ITG Request #026

SPECIFICS	DESCRIPTION		
Title	**Prioritize Restitution Recipients**		
Description	This request is for an enhancement to JIS to allow courts to prioritize restitution recipients in cases where restitution is owed to multiple victims.		
CLUG	Courts Limited Jurisdiction		
CLUG Vote	Unanimous	CLUG Score (if available)	23
CLUG Priority	TBD		

ANALYSIS RESULT			
AOC Hours (Equivalent Cost)	1010 hours ($76,760)		
Contractor Costs	None		
Estimated **Minimum** Project Duration	6 months		
Type of Resources	Legacy	Type of Resources	Internal
Total Estimated Cost	1010 hours ($76,760)		

DELEGATION MATRIX RESULT	
Send to:	JISC

Prioritize Restitution Recipients

Request Detail

Requestor Name:
Ervin, Sandra G

Origination Date:
08/23/2010

Requestor Email:
servin@co.okanogan.wa.us

Requestor Phone:
509-422-7173

Recommended Endorser:
District and Municipal Court Management Association

Request Status: Awaiting CLUG Recommendation

Request Type: Change or Enhancement

Which Systems are affected? Judicial Information System (JIS)

Other affected Systems / Business Processes

Business Area: Accounting

Communities Impacted: CLJ Judges
CLJ Managers
Public and Other Users

Impact if not Resolved: Medium

Impact Description:

Persons/Agencies with large amounts owing would have a delay in in when they begin received payments, but will recieve whole payments instead of partial.

Using figures used in the problem description and $50 monthly payments The following is a summary of payments to recipients: (Amount/Current JIS Set-up/recommend change)

Year 1 - Total Payments:

Rec #1 - ($588.24 / $500.00) **Rec #2** ($11.26 / $100.00)

Year 2 - Total Payments

Rec #1 - ($588.24 / $600.00) **Rec #2** ($11.76 / $0)

What is the Business Problem or Opportunity

The courts would like the ability to prioritize restitution recepients in cases where restitution is owed to multiple victims.

The problem occurs when one recipient has a large amount of restitution ordered and another victim has a small amount ordered. The payments made by the def are split proportionally between the recipients. This creates alot of small payables to issue or hold on books until they are sufficient to cut a check.

Example - A vehicle accident is invlolved in a case with restitution ordered to insurance company and an individual for deductible.

Recipient 1 - Insurance Company - $5,000

Recipient 2 - Vehicle owner - $100 (deductible)

Currently if the defendant makes a payment - the payments would be split proportionally to each victim. (Breakdown for a $50 pmt is Approx $49.02 to Recipient 1 and $.98 to Recipient 2.

The court can either cut a $.98 check with each payment or hold until the amount is sufficient to cut a check. (12 monthly payments of $50 only total $11.76 for recipient#2)

If able to prioritize court would put recipient #2 payable 1st and Recipient payable 2nd.

Current set-up can should/ remain as defalult setting. Would like the ability to prioritize when ordered and/or needed.

Expected Benefit:

Reduced cost to courts in processing payments to restitution recipients. (time/supplies)

Any Additional Information:

Endorsement Detail

Endorsing Committee
District and Municipal Court Management Association

Endorser Name:
Ervin, Sandra G

Origination Date:
08/23/2010

Endorsing Action: Endorsed

Endorser's Explanation and Comments

Prioritize Restitution Recipients

Endorser Email:
servin@co.okanogan.wa.us
Endorser Phone:
509-422-7173

AOC Analysis Detail

Analysis Date: 10/29/2010

Request Rationale

Aligns with JIS Business Priorities, IT Strategies & Plans:	Yes
Aligns with applicable policies and with ISD Standards:	Yes
Breadth of Solution Benefit:	Wide

Cost Estimates

Cost Benefit Analysis Complete?	No
Cost to Implement?	1010 hours
Positive Return on Investment?	
Projected Maintenance cost?	$0
Feasibility Study needed?	No

Court Level User Group

Courts of Limited Jurisdiction

Key Business Objectives:

This request is for an enhancement to JIS to allow courts to prioritize restitution recipients in cases where restitution is owed to multiple victims. The request seeks to maintain the current system as the default whereby any payments are split proportionally amongst the victims.

Benefits and Business Value:

This enhancement would allow Courts of Limited Jurisdiction (CLJs) to prioritize restitution recipients in cases where one or more recipients have a large amount of restitution while other recipients has a very small amount ordered. By implementing this request, courts would be able to assign a higher priority to the recipients of the very small amounts in order to reduce the number of payments the courts must make to these recipients.

AOC Analysis - Proposed Solution

The Administrative Office of the Courts (AOC) proposes to enhance JIS in order to provide court staff the option to prioritize restitution recipients in cases where one or more recipients have a large amount of restitution while other recipients have a very small amount. When ordered courts would be able to assign a higher priority to the recipients of the very small amounts in order to reduce the number of payments the courts must make to these recipients. The Create Accounts Receivable screen would be modified to capture the prioritization information for restitution recipients.

AOC Analysis - Proposed Approach

AOC would provide courts the option of prioritizing restitution recipients. This would impact the JIS Create A/R (CAR) and Receipting (RCP) screens. Other screens that might be impacted are Restitution (RST) and Case Financial History (CFHS). JIS Accounting reports may also be impacted.

This work would require complete unit testing of the Time Pay programs. It would also entail full testing and verification of functionality by Quality Assurance.

Additional Systems Affected

Addtional Court Communities Affected

AOC Analysis Attachments

ITG Request 026 - Prioritize Restitution Recipients.docx

Confirmation of Endorsing Action Detail

Endorsing Committee

District and Municipal Court Management Association

Endorser Name:

Endorsing Action: Endorsed

Endorser's Explanation and Comments

Prioritize Restitution Recipients

Vance, Aimee R

Origination Date:

11/01/2010

Endorser Email:

avance@ci.kirkland.wa.us

Endorser Phone:

425-587-3163

Analysis of IT Governance Request #026
Prioritize Restitution Recipients

Summary of Proposed Solution:
The Administrative Office of the Courts (AOC) proposes to enhance JIS in order to provide court staff the option to prioritize restitution recipients in cases where one or more recipients have a large amount of restitution while other recipients have a very small amount. When ordered courts would be able to assign a higher priority to the recipients of the very small amounts in order to reduce the number of payments the courts must make to these recipients. The Create Accounts Receivable screen would be modified to capture the prioritization information for restitution recipients.

Sizing:
The following estimate is based upon the best available information and does not include cost or effort estimates for on-going maintenance of the enhancement. This analysis was approved by AOC's Operations Control Board on October 14th, 2010.

This enhancement would be accomplished by AOC's internal resources. The systems affected by the change would be: JIS.

AOC estimates that this project would take 6 – 8 months to complete. This is an estimate of the duration of the project from the date work would begin on the project until final implementation.

Group	Hours	Tasks
Court Education	80	Update training and documentation.
Business Analysis	80	Includes Customer Service input.
Architecture	10	
Maintenance (Legacy)	640	Coding, documentation, unit testing.
Data Warehouse	0	
Quality Assurance	200	Testing and validation.
Project Management	0	
Total	**1010 hours**	

ISD staff costs average $76 per hour. Contractor staff generally costs $120 - $150 per hour.

Request:
This request was generated by the District and Municipal Court Management Association as a re-validation of a previous request under the Blue Sheet system. This request was originally (Change Request) CR 828.

This request is for an enhancement to JIS to allow courts to prioritize restitution recipients in cases where restitution is owed to multiple victims. The request seeks to maintain the current system as the default whereby any payments are split proportionally amongst the victims.

Business Impacts:
This enhancement would allow Courts of Limited Jurisdiction (CLJs) to prioritize restitution recipients in cases where one or more recipients have a large amount of restitution while other recipients has a very small amount ordered. By implementing this request, courts would be able to assign a higher priority to the recipients of the very small amounts in order to reduce the number of payments the courts must make to these recipients.

AOC gathered data to determine how often the situation addressed in this enhancement request occurs. The parameters used by AOC were how many times the highest restitution ordered on a single CLJ case was at least 1000% higher than the lowest restitution ordered on the case. AOC discovered that there were 263 cases that would meet this scenario. There were an additional 299 cases where the highest restitution ordered was 500% higher than that ordered for the lowest recipient.

Proposed Solution:
AOC would provide courts the option of prioritizing restitution recipients. This would impact the JIS Create A/R (CAR) and Receipting (RCP) screens. Other screens that might be impacted are Restitution (RST) and Case Financial History (CFHS). JIS Accounting reports may also be impacted.

This work would require complete unit testing of the Time Pay programs. It would also entail full testing and verification of functionality by Quality Assurance.

Assumptions:

1. A Restitution account receivable will have only one recipient; there will not be multiple recipients on a single A/R.
2. The proposed solution must function correctly with the prioritizations defined in JIS Time Pay and the court-level prioritization of restitution, fines/fees, and probation.

Risks:

1. This request should be considered in conjunction with other requests for changes to Time Pay processing.

IT GOVERNANCE REQUEST DECISION

Recommend Decision (4th step) From Court Level User Group (CLUG)

Court Level User Group	**Courts of Limited Jurisdiction**
Chair of Group	Cynthia Marr

IT Request - **#26 Prioritize Restitution Recipients**								
Date of Decision - November 9, 2010								
Decision to Recommend for Approval	☒ **Approve** *(unanimously)* ☐ **Decline** *(unanimously)* ☐ **Split Vote:** *moves forward to JISC with pros & cons*							
Prioritization of Request	TBD – CLUG will prioritize all active requests at November 23, 2010 meeting. Request # 26 and Request # 31 will be prioritized together at the same level.							
Urgency of Request	☐ High ☒ Medium ☐ Low							
Scoring of Request	**Business Value** (1-10)	**Relative Priority** (1-10)	**Cost** (1-5)	**Complexity/ Level of Effort** (1-10)	**Risk** (1-5)	**Benefit /Impact** (1-5)	**Impact of Doing Nothing** (1-5)	**Request Total Score** (0-50)
	3.5	**5**	**3**	**6**	**2.5**	**3**	**0**	**23**
Pros & Cons *(if vote is not unanimous)*								
Additional Statements *(attachments from other groups in support or additional information that should go to the JISC for consideration)*	☐ **No =** additional statements/attachments ☐ **Yes =** additional statements/attachments							
Additional Notes	Subject to any statutory requirements or restrictions regarding payment of restitution. If both this request and Request #26 (Prioritize Restitution Receipts) are approved, the CLJ CLUG would ask that the two requests be combined, as recommended in the AOC analysis.							