ITG Request 003 – Imaging and Viewing of Court Documents

Presented to the JISC for
Authorization decision

Superior Court Judges Association (SCJA)

IT Governance Endorsement Decisions

Decision Prepared by AOC ISD Liaison, Heather Morford

November 6th, 2010

RE: IT Request # 003 View Images Across All Trial Courts

The SCJA Board of Trustees met on November 6th, 2010 and reviewed IT Request #003 View Images Across all Trial Courts.

The AOC analysis outlines one of the greatest risks associated with the proposed solution is that vendor costs and individual county costs are unknown at this time.

The SCJA Board of Trustees voted to endorse #003 and move the request forward but ONLY for vendors who do not charge AOC or the counties ADDITIONAL licensing fees for implementing the proposed solution.

Analysis of IT Governance Request #003
Imaging and Viewing of Court Documents

Summary of Proposed Solution:
The solution that the Administrative Office of the Courts (AOC) proposes to provide accessibility to document images across courts and jurisdictions is for individual courts to retain their own document images and AOC to serve as an intermediary or "hub" between courts wishing to see document images of other courts. AOC would accomplish this by enhancing JABS to include a list of links to document images available for a case. When a user clicks on a document link, JABS would retrieve the document image from the court that holds the document and display it to the user. Because AOC would be acting as an intermediary for viewing document images rather hosting duplicate copies of document images at AOC, this solution addresses concerns over the accuracy, currency and availability of document images as they would continue to reside with the local court.

This project carries several risks that could impact the successful completion of the project. The risks include: multiple vendors are known to provide imaging services to Washington courts and the vendors may be unwilling to accommodate the enhancements on their end necessary to allow this solution to succeed. There may be work that has to be completed by court staff locally in order to successfully implement this project. Additionally the capability of viewing and sharing document images across courts is generally a feature available in the leading Case Management software suites.

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 September 2nd, 2010.

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. The availability of vendor support could significantly affect this estimate.

Group	Hours	Tasks
Court Education	80	Documentation, implementation, training, and testing instructions in training
Business Analysts	80	Write Use Case, assist with User Interface Design
Architecture	24	Analysis of
Maintenance (Java)	160	Adapt JABS to enable this solution
Data Exchange	320	Includes build business model (needed to create schema)
Quality Assurance	120	Ensure no conflict with eTicket and test schema
Project Management	100	Estimate based on 12% of total project hours
Vendors	Unknown	Creating services and knowledge transfer
Total	**884 hours, plus vendor charges (if any)**	

AOC staff costs estimated average is $50 per hour (composite AOC, not including benefits). Contractor staff generally costs $120 - $150 per hour.

Request:

The Superior Court Judges Association (SCJA) requested the ability to view all documents related to a case or person. The JISC asked the SCJA to narrow the request to provide the ability to view images of specific court documents to authorized court staff and justice partners.

The solution should provide images of the following documents:

1. Domestic violence protection orders
2. Anti-harassment orders
3. Judgment and sentence orders and underlying guilty pleas
4. Charging Information
5. Probable Cause Statements
6. Clerk's minutes
7. Standard decrees of dissolution

The solution shall allow personnel to view documents from all trial courts and not just their own court.

The solution shall provide clear information on whether or not a specific document is available as an image.

Business Impacts:
Architecturally, AOC would be the hub. The courts would continue to maintain the imaged data store locally. Thus, AOC would not store the images and/or any indexes of documents either at a case or court level, due to issues with redundancy, currency, and archiving/destruction. AOC would store access information for each court's imaging system.

Proposed Solution:
The solution shall allow personnel to view documents from all trial courts and not just their own court.

The solution shall provide clear information on whether or not a specific document is available as an image.

The local court IT staff and/or vendor would provide several "services" per interface specifications approved by AOC:

- A *service* would <u>receive</u> from AOC a case number, and the *service* would <u>return</u> to AOC a real-time list of imaged documents for that case (with unique key information for each document).
- A *service* would <u>receive</u> from AOC the unique key information for a specific document for a specific case, and the *service* would <u>return</u> to AOC a copy of the imaged document.

The AOC would enhance JABS, and create an AOC web service, to provide access to imaged documents, which are stored at the court, as follows:

- An "imaged documents" tab would be added in JABS. Access to that tab will be determined using data in AOC's DB2 – JIS security structure.
- When the JABS user selects the "documents" tab for a case, the JABS application would call the AOC web service that would then call the court's *service* with the case information, and the court's imaging system would return a list of imaged documents to the AOC web service which would forward the list to JABS for that case. JABS would display the list (on that tab or in a separate window).
- When the JABS user selects a document from that list, the JABS application would call the AOC web service that would then call the court's *service* with that document's unique key information, and the court's imaging system would return a copy of the imaged

document to the AOC web service which would forward the image to JABS. JABS would display the imaged document in a separate window.

- If the court has no imaging system, JABS will display 'Court imaging system not available.'
- If the case has no imaged documents, or if some other error such as timeout occurs, JABS will present a message saying 'court document not available at this time.'
- Document data will be passed in standard MIME format using the standard MIME format codes as defined at http://www.w3schools.com/media/media_mimeref.asp. It is the receiving court's responsibility to be able to open the document using the browser interface which is JABS.
- Sealed case data and such will be returned as a MIME document, showing data as determined by the sending court.

Assumptions:

1. The requestor would not have to log into a separate application in order to view a document.
2. The court's imaging system would allow or limit access to documents, such as documents for sealed cases, or sealed documents in open cases.
3. Real-time availability of the imaged documents is essential.
4. Service level agreements (SLAs) would be needed with each county and vendor to provide this information.
5. Vendors would need to provide the services.
6. Vendors would need to host a test environment for AOC testing and support.
7. AOC has no current capacity to image and store documents if a court does not image locally.

Risks:

1. There is no current inventory of imaging vendors and participating courts. The most recent survey was in 2007-2008 for superior courts. There are believed to be four principal commercial vendors.
2. This project could involve significant time commitments from court staff.
3. Funding may not be available for required vendor work.

IT GOVERNANCE REQUEST DECISION

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

Court Level User Group	**Multi-Court Level User Group**
Chair of Group	Rich Johnson (Div I COA)

IT Request - **#003 View Images of Documents Across all Trial Courts**								
Date of Decision – December 7th, 2010								
Decision to Recommend for Approval	☐ **Approve** *(unanimously)* ☐ **Decline** *(unanimously)* X **Split Vote:** *moves forward with pros & cons*							
Prioritization of Request	# **not prioritized due to split vote**							
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)
	8	**8**	**0**	**4**	**2**	**5**	**3**	**30**
Pros & Cons *(if vote is not unanimous)*	**See Pages 2-4 of this documents for pros and cons**							
Additional Statements *(attachments from other groups in support or additional information that should go to the JISC for consideration)*	☐ **No =** additional statements/attachments X **Yes =** additional statements included							
Additional Notes	***The group could not reach a unanimous decision on this request. The vote was split 7 in favor, 2 against. All members were asked to submit pros and cons and the resulting statements are included in this decision recommendation.**							

MCLUG MAJORITY OPINION, ITG-003, Imaging and Viewing of Court Documents

The motion was to forward the MCLUG's scoring and approval of the request to the JISC.

Substantive Reasons to Move the Request Forward to the JISC for Approval:

1.) Providing cross jurisdiction access to imaged court documents is essential to enable the Superior Courts to meet the legislative mandate of RCW 28.09.182 to determine the existence of any information and court proceedings relevant to the placement of children in family law proceedings.

2.) All trial courts are mandated by RCW 26.50.160 to prevent the issuance of competing protection orders in different courts. JIS is mandated by this statute to provide information on the parties to all protection orders, a criminal history of the parties and other relevant information necessary to assist court in issuing orders . Judges believe that viewing the actual court documents requested is relevant information necessary to fulfilling their responsibilities under Chapter 26.50.RCW.

3.) Lack of access to the actual court documents from other jurisdictions is impeding the ability of judges to make informed decisions on placement of children and issuance of protective orders.

4.) AOC has proposed an appropriate cost effective solution to accomplish this request as an upgrade to JABS by providing a hub to access imaged documents from the various jurisdictions.

N.F. Jackson, Whatcom County Court Administrator

MCLUG MINORITY OPINION, ITG-003, Imaging and Viewing of Court Documents

The motion was to forward the MCLUG's scoring and approval of the request to the JISC.

While I had earlier declined to vote for a motion to table the request without discussing the request, I voted against forwarding the request as-is.

Procedural Reasons:

My reason for voting against forwarding the request was because I believed and still believe that there are a number of unknown matters relevant to the MCLUG's assessment of the request. I think it the job of a CLUG to make informed and substantially complete recommendations. I think that a CLUG is abdicating its duty if it passes the buck, by forwarding incomplete recommendations.

There was a perception that once the request hit the MCLUG's table it had to be acted upon immediately. I disagree with that perception and feel instead that the job of a CLUG, if it discerns gaps or alternatives, is to delay a recommendation in order to seek additional assessment or input in order to make its best recommendation.

Substantive Reasons:

Specifically, at first there were unidentified concerns expressed by the Clerks. Later there was an oral report of a survey of imaging vendors reciting this or that. I am not comfortable performing my MCLUG duties based on hearsay. It was said that not only vendor costs might be incurred, but that Clerk costs might be incurred.

I doubt the efficacy of untoward vendor costs, because our court was part of an AOC demo five or six years ago that accomplished exactly the same display of documents as described in the request, without any consultation with our vendor, merely by the county granting online access to the AOC to search for documents images. However, if an imaging county does not have online access, this could involve local costs.

Likewise I doubt the cost or burden on Clerks. The Clerk labor is in docketing, scanning and linking the docket and the images. The access to the thus docket/scanned/linked images is hands-free on the Clerk's part.

BUT, these questions must be asked and answered before we can or should forward an informed recommendation.

Pat Swartos, Mason County Clerk

MCLUG MINORITY OPINION, ITG-003, Imaging and Viewing of Court Documents

The motion was to forward the MCLUG's scoring and approval of the request to the JISC.

Cons to approving the request:

1) The WSACC need more information & discussion on this project in order for it to go forward.
2) More information is needed from all the vendors on how the process will work with each Imaging System.
3) The estimated cost of this is low. The cost will be considerably higher.
4) There will be costs to the County offices (Clerks & IS department).
5) Concern that sharing of images will expand beyond Judges and staff. Anyone or agency beyond that should not be able to provide links to the public to access these records without paying a subscription. They should not be allowed to make copies with out this.
6) Most of the Clerks now provide access to their local Judges to view the document images.
7) The majority of CLJ courts do not have imaging, and their Domestic Violence and Anti-Harassment Orders will not be available to view with this project. State-Wide Protection Order are processed in both court levels.

Additional Information from Siri Woods, Chelan County Clerk

This request is more complex than it appears. The way this could logically be done is for clerks to upload orders that are in JABS and for AOC to convert them to one format and attach them to the name of the document in JABS.

Counties would have to have WEB servers on their imaging systems and most do not and every one would require a seat so it would be necessary for AOC to at least purchase one seat on each WEB SERVER. There be a big question about confidential documents being accessible. I don't think clerks would allow that except on specific request. That is how I do it now on my system. I allow attorneys or the press or whomever purchases a seat on my system to subscribe. Access is only to public documents. If a confidential document is required, the attorney of record or counsel who represent the party who is entitled to access, will be send the document by staff. There is no right to access from other counties, they too would have to purchase a subscription.

Again, this could only be done by the few counties who have public access currently or who are able and willing to purchased web servers to give access to others outside of their county.

That is why I think the upload would be a better way to go. Counties currently upload J&Ss and Support orders all the time and the State offices of Support Enforcement and Corrections make them available to their people.

Imaging and Viewing of Court Documents

Request Detail

Requestor Name:
Ammons, Kevin

Origination Date:
07/22/2010

Requestor Email:
kevin.ammons@courts.wa.gov

Requestor Phone:
360-704-4085

Recommended Endorser:
Superior Court Judges' Association

Request Status: Awaiting CLUG Recommendation

Request Type: Change or Enhancement

Which Systems are affected?
Judicial Information System (JIS)
Superior Court Management Information System (SCOMIS)
Data Warehouse
Judicial Receipting System (JRS)

Other affected Systems / Business Processes

Business Area: Other

Communities Impacted:
Superior Court Judges
County Clerks
Superior Court Administrators
CLJ Judges
CLJ Managers
Family and Juvenile Law Judges
Juvenile Court Administrators

Impact if not Resolved: High

Impact Description:

In order to see the text of key documents from other jurisdictions, court personnel must call thhe other jurisdiction and have the text of the documents read over the phone. This could be eliminated if images were available of the documents in the current system.

Request Attachments

10-03 002 ITG - View Documents from Other Courts.docx
SCJA Case Management System Request to JISC (17).docx
Superior Courts IT Review - April 19 2010_Meeting Summary (5).docx

What is the Business Problem or Opportunity

Important Note This request was originally submitted as part of a pilot of the IT Governance process. The processing of this request took place before the IT Governance Portal was developed. As such, the information related to this request is being included in the portal for completeness. The history entries in this record are not indicative of either the actual processing dates or the bodies that performed the various steps of the governance process. ***The original request follows*** The Washington Legislature has mandated that courts consider a variety of relevant court information to improve judicial decision-making and outcomes in areas such as domestic violence protection orders, release decisions, and family courts. Of the 39 Washington counties, 38 have installed imaging systems and scanned significant portions of their court records. Analysis should address: - Data exchange committee responsibilities and efforts-to-date - Strategies to ensure scope is clearly defined and maintained - Impacts on Superior Court systems - Impacts on other agency data systems - Ongoing maintenance of data interfaces - Balancing functionality, risks and costs. This request went to the JISC. The JISC decided the request was far too broad and returned the request to the SCJA in order to narrow the request to reflect business priorities. ***On June 19th, the SCJA clarified their business goals and priorities. The following text is extracted from an email and summarizes the SCJA's answers to several questions and their priorities on what documents should be included in this request.*** The proposed problem statement is approved to read: Superior Court judges have a need to see images of certain documents from other courts to verify information or to find details not recorded in SCOMIS or JIS. Currently, court staff must call the clerks of other courts and have specifics of the documents read to them. In order to properly analyze the request, AOC also requests answers to the following open questions. The answers by the SCJA to the questions are: 1. What types of documents, and what information in those documents, are most essential to meet the judge's business need? a. Court Orders: Including DV protective orders, anti-harassment orders, Judgment and Sentence and underlying guilty pleas, Information and probable cause statements b. Clerk's minutes entries c. Standard decree of dissolution 2. At what point or points do documents need to be viewed? (E.g. On the bench? Before the case is heard? In chambers?) a. All of the above 3. Does any other court staff need to view to the images? If so, who? a. Judge's Law Clerk or Judicial Assistant, Bailiff, Coordinator, or similar personnel 4. Does every court need to see documents from every other jurisdiction and/or court-level? a. All trial courts 5. What is the impact if some jurisdictions do not have images that go as far back as other jurisdictions? (E.g. County A has scanned documents back to 2007 whereas County B has scanned documents back to 1983.) a. Okay as long as record is clear (in other words if no record is shown, is it because none exists or because the county didn't scan prior to that date) 6. The original request presented by the SCJA indicated that judges need to have view access of documents from other agencies, including jails. If this is a core business need, we also need questions 1-5 answered for each separate agency. In the minutes above, it says "permit view access to data", should you say this, or assume they meant images of documents? a. Not a core need, but would be nice. Would like to eventually get access to data/documents from other states. The Judges Association would like to have access to the actual documents images. 7. What are the priorities for the documents, jurisdictions, and agencies? a. DV protective orders b. Anti-harassment orders c. DUI conviction Which means that we have to have access to other jurisdictions and trial court levels – district and municipal courts. Agencies are the least priority.

Expected Benefit:

If court staff were able to access images of key documents, decision-making would be greatly expedited.

Any Additional Information:

This request was initiated on February 26, 2010 by the SCJA. It was returned to the SCJA by the JISC to narrow the broad scope into a more specific request.

Endorsement Detail

Endorsing Committee

Endorsing Action: Endorsed

Imaging and Viewing of Court Documents

Superior Court Judges' Association

Endorser Name:
Dalton, Jeanette M

Origination Date:
08/05/2010

Endorser Email:
jdalton@co.kitsap.wa.us

Endorser Phone:
360-337-7140

Endorser's Explanation and Comments

This is verbatim what our sub user group determined as answers to the questions presented.

AOC Analysis Detail

Analysis Date:	09/09/2010
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?	Dependant upon vendors
Positive Return on Investment?	
Projected Maintenance cost?	
Feasibility Study needed?	No
Court Level User Group	
Multi-level CLUG	

Key Business Objectives:

The solution should provide images of the following documents:

1. Domestic violence protection orders
2. Anti-harassment orders
3. Judgment and sentence orders and underlying guilty pleas
4. Charging Information
5. Probable Cause Statements
6. Clerk's minutes
7. Standard decrees of dissolution

Benefits and Business Value:

The solution shall allow personnel to view documents from all trial courts and not just their own court.

The solution shall provide clear information on whether or not a specific document is available as an image.

AOC Analysis - Proposed Solution

The solution that the Administrative Office of the Courts (AOC) proposes to provide accessibility to document images across courts and jurisdictions is for individual courts to retain their own document images and AOC to serve as an intermediary or "hub" between courts wishing to see document images of other courts.

AOC Analysis - Proposed Approach

AOC would accomplish this by enhancing JABS to include a list of links to document images available for a case. When a user clicks on a document link, JABS would retrieve the document image from the court that holds the document and display it to the user. Because AOC would be acting as an intermediary for viewing document images rather hosting duplicate copies of document images at AOC, this solution addresses concerns over the accuracy, currency and availability of document images as they would continue to reside with the local court.

This project carries several risks that could impact the successful completion of the project. The risks include: multiple vendors are known to provide imaging services to Washington courts and the vendors may be unwilling to accommodate the enhancements on their end necessary to allow this solution to succeed. There

may be work that has to be completed by court staff locally in order to successfully implement this project. Additionally the capability of viewing and sharing document images across courts is generally a feature available in the leading Case Management software suites.

Additional Systems Affected

Judicial Access Browser System (JABS)

Addtional Court Communities Affected

Superior Court Judges
County Clerks
Superior Court Administrators
CLJ Judges
CLJ Managers
Family and Juvenile Law Judges
Juvenile Court Administrators

AOC Analysis Attachments

ITG Request 3 - Imaging and Viewing of Court Documents.docx

Confirmation of Endorsing Action Detail

Endorsing Committee
Superior Court Judges' Association

Endorser Name:
Dalton, Jeanette M

Origination Date:
11/17/2010

Endorser Email:
jdalton@co.kitsap.wa.us

Endorser Phone:
360-337-4464

Endorsing Action: Endorsed

Endorser's Explanation and Comments

Endorsement Attachments

Letter of Support for Imaging Project.pdf

WASHINGTON
COURTS

Washington State Supreme Court Gender and Justice Commission

COMMISSION MEMBERS

Honorable Barbara A. Madsen, Chair
Washington State Supreme Court

Ms. Barbara L. Carr
Jefferson County Juvenile Court

Honorable Vickie Churchill
Island County Superior Court

Ms. Mirta Laura Contreras
Columbia Legal Services

Honorable Sara Derr
Spokane County District Court

Honorable Joan DuBuque
King County Superior Court

Honorable Ruth Gordon
Jefferson County Clerk

Ms. Margaret Hobart
WSCADV

Honorable Cynthia Jordan
Coeur d'Alene Tribal Court

Ms. Jennie Laird
Attorney-at-Law

Ms. Judith Lonnquist
Attorney at Law

Professor Natasha T. Martin
Seattle University School of Law

Honorable Craig Matheson
Benton and Franklin Superior Courts

Honorable Alicia Nakata
Chelan County District Court

Ms. Leslie W. Owen
Northwest Justice Project

Ms. Yvonne Pettus
Tacoma Municipal Court

Mr. Bernard Ryan
Attorney at Law

Honorable Ann Schindler
Court of Appeals, Division I

Honorable Jane M. Smith
Colville Tribal Court of Appeals

Mr. David Ward
Legal Voice

Honorable Chris Wickham
Thurston County Superior Court

Ms. Myra Downing, Executive Dir.

January 12, 2011

TO: Justice Mary Fairhurst, Chair
Judicial Information System Committee

FROM: Chief Justice Barbara Madsen, Chair
Gender and Justice Commission

RE: LETTER OF SUPPORT FOR IMAGING PROJECT

I am writing on behalf of the Washington State Supreme Court Gender and Justice Commission. We are in complete support of the Superior Court Judges' Association (SCJA) request to make the necessary technological changes that would allow the ability to see images of certain documents such as domestic violence protection orders.

In the fall of 2010, the Commission undertook a statewide initiative in which we gathered feedback from all levels of court regarding what could be done to improve the court's response in managing domestic violence cases. The number one solution given was the ability to see the provisions on domestic violence protection orders. Just knowing one exists is not enough to prevent issuing a conflicting or duplicative order. When this occurs, there is not only confusion in the courts, but frustration for law enforcement, perceived lack of clarity for the abuser and most importantly, the chance for increased danger for the victim.

We applaud SCJA for making this a priority and taking the initiative to propose a solution that will have an extremely positive impact on court practices.

Please do not hesitate to contact Myra Downing at Myra.Downing@courts.wa.gov if we can be of further assistance.

STATE OF WASHINGTON
1206 Quince Street SE • P.O. Box 41170 • Olympia, WA 98504-1170
360-753-3365 • 360-586-8869 Fax • www.courts.wa.gov