Judicial Information System Committee Meeting January 21, 2011

DECISION POINT – IT Governance Policy for Supreme and Appellate Court Requests

MOTIONS:

- I move to adopt the attached JIS IT Governance Policy – Supreme Court and Court of Appeals Requests.

I. FACTS

The JISC adopted the Final IT Governance Framework and a formal JIS IT Governance Policy in 2010 to provide a consistent and structured process for making effective IT investment decisions. The JIS IT Governance process went into effect in July, 2010.

Under the IT Governance Policy, "IT governance applies to all persons, organizations, or agencies that operate, manage, or use the portfolio of IT products and services provided by AOC." (JIS IT Governance Policy, p.2, para.1). RCW 2.68.010 gives the JISC the authority to "determine all matters pertaining to the delivery of services available from the judicial information system."

Services that are not part of the JIS Portfolio are local, and thus are provided and funded by individual courts. For the Washington Supreme Court and Court of Appeals, the Administrative Office of the Courts (AOC) provides its local IT services.

II. DISCUSSION

Neither the IT Governance Framework nor the JIS IT Governance Policy clearly delineate when IT investments for the Supreme Court and Court of Appeals are considered JIS investments, subject to approval by the JISC, and when they are considered local investments. There are multiple IT governance requests from the Court of Appeals Executive Committee currently in the IT Governance process. A clear policy is needed to guide governance action for current and future IT governance requests from the Supreme Court and Court of Appeals.

III. PROPOSAL

If approved, the attached "JIS Information Technology Governance Policy – Supreme Court and Court of Appeals Requests" will provide clear guidance for when IT investment decisions will be made by the JISC and when they will be made locally. In cases that do not clearly fall within one of the delineated rules, the policy

vests authority in the JISC to determine whether an investment is under JISC or local authority.

IV. OUTCOME IF NOT PASSED –

If the JISC does not adopt a clear policy on this issue, there is a risk that investment decisions will be made inconsistently.