



MINNESOTA JUDICIAL BRANCH

Legal Paraprofessional Pilot Project Implementation Committee

Meeting Summary

January 27, 2020 | 1:00 pm – 4:00 pm

#	Topic
1.	<p>Welcome & February Meeting Schedule</p> <p>A. February Meetings Committee agreed to meet twice in February to review and finalize the committee report.</p> <p>B. Review of Regulatory Sandbox draft Hard to envision how an option like this could fit into what the Court order requires. One issue of concern is funding for an ongoing regulator FTE position plus possibly more (IT staff, etc.). The model is based on licensing and that is not the approach that we're taking so it doesn't quite seem to fit with what is currently contemplated in MN.</p>
2.	<p>Confirm possible decision points</p> <p>A. Participant Qualifications The committee further discussed what "substantive experience" means for the pilot project. The requirements established should not restrict the ability to participate in the pilot. The committee discussed creating a roster process that includes an application and certification guidance for the participants. Will also need a standing committee to oversee the pilot projects. The process should also include some kind of oversight of approved participants that may result in removal from the pilot projects.</p> <p>B. Areas of Law</p> <p><u>Housing Disputes</u> The committee agrees to keep this is an area for pilot project focus. In scope: Landlord/Tenant actions under Minn. Stat. § 504B, representing tenants. Out of scope: landlord representation, other housing/property case types.</p> <p><u>Family Law Disputes</u> The committee agrees to keep this as an area for pilot project focus as well. In scope: child support modifications, default hearings, paternity cases, informal court processes (e.g., the family law simplification project), and mediations under certain conditions (property, child support). Out of scope: disputed custody, cases with allegations of domestic and child abuse, major income/financial/property disputes</p>
3.	<p>Discuss Focus Group Report The committee received a summary of the sessions and the outcomes. One item that remained unsettled was establishing a goal, or goals for the pilot project. The committee discussed some ideas for goals, including improve court efficiency, increase representation for low to modest income Minnesotans, and access to justice.</p>



MINNESOTA JUDICIAL BRANCH

4. Continued evaluation discussion

The committee agreed that the final report should include high-level recommendations that an evaluation plan be developed before the pilots are launched based on the goals. Some possible evaluation options might include satisfaction survey(s), MNCIS data, feedback from judges, and financial/cost data.

5. Final report content review

Some committee members expressed concerns about breadth of feedback received through both the survey and the focus group sessions. The committee discussed options for addressing these concerns in the future.

Member Roster & Attendance

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Justice Paul Thissen	Co-Chair
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Judge John Rodenberg	Co-Chair
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Thomas Nelson	MSBA
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Sally Dahlquist	Inver Hills Community College
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Maren Schroeder	Rochester, MN
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Tiffany Doherty-Schooler	Duluth, MN
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Pamela Wandzel	Minneapolis, MN
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Christopher O. Petersen	Minneapolis, MN
<input type="checkbox"/>	Bridget Gernander	State Court Administrators Office
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Liz Reppe	State Law Library
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Guests:	
	▪ Ellen Bendewald, SCAO	
	▪ Sarah Welter, SCAO	
	▪ Melissa Kantola, SCAO	
	▪ Sarah Doege, COA	
	▪ Madeline Baskfield, COA	