JUDICIAL INFORMATION SYSTEM COMMITTEE (JISC)

December 03, 2010
9:00 a.m. to 12:00 p.m.
AOC Office, SeaTac, WA

Draft Meeting Minutes

Members Present:
Justice Mary Fairhurst, Chair
Mr. Larry Barker
Ms. Linda Bell
Judge James Heller
Mr. William Holmes
Mr. N. F. Jackson (phone)
Mr. Rich Johnson
Judge J. Robert Leach
Judge Steven Rosen
Judge Michael Trickey
Ms. Yolande Williams
Ms. Siri Woods (phone)
Judge Thomas J. Wynne, Co-chair

Guests Present:
Mr. Sanjeev Batta - Cayzen
Ms. Betty Gould (phone)
Ms. Lynne Jacobs
Ms. Marti Maxwell
Mr. Brian Rowe - ATJ
Mr. Chris Shambro (phone)
Mr. Kevin Stock
Ms. Amy Vance
Mr. Joe Wheeler - MTG

Members Absent:
Chief Robert Berg
Mr. Jeff Hall
Mr. Marc Lampson
Mr. Steward Menefee

Staff Present:
Mr. Kevin Ammons
Mr. Bill Burke
Mr. Bill Cogswell
Mr. Marty Derksema
Ms. Vonnie Diseth
Ms. Kate Kruller
Ms. Vicky Marin
Ms. Melanie McAleenan
Ms. Heather Morford
Mr. Mark Oldenburg
Ms. Pam Payne
Mr. Ramsey Radwan
Mr. Mike Walsh
Mr. Craig Wilson
Mr. Kumar Yajamanam
Ms. Deven Zipp

Call to Order

Justice Fairhurst called the meeting to order at 9:00 a.m. and introductions were made.

Approval of October Meeting Minutes

Justice Fairhurst asked if there were any changes or comments to the draft minutes from the October 27, 2010 meeting.

Mr. William Holmes addressed his previous recommendation regarding the importance of the juvenile court clerks being considered for the superior court case management system and recalled Judge Heller also mentioning the same regarding Courts of Limited Jurisdiction and did not see that mentioned in the notes. (Staff followed up and confirmed the October 1, 2010 special session minutes do capture the recommendations made by Judge Heller and Mr. Holmes.)

With no changes, Justice Fairhurst approved the October 27, 2010 minutes.

Budget Status Update

Mr. Ramsey Radwan gave the budget status update. This month we have the green sheet update, a snapshot of the total biennial amount allocated compared to the amount expended and the amount obligated through October 31, 2010, and then the variance.

The changes between the last report and this month are reflective of staff from Vonnie's group and staff from my group getting together to every contract. Each work order was reviewed to be sure each one is in the correct operational plan line item. We will have a six month update at the next meeting.

Mr. Radwan presented the budget timeline. This chart depicts timeframes for the supplemental and biennial budget development, legislative session, calendar year, fiscal year and what I have preliminarily deemed as project planning and how all of that relates to JISC meetings, Supreme Court budget committee meetings, as well as Supreme Court en banc meetings. All budget submittals that run through either the court's budget or the AOC budget must be approved by the full court.

What we wanted to point out here is how we compile all the requests into a queue and the timeframe that must be met in order to ensure all groups have enough time to make sound recommendations and decisions. This is a draft to help initiate a process for supplemental and biennial budget requests going forward.

Legislative Update

As follow-up to the recent elections, Ms. Mellani McAleenan gave a legislative update. Leadership in the House and the Senate is not changing hands. However, the Republicans did pick up seats in both the House and the Senate. Senator Prentice, the current Ways and Means Budget Chair, has announced that she is going to run for President Pro Tem. That is the person who runs the show when the Lt. Governor isn't available. This means that she won't be the Budget Chair anymore. Senator Ed Murray from Seattle has announced his desire for that seat. The majority leader's control remains the same. Senator Brown will remain majority leader in the Senate and Speaker Chopp will retain control of the House. The majority leader's position in the House will change because Lynn Kessler has retired. Pat Sullivan will take her place. The minority leaders will remain unchanged. Because of the budget situation, there is a possibility that they will do a special session.

ISD Status Update

Ms. Vonnie Diseth gave highlights on the project activity happening in ISD. The current report is through the end of October. Some of you who are actively involved in some of the projects may have newer information than what is reported in this report and may know different things that are going on or new events that have come up since the date of this report. I just want to remind you that when you see a discrepancy in something, please make sure you're looking at what the reporting period is. Often times, the report timing is the reason for the discrepancy.

Please take a look at the last two projects. The Superior Court Management Feasibility Study (SCMFS) project was Yellow with there being some issues of moderate impact. The Vehicle Related Violations (VRV) – as of October, you will see a green dot showing it active and the schedule and everything is on track. That situation has changed since this reporting period. The current status is that it should be yellow because there is a schedule change for on boarding of new courts.

Vonnie then did introductions of several new staff that were hired in the last month. Mark Oldenburg and Marty Derksema are two new Business Analysts. Craig Wilson is the new Portfolio Manager. She mentioned that there had been some turnover in the project management area. Kathy Wyer accepted the offer to be the new Court Education Manager in Dirk Marler's Judicial Services Division (JSD). Jody Graham, our PMO manager, decided to retire. We now have a vacancy there. Deven Zipp, our Project Manager on the Superior Court Management Feasibility Study, is unfortunately leaving to take a position with Department of Health. The good news is that we had just hired three new Project Managers, so the

timing was good for them to step right in. The three new Project Managers are: Mike Walsh, Bill Burke and Kate Kruller. Mike will be taking over the VRV and RMS projects. Bill is taking over the Superior Court Data Exchange (SCDX) project and Kate will be taking over the Superior Court Management Feasibility Study (SCMFS). In addition, we have two contracted Project Manager's who are not here today. But, they are also helping us work on other projects. There are two more vacancies on the Project Management team that we will continue to fill.

Justice Mary Fairhurst commented that this turnover creates an opportunity for us to bring in new people. The work being done is very transferrable. We have the substantive expertise at the table --- in the CLUGs and in our customers. And, we have the IT professionals – the Project Management expertise and the Business Analyst expertise in the new staff who are coming here. I want to welcome everyone who's joining us. We look forward to working with you and learning from you and having you help us be the success that we want to be. And that is our vision, so thank you.

Ms. Vonnie Diseth continued with an update on the Operational Activities. One of the major changes that we're working on, is improving the communications with Department of Licensing (DOL) and working to monitor progress on outstanding issues. We have had many significant issues since the summer with the lack of communications with DOL. When they've had issues with their system, they have not consistently communicated with us what those issues are. Over the past month, since the November time period, Marcus Bailey, DOL's interim CIO, and I agreed to get our technical teams together on a regular basis to discuss and resolve the issues. The ISD and DOL technical staffs are meeting every two weeks to discuss system changes that are underway at DOL and how they impact us and the court community. We are working with them to make sure DOL understands how their changes impacts us and what we need to know and when we need to know it, so that we can communicate with our customers and let them know ahead of time that something is happening. The teams have created a list of outstanding issues and are tracking their status. We are looking at finding a common place where DOL, the courts, and AOC can go to see the list.

Ms. Vonnie Diseth reported next on the priority project reports, and specifically talked about the 3 top priority projects that we are involved in.

#1. Superior Court Management Feasibility Study (SCMFS)

The project team has been working with stakeholders on defining the project scope. AOC Project Manager, Deven Zipp, recently updated the SCMFS Project scope diagram – using input from the Court Clerk community and produced the finalized document approved at the Executive Sponsor Committee (ESC) meeting. *(*ESC Scope Statement Scope Diagram attached at end of document*)

Remember, a risk had been identified independently by three different groups (the Superior Court Judges Association (SCJA), the project team, and the vendor (MTG) --- all coming to the same conclusion: The SCMFS Project did not have the clerks participating on the project. Judge Warning then attended the Clerks Association meeting on September 23, 2010 and extended the invitation to the clerks to participate in the process as equal partners.

While these conversations took place, the project team continued with requirements gathering and validation with the judges and court administrators. An Executive Sponsor Committee (ESC) was formed and comprised of representatives from the judge, administrator and clerk communities. This committee would help the project team resolve issues and make decisions.

The updated SCMFS Project scope diagram was presented at this JISC meeting as a result. The document comprises the ability to meet the business needs of the Superior Courts for managing

caseflow, calendaring, participant/party information tracking, case records and relevant disposition service functions in support of judicial decision making, scheduling and case management.

Justice Fairhurst allowed time for the JISC membership to discuss the SCMFS Project scope diagram and ask questions. Discussion covered that the number of scope elements had increased with the clerk input. The ESC had approved the scope diagram as presented. Anything that did not have an X or an arrow was being recommended now to be included as part of the scope. Anything with an arrow was determined not to be a business function --- but may still be addressed in a technical or non-functional area. To be thorough, the feasibility study vendor will confirm whether items that had been ruled out of the scope were offered as options in the various software systems on the market. Questions were fielded on the life cycle of this type of software, local vs. central business processes, preventing scope creep, integration, keeping the Juvenile Court Clerk processes in mind and budget impacts (high level cost estimates coming no later than March).

Justice Fairhurst reminded JISC members that this is a ***feasibility study***. "The clerks are now onboard, so we have a different request… … we're now looking at a system that will work for both the clerks and judges." Fairhurst added, this is not procurement, "… It's what we're going to look at to determine what options we will consider without knowing what we're going to do until we get the feasibility study back."

Ms. Vonnie Diseth requested a JISC vote to approve the SCMFS Project Scope as depicted in the diagram. The JISC approved the SCMFS Project scope.

#2. Vehicle Related Violations (VRV)

Ms. Vonnie Diseth introduced Mike Walsh as the project manager for VRV and Record Management System (RMS) projects. She explained briefly why the VRV on boarding schedule was pushed back and that it was due to DIS key critical resources needing to focus their time and efforts on the changes to JINDEX brought about by the RMS project and a time constraint with their contractor.

Ms. Diseth also reported that she sent e-mail correspondence to the courts impacted explaining the delay to the on board schedule. She also has scheduled follow up conference calls with Issaquah, Kirkland, and Lakewood municipal courts to solicit feedback.

Vonnie then added that for those same reasons the April and May 2011 are our current target dates and that Mike Walsh is on the RMS project team and will report back to the JISC with updates.

#3 Superior Court Data Exchange

Ms. Vonnie Diseth presented an update on the current state and challenges for the Superior Court Data Exchange (SCDX) project. We are looking at a different approach and are evaluating estimates and timelines to decide on options and which direction we want to go. Then, we will be able to put some numbers to that and come back to the JISC with what the new recommended approach is.

Ms. Yolande Williams asked the question: what's changed between then and now that has us reassessing the direction that we want to go before we move forward?

Ms. Vonnie Diseth replied: What changed is that we have more knowledge now on how much effort is involved in doing the approach that was laid out to be done on this project. There are 22 screens that translate into 58 services that have to be built. Based on looking at the VRV project that was completed and how long it took to build those services. Taking that information and extrapolating it to the work that needed to be done for the SCDX – came out to a huge number that extended way beyond June of 2011.

So, the team is looking at that and saying this approach and plan isn't going to work in the time allotted. It is a viable long term approach of where we need to be. But, for a short term approach of trying to deal with the Pierce County's duplicate data entry issue and to get that data exchange going with Pierce County sooner rather than later --- we simply have to look at other options. Continuing with the current plan is not acceptable due to the timeline. The other reason we need to reassess the approach is that the current plan is laid out using the "waterfall" approach. That approach dictates that you do all the business requirements gathering and analysis for the entire system (all the business functions) first, followed by the development/coding, testing, and implementation. That entire process can take months or even years before any value is ever delivered to the customer. So, if there is a problem with the technical architecture or process, it is not discovered until the very end. In an iterative development process, the functions are broken down into bite size releases that deliver specific functionality to the customer more quickly. With each new iteration, you are building on the successful delivery of the prior release. Your odds of success are greater, risks are reduced, and the customer is more satisfied because they are seeing results much more quickly.

Looking at the work that needed to be done on the project under the current approach, we would not begin any coding or development work for another year out. So, what the technical team wanted to look at is changing that approach, and working more closely with the Pierce County technical staff to pick some critical services that we can build from beginning to end to test the technical design and architecture to ensure that it will work as expected. This will enable us to prove the concept will work and that we can get a DX with Pierce County going. It is an iterative approach that will allow us to build upon that success. We're trying to lay out a plan so that a short term solution that meets the Pierce County need can still evolve it into the long term solution for any court wanting to use the exchange.

Mr. Rich Johnson summarized by saying that Vonnie and I have been communicating quite a bit about this. At the time the project began, no one really had the knowledge and clear understanding of what all was involved and I think that led to an under estimation of the scope and time associated with the project. Unfortunately, that maybe didn't come to our attention as soon as we would have liked. But now that it is here, what we're saying is that we need to meet this need that's been there for a long time and we can do that with a more simplistic approach.

Ms. Vonnie Diseth closed with the request to hold off the detail of this conversation --- because the technical team is still working on the options and getting answers. ISD also needs to meet with Pierce County and get their input and work with Kevin and his technical team to discuss what the best solution of those options are and how we should go forward together. Based on the findings, we will put together more detailed information to come back to the JISC and be prepared to talk about the short and long term approach options.

Committee Reports

Data Management Steering Committee

Mr. Rich Johnson reported that we pretty much have already received the report on the projects. He focused his comments on how this impacts the committee; how the committee impacts this and the interrelationships associated with the projects and the committee.

I think the difficult part (I'll speak for the committee as the Chair) is that as a committee we have (and several JISC members are on this committee) have really worked hard to engage ourselves with the project manager, with the projects. I believe there was a communication breakdown in addition to some of the other things we've already identified as far as uncertainties and estimates. I think coming out of

this, at least from the committee standpoint, the focus probably needs to be on how we do a better job of communicating when there are problems or issues with ongoing projects.

The DMSC will meet next week to talk about some other things; but probably most important is an ITG request for expanding the data warehouse to include accounting data. There's a need out there at both the Superior Court and District and Municipal Court levels to get some accounting reports. We now have that project that's been analyzed and came back to us and we said we wanted to reanalyze and we got back another trimmed down version that I believe will ultimately get to this group for action.

Data Dissemination Committee
Judge Thomas Wynne reported on the Data Dissemination met after our October JISC meeting and we discussed one issue left over from the public case search workgroup, and that is probable cause hearings, as they appear on the public website. We did not reach a consensus on that; we have a possible solution and we're going to have to meet again to see if that possible solution is feasible.

Justice Fairhurst reported on two quick updates: One on GR30 and the electronic tickets. The rules committee has determined to publish it for 60 days, an expedited comment period. On GR31, which was the Public Records Act, this body was concerned about having GR31 amended and what it did to the court records and everything that had been accomplished originally in the GR31, and so we have given feedback to BJA suggesting two rules. That there be a separate rule that deals with the Public Records Act and that GR31 is written stay as it is, with some minor tweaks so that it corresponds.

I did hear from Judge Marlin Appelwick yesterday and he was not sensing any objection to having a separate rule. They will be discussing it next Friday at the BJA. Judge Wynne is planning as Data Dissemination Chair to represent JISC at that presentation.

JISC Baseline Service Level Workgroup Update

Ms. Vonnie Diseth reported the workgroup meets every three weeks. We've had three meetings thus far. It was agreed that we had to have a quorum of four people to hold the meetings. The group has been working through identifying the business services as a whole, and working through that we've established some criteria, but not all. Discussion at the next meeting will include establishing the criteria for making the difficult decisions of what should be local and what shouldn't be local. Again, we're trying to keep in sync with the information that the superior court feasibility study group is using, as well. The expectation has been set for the committee to have the preliminary draft report ready in January. With the final report due out in March.

IT Governance

Mr. Kevin Ammons provided the IT Governance update. He began by reminding the committee that the statistics are compiled on the 15th day of each month, so the numbers presented are slightly out of date. The data is showing that more of the requests are past the analysis stage of the process and are reaching the point where they can be authorized to proceed by the JISC, or under delegated authority.

Mr. Ammons then turned to ITG Request #018 – Add a Code for a Victim of Identity Theft. This request was initiated by the JISC at its August meeting with the adoption of the recommendations of the Public Case Search Work Group. The request sought to add a code to identify a victim of identity theft so that when a case appears on the public case search, the person is clearly identified as being a victim of identity theft and not the defendant. The AOC analysis team has determined that adding this code would not achieve the desired effect. Instead, the AOC analysis recommends that this issue be resolved through a business process at the courts.

Justice Fairhurst clarified that the request was coming to the JISC because it had been initiated by the JISC, not because it was at the stage for JISC to decide whether or not to authorize the request.

Judge Wynne stated that the proposed business process may not be satisfactory as it would not affect the cases already in the system. He also asked how we would educate the court clerks to ensure the business process achieved the desired results.

Mr. Ammons explained that Court Education Services would be responsible for providing the information on the business process to address these situations.

Justice Fairhurst suggested that the analysis be sent to the Data Dissemination Committee to decide how to proceed with the request. She asked for consensus from the JISC that the Data Dissemination Committee be authorized to look at the analysis and decide how to proceed without coming back through the JISC. All members agreed.

Ms. Vicky Marin asked the members to look at ITG Request #026 – Prioritize Restitution Recipients. She stated that this request was a companion to Request #031 that had been presented at the October 27, 2010 meeting. The CLJ CLUG prioritized these requests together, as recommended in the AOC analysis, as their current top priority.

Justice Fairhurst stated that the committee should hold the request and instead discuss the review cycle for requests. She asked if other requests would be ready for the January JISC meeting. Mr. Rich Johnson stated that the Multi-level CLUG would likely have other requests that would be ready for the next JISC meeting.

Mr. Bill Cogswell stated that there are both short and long term considerations to the issue of how often requests should be prioritized. He continued to say the ISD is producing a draft proposal on how to do fund allocation and scheduling of approved ITG requests. This draft proposal will contain a matrix that takes into consideration the size and type of project along with how often those types of projects should be considered.

Ms. Vonnie Diseth told the JISC that ISD is in the process of looking at all of the projects underway or planned in ISD and identifying the dependencies amongst those projects. In addition, ISD is working on a resource utilization list to identify how much staff time is committed versus how much is available for new projects. She stated that these could be used to provide a visual indication of where resources are under-utilized and available for project work.

Justice Fairhurst suggested that the JISC was not ready to decide on any request at this meeting. Instead, she felt that the item should be discussed at the January meeting, or possibly a special meeting. That would provide time to get the materials early and make strategic decisions.

Mr. William Holmes stated that the Superior Court CLUG wanted to know what their budget level was and that that was a concern for the CLUG as it tried to make decisions.

Mr. Rich Johnson suggested that the community work to get as many requests pushed forward as possible so the JISC could decide what projects to accomplish by June 30th.

Justice Fairhurst stated that the recommendation was for a special meeting in January to deal with the issues and to replicate the tabletop discussion as much as possible. Ms. Diseth suggested that the meeting be held later in January. Based on input from Ms. Pam Payne, Justice Fairhurst asked all members to communicate their availability for January 21st to Ms. Payne.

Ms. Vicky Marin then moved the discussion to the stakeholder comment process. She reminded the JISC that at the October 27 meeting the committee adopted a stakeholder notification and comment process and the draft policy in the meeting packet was to implement the process.

Mr. William Holmes moved to accept the draft policy. Judge Thomas Wynne seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously, Justice Fairhurst noted for the record that Judge Steve Rosen, Judge James Heller, Kevin Stock, and Yolande Williams had departed the meeting prior to the vote.

ISD Overview

Ms. Vonnie Diseth and Mr. Bill Cogswell presented to the JISC committee a high level overview of the Information Services Division (ISD) structure. Ms. Diseth reminded the committee of who our current customers are and what the mission of AOC is: "To advance the efficient and effective operation of the Washington State Judicial System".

Ms. Diseth gave an outline of the new organization structure showing a Tactical to Strategic Focus as shown on slide 6 of the presentation. As part of the transformation new functions have been added, these are listed under the Associate Director position.

This new structure will poise ISD in a strong position to deliver quality products and services to the court communities.

Next Meeting

The next regular JISC meeting will be January 21, 2010, at the AOC SeaTac facility; from 9:00 a.m. – 3:00 p.m.

Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 12:00 p.m.