JUDICIAL INFORMATION SYSTEM COMMITTEE

March 5, 2010
9:00 a.m. to 12:00 p.m.
AOC Office, SeaTac, WA

Minutes

Members Present:
Justice Mary Fairhurst, Chair
Chief Robert Berg
Ms. Cathy Grindle
Mr. Jeff Hall
Mr. William Holmes
Mr. N. F. Jackson
Mr. Rich Johnson
Judge Steven Rosen
Judge Michael Trickey
Ms. Siri Woods
Ms. Yolande Williams

Members Absent:
Judge James Heller
Mr. Marc Lampson
Mr. Steward Menefee
Judge Thomas J. Wynne

Guests Present:
Mr. Shayne Boyd
Ms. Barb Miner
Mr. Jordan Moss
Mr. Brian Rowe
Mr. Joe Siegel
Mr. Kevin Stock
Mr. Jake Taylor
Mr. Roland Thompson
Mr. Mike Zanon

Staff Present:
Mr. Bill Cogswell
Ms. Jody Graham
Ms. Vicky Marin
Mr. Chris Ruhl
Ms. Pam Payne
Mr. Gregg Richmond
Mr. Ramsey Radwan
Ms. Kathy Wyer

Call to Order

Justice Fairhurst called the meeting to order at 9 a.m. and introductions were made.

October 23, 2009 Meeting Minutes

Motion to approve the December 4, 2009 meeting minutes, the motion carried. August minutes as amended were approved.

Budget Status Report

Mr. Ramsey Radwan presented the Expenditure and Obligation financial report for activity through December 31, 2009. A new report, entitled Project Allocation Revisions, was also presented. The Project Allocation Revision report will identify changes in the amount allocated or budgeted and will be presented to the JISC every six months. Mr. Radwan also presented four versions of a new report entitled Quarterly Comparison. This report is designed to compare quarterly budget estimates to quarterly expenditures and obligations. The JISC selected version 4 as the preferred version. Mr. Radwan will present the Expenditure and Obligation and the Quarterly Comparison reports at the April 23, 2010 JISC meeting.

Legislative Status Report

Mr. Jeff Hall reported the House and Senate budgets are out. The Senate has passed their budget off the floor, and the House budget is still on the floor. This version for the House, came out of the Ways and Means committee.

There are significant differences in the 2 budgets relative to JIS. The Senate budget fully funds the supplemental budget request of 3.7 million dollars for fiscal year 2011, and also does a 1.5 million dollar fund transfer from the JIS account to the General Fund. It makes some corrections to the proviso that we instituted last year. The Senate budget also includes a $100,000 dollar proviso

against appropriated funds requiring a 3rd party review of the JIS Operational Plan developed by Ernst & Young and adopted by the JISC.

The House budget does not include either the supplemental budget request or the fund sweep as included in the Senate budget. It also fails to make the technical correction to last year's proviso. The House budget does contain a new proviso that requires that we take a look at existing in-state Case Management Systems that are operational and report back to the legislature.

We are working with the House to try to bring them to an agreement that they will work with the Senate in funding the supplemental budget request. The Equipment Replacement funding in the current budget appropriation appears to be safe at this time.

Mr. Jeff Hall reported on Bill 6499 (Concerning the administration, collection, use, and enforcement of tolls). We have completed our feasibility study and we will send it to DOT for them to use. DOT is expected to reimburse AOC for the feasibility study. As passed by the legislature, the bill creates an administrative process for contesting toll violations and removes this process from the purview of the courts.

House Bill 3178 (Creating efficiencies in the use of technology in state government) is a technology bill; initially the overall bill did not touch the judicial branch. A striker on the bill was passed which very explicitly pulled the judicial branch into several provisions of the bill. The House passed the bill with objectionable language. The Senate floor striker included more palatable language consistent with our requested amendments.   Generally, the bill addresses issues like IT governance and portfolio management, areas we are already addressing under the operational plan. Section two, which places some restrictions on IT purchases in 2011, was amended to specifically exclude the judicial branch. There is a new section amending our JIS statute, chapter 2.68 RCW which requires JISC to develop an IT portfolio consistent with the criteria outlined for the rest of state government. In addition, the judicial branch is encouraged to participate in the development of a state wide IT strategy as outlined in section eleven. Finally, the judicial branch is required to present our JIS portfolio for review to OFM, DIS, and appropriations committee staff. The bill also requires DIS to work on a statewide IT inventory, in anticipation of developing a statewide IT asset management process.

There is an early budget savings bill that restricts hiring, out of state travel, equipment purchases and contracts over five thousand dollars. The bill this year specifically excludes JIS equipment and JIS contracts.

Operational Plan Status Update

This was moved to the end of the meeting. Discussion did not take place due to time constraints. Please direct any question with regards to the enclosed report, to Gregg Richmond.

Non – JIS Information Technology

This was moved to the end of the meeting. Discussion did not take place due to time constraints.

IT Governance Initiative Update

Mr. Shayne Boyd presented the final IT Governance framework to the committee for approval. Mr. Boyd explained that, at the direction of the JISC, the IT governance team included the court

community in the development of the framework, which was done through governance advisory panels (GAP) for each court level that worked through the process and workflows. The outcome of those sessions was tested through tabletop exercises using real and fictitious examples.

The result was a process containing 5 key steps: Initiate, Endorse, Analyze, Recommend, and Schedule. Mr. Boyd explained how IT requests would flow through each of the steps of the governance process. He explained that the process includes communication on the status of requests. The process will necessarily be handled on paper initially, but would be automated eventually.

In the initiation step, a concern was raised that the process would be too complicated. In response, they developed the minimum information that is necessary to move requests through the process. Incidents and mandated changes would have a fast-track process. Individual sites can develop their own rules for review of requests to avoid bogging down the system.

The endorse step addresses the concern raised was to ensure the real problem gets clearly defined. The feedback from the GAP sessions was that there should be 10 bodies endorsing requests, not the entire list of 36 groups on the listserv. To address the issue of timeliness, the endorsing groups should have charters that establish rules for how requests will be processed through them. They are also looking for endorsement groups to identify what other groups might be impacted by a proposed change. At the endorsement step, it would be the court community that would deny a request. It would also serve as a way to narrow the number of requests.

To address a concern that it would take too long for AOC to analyze requests, the analyze step will consist of a "ballpark" estimate, and if it's over a certain size, the recommendation back to the endorsing group would be that it be moved forward for a feasibility study. Can't commit to timeframes, but simpler requests could take hours, more complex requests approximately 5-7 days, if AOC receives supplemental funding to have the bodies to do that. Based on feedback from the GAPS, that analysis would go back to the endorsing groups to confirm that they want the request to go ahead. The key will be to get the feedback loop from the endorsers without requests getting bogged down. To avoid requests taking too long in the analysis step, the plan is to have them tracked.

The recommend stage is step four of the governance process. User groups will apply filtering criteria, scoring the request, grouping them as to high, medium, or low, and prioritizing them top to bottom. The outcome would be a unanimous decision to advance the request, advance the request with pros and cons, or unanimously decline to forward the request. If no unanimity, requests would still move forward. The Review Committees would be one for each court level. Things that affect more than one court level would go directly to JISC. If the committees are approved, the question of who should be on these committees will come back to the JISC for approval.

The Schedule step is deciding to schedule, pend, or return a request to the recommending committee. JISC makes the decisions, but JISC has delegated decisions under certain dollar values to Gregg or Jeff. The committee can change that delegation at any time. To avoid items remaining in pending status for too long, they should be re-evaluated periodically. If a request is returned to the recommending committee, the committee has the choice to re-send the request. If a request is returned by Gregg or Jeff, and the recommending group disagrees, the request would go to the JISC. To address competing priorities, the JISC needs to set a single set of senior-level guidance that the endorsers, recommending committees can use. JISC can re-evaluate and re-set senior level guidance periodically.

- Motion: To adopt the framework – as presented by Shayne and shown in the PowerPoint – as amended by the JISC today. The amendment: to have AOC as the 4th review committee for all requests that don't fall under the purview of one of the other 3 groups, and adding the Misdemeanant Corrections Association as the 11th endorsing group. Between now and the next meeting, they will come back with more detail, and the committee will buy off on that document.

  Yea: unanimous. Nay: none. Abstained: none.

The next steps are to create and charter the committees, create the documentation, do the training necessary, and move toward automation. JISC will come back in the next few weeks and provide guidance regarding current priorities, business priorities, whether to dedicate specific amounts for funding, identify key projects, and endorse recommended strategies.

SCJA Request/Recommendations for a Case Mgmt System

Mr. Jeff Hall reported a commitment was made to start the next big project in July 2010. The next project that should be taken on is the superior court case management and calendaring system for superior courts. That has been the consensus but not the official action of JISC to make that statement.

In trying to honor the developing governance process, and in order to be prepared to meet the deadline to start in July, Mr. Hall has been talking to and working with the Superior Court Judges Association (SCJA) over the past couple of months, to put into writing and describe in as much detail as possible what their need is and what their official request is to JISC, to proceed with the acquisition of a case management system for superior courts.

In order to keep this moving forward, based on what was adopted today, Mr. Hall suggested bringing the superior court administrators, judges and clerks together to have an initial conversation about this so we can move this forward to JISC for action potentially at the April JISC meeting. Mr. William Holmes asked to have juvenile court administrators included in the conversation.

Public Case Search Workgroup Report

Discussion did not take place.

Data Management Steering Committee Report

Discussion did not take place due to time constraints. Please direct any question to Rich Johnson.

Next Meeting

The next regular meeting will be April 23, 2010, at the AOC SeaTac facility; from 9:00 a.m. – 12:00 p.m.

There being no more time, the meeting was adjourned at 12:20 p.m.