates accordingly.
15. The system should support electronic signing of reports by guardians for verification purposes.
16. Court orders should be accessible within the guardianship system for all relevant parties.
17. The system should provide administration capabilities for managing forms, resources, and red flags efficiently.
18. Court management should be able to reassign reviews to ensure timely processing.
19. The system should queue filings for review to appropriate staff members based on established rules and allow for reassignment by court management.
20. The system should prepopulate essential information on annual reports to reduce errors.
21. The system should allow tracking of reports along a court workflow, showing statuses and bottlenecks.
22. The system should search for "red flags" from specific reports and filings to efficiently identify and address potential concerns or issues based on configuration by the court.
23. The system should identify duplicate reports to ensure fresh submissions.
24. The system should allow court staff to indicate credible allegations or findings of abuse or fraud by guardians.
25. The system should allow court staff to queue reports for review, track reviewed and pending reports, and manually add "red flags" during the review process.
26. "Red flags" should be visible only to court staff and judicial officers to maintain confidentiality.
27. Accounting irregularities should be highlighted for review.
28. The system should compare case-level bond data to the estate value to set red flags on data discrepancies.
29. The system should automatically set tasks and reminders for required actions by guardians and court staff.

## **4.0 Aggregate Information/Queries**

**Scenario 1:** Court staff log into the guardianship system and notice that several reports are overdue for submission. Using the system's notification feature, they send reminders to the relevant guardians and attorneys via email, text, and mail, informing them of the status of their submissions (due, overdue, submitted, reviewed, accepted). The system automatically records the communication preferences of each party and sends notifications accordingly, providing confirmation and updates through their preferred communication channels.

**Scenario 2**: As the due date for a report approaches, court staff receive an alert indicating that the report is incomplete. Using the guardianship system, they identify the missing information and notify the guardian to ensure accuracy, completeness, and compliance with required standards and regulations.

Requirements (Not an Exhaustive List):

1. The system should identify incomplete reports or filings to ensure accuracy, completeness, and compliance with required standards and regulations, utilizing AI capabilities.
2. The system should track the status of reports to monitor progress, ensure accountability, and maintain an organized workflow.
3. The system should track estate value over time to ensure responsible financial management.
4. Court staff should receive alerts for reports that have not been reviewed within a set number of business days of submission.
5. The system should search for "red flags" across cases to identify patterns of errors or recurring issues, improving case processing based on configuration by the court..
6. The system should allow court staff to indicate that a red flag should be dismissed.
7. Notifications should be sent to court staff if a case involves an incapacitated person or a guardian matched to a death record.
8. Judicial officers should receive real-time alerts when active guardians are removed from cases for cause in any jurisdiction in the state.
9. The system should notify court staff if a guardian on any cases has been suspected or found to have abused or defrauded another person under guardianship in any jurisdiction.
10. Court staff should be notified if a guardian or person under guardianship is charged in a criminal or domestic violence case.
11. The system should capture the relationship between guardians and the person under guardianship.
12. The system should allow reporting of the person under guardianship’s needs or wants.
13. The system should notify appropriate agencies when a person is adjudicated incapacitated.

## **5.0 Correspondence**

**Scenario 1:** A court staff member receives a notification from a guardian requesting clarification on the upcoming court hearing date for a guardianship case. Using the guardianship system, the staff member replies to the communication and the system captures the date, time, and content of the message. This ensures that all parties involved are aware of the communication exchange and can refer back to it as needed.

**Scenario 2:** After receiving the notification from the court staff member, the guardian promptly replies, acknowledging receipt of the information and providing additional details regarding their availability for the hearing. The system records the reply in the system, indicating the date and time of the response. This allows for clear tracking of communication history within the system, ensuring that all parties are informed of the latest developments in the case.

**Scenario 3:** An attorney representing a party in a guardianship case needs to correspond with the court regarding recent case developments. Using the guardianship system, the attorney logs into the platform and sends a message to the court staff, detailing the updates and requesting any necessary actions. The system allows for bi-directional communication between the attorney and court staff, ensuring that parties have access to the most up-to-date information.

**Scenario 4:** The court schedules a hearing for a guardianship case and needs to notify all relevant parties of the hearing date. Using the guardianship system, the court staff enters the details of the upcoming hearing into the system, including the date, time, and location. The system automatically generates and sends court hearing notices to all parties involved, utilizing mail, email, and text communication channels. This ensures efficient communication of court hearing dates and helps parties stay informed about scheduled events.

Requirements (Not an Exhaustive List):

1. The guardianship system should allow court staff to log and track communication exchanges.
2. The system should permit recording of replies to ensure comprehensive documentation of communication history.
3. Two-way communication should be supported with the court.
4. The system should have the capability to generate and send notices of court hearings and other events via mail, email, and text.
5. Notices should include relevant details such as date, time, and location of hearings.
6. Communication records should be easily accessible and searchable within the system for reference and audit purposes.
7. The system should provide a "read aloud" option and availability in multiple languages.