

APPROVED MINUTES
JUDICIAL INFORMATION SYSTEM COMMITTEE
December 7, 2007, 10:30 a.m. to 12:00 p.m.
SeaTac Office Center, SeaTac, WA

Members Present:

Justice Bobbe Bridge, Chair
Judge C. Kenneth Grosse, Vice Chair
(via telephone)
Justice Mary Fairhurst
Ms. Cathy Grindle
Judge Glenna Hall
Mr. William Holmes
Mr. N. F. Jackson (via telephone)
Mr. Richard Johnson
Mr. N. A. "Butch" Stussy
Ms. Yolande Williams
Ms. Siri Woods (via telephone)
Judge Clifford Stilz (via telephone)
Judge Thomas J. Wynne

Members Absent:

Judge James Heller
Mr. Greg Banks
Mr. Robert Berg
Mr. Marc Lampson
Judge Michael Trickey (Ex-Officio)

Guests Present:

Ms. Barbara Miner

Staff Present:

Mr. Jeff Hall
Mr. Gregg Richmond

CALL TO ORDER

Justice Bridge called the meeting to order at 10:50 a.m., and introductions were made.

Motion: A motion was made, seconded, and unanimously carried to approve the October 26, 2007 meeting minutes as written.

UPDATE ON SEARCH FOR INFORMATION SERVICES DIVISION DIRECTOR

Mr. Butch Stussy said that a recruiting firm had provided several candidates for the position of Director for the Information Services Division. He went on to say that he would interview three of the candidates the week of December 10. Mr. Stussy also said that he was going to invite members of the JISC to participate in making a final selection.

PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO GR 22/RESPONSE TO SSB 5470

Judge Thomas Wynne said that Substitute Senate Bill 5470 requires a JIS check before Superior Court Judges or Commissioners may enter a final parenting plan. He went on to say that the bill was causing problems for judges around the state because the information from JIS is confidential, however the information retained should be entered as part of the record and then disclosed to the parties. He said that Snohomish County created a local GR 22 rule, which stated information obtained from the JIS would be retained in the GR 22 file. Judge Wynne went on to say that the Data Dissemination Committee recommended a change to the GR 22 to be consistent with the method used in Snohomish County if the JIS check is relevant to issues in the parenting plan, and is disclosed to the parties; if it is not relevant then it should not be disclosed to the parties.

Motion: Judge Glenna Hall moved to approve the change. Judge Thomas Wynne seconded the motion.

Ms. Barbara Miner said that the Board for Judicial Administration (BJA) was working on the parts of SSB 5470, to be implemented next year, regarding a liaison and some other issues. She went on to say that the BJA was working on the Federal DBA language.

Mr. N.F. Jackson asked how a clerk is to know when they can disclose the JIS information in regards to GR 22.

Judge Wynne said that (as a scenario) a judge would have a relevant report with a notation on the record about the report and disclosure of that report would be available to the attorneys of the parties involved.

Judge Glenna Hall said that most judges review the JIS screen, decide if there is something that needs to be dealt with, and then print a paper copy if needed. She went on to say that the only thing that would be part of the record would be those things the judge determined were relevant to his/her ruling.

Mr. Jackson said that clarification needed to be made for clerks that they do not disclose GR 22 JIS background checks.

Ms. Miner said that according to the rule change, if the judge decides to put the information in the file it would follow the same rules that are on the cover sheet as to who has access. She went on to say that whoever can have access is described in the GR 22 rules.

Judge Wynne said the information regarding rules was in subsection C, H, and I.

Ms. Siri Woods said that for Best Practices, the court should state on record that they have checked the JIS record and the clerk should put that notation in their minutes.

Motion: After a thorough discussion, Justice Bridge entertained a motion to approve the proposed amendment to GR 22. The motion was unanimously approved.

Justice Bridge expressed kudos to Judge Grosse for his work on GR 22.

Mr. Jeff Hall clarified that the rule would be submitted to the Supreme Court on behalf of the JISC.

Judge Wynne asked for a recommendation that the adoption of the rule be expedited due to the fact that SSB 5470 was already in effect.

Justice Bridge asked if John Bell and Nan Sullins could work on expediting the recommendation to the rules committee for their first meeting in 2008. In response, Judge Wynne said yes.

SEX OFFENDER TASK FORCE FINAL REPORT

Mr. Hall explained to the committee that this was a high profile political issue and since there is a reference to the JIS systems in the recommendations, the committee needed to be aware of the issue. Mr. Hall went on to say that there had not been any inquiries of the AOC regarding the issue. He also said that on page six of the report the Sex Offender Task Force said that there is a need for misdemeanor criminal history to be available to Superior Courts regardless of where the criminal history came from. Mr. Hall indicated that there was a recommendation that all municipal courts be required to have access to the DISCIS system.

Judge Kip Stilz asked if anyone had done a search of the law tables to find out which offenses qualified as sex offender prosecutions in municipal/district courts.

Mr. Hall answered that he did not know.

Justice Bridge said that the update should be considered an FYI and to watch for any recommendations for mandates to JIS.

Action Item: Mr. Stussy said that AOC could do a search of offenses that qualify as sex offender prosecutions in municipal/district courts.

Ms. Woods commented that at the last Justice Information Network meeting a presentation was given by Elizabeth Drake and Barney Barnowski titled, "The Washington State Criminal Records Audit for Adult Felonies." Ms. Woods suggested that the presentation be done for JISC or BJA in an effort to provide information about what judges should do and how information should be exchanged.

Action Item: Jeff said he would look into it and see if it would be appropriate for the JISC to see.

COMMITTEE REPORTS

Data Dissemination Committee

Judge Wynne said there was a request for JIS access to case type 7 from the State Office of Public Defense in Thurston County dealing with the Thurston County Office of Assigned Counsel who works for the State Office of Public Defense providing representation in dependency cases. He went on to say that a telephone poll was taken of the committee to approve access.

Data Management Steering Committee

Rich Johnson stated that he had two levels of reporting as the committee encompasses the data exchange and the data warehouse. He said the first phase of the data warehouse was moving ahead according to the schedule. He said the second phase was more critical with a lot of resources (staff) being put to that. Mr. Johnson said that his report regarding data exchange was not positive and he felt the project indicator (on paper) should be red. He went on to say that the resources that should be committed to data exchange were committed to CMS. He said that they are not making any progress

on the data exchange side. They need resources, a more detailed plan, and more information. He said he had a video conference with Jeff Hall and Gregg Richmond and came up with a revised approach, which would be tied more closely to the implementation of the Core CMS.

Mr. Stussy said that a resource plan was going to be assembled and that it would be difficult to build data exchanges until all of the pieces were in place. He also said that until certain portions of CMS and the data warehouse are completed, it would be hard to determine how much work was needed on data exchanges.

Mr. Hall said that the Data Management Committee released a survey to obtain information as to what data exchanges are currently occurring. He said that hopefully that information would tell them what data was needed which would drive the creation of the exchanges. He went on to say that courts had previously asked for future data exchanges, which he did not know about, and which would be added to the comments from the survey to create a catalog of what exchanges need to be built.

Mr. Hall talked about Imaging and that as a singular data exchange it was an impediment to a large number of Superior Courts being able to move forward with CMS. He said that a meeting with Eagle Systems was being set up to scope what the generic Imaging data exchange should be.

Mr. Johnson reiterated the fact that there is a need for resources in the form of dollars. He went on to say there have been 15 responses to the survey put out by the Data Management Committee out of two-hundred plus courts.

Ms. Williams asked Jeff and Gregg if they knew how much money it was going to take to get the project back on track.

Mr. Hall responded that they did not have a figure, but the first allocation of resources would be for a data exchange project manager. He said that the number of resources or how much time would be needed to be allocated to data exchange would not be known until the number of data exchanges that need to be built is known. Mr. Hall went on to say that statewide data exchanges were covered in the CMS project and the local data exchanges were in the roadmap but not within the CMS project.

Ms. Grindle commented that according to the Data Warehouse status report, there were a lot of resources allocated to that project, but it would not be finished until the end of February 2008. She went on to say that BOXI training was being conducted, but it seemed to be a waste of time since the training was for a warehouse that would be meaningless in three months.

Mr. Richmond responded that the Enterprise Data Warehouse (EDW) is broken into two phases; phase one is all of the information that currently resides within JIS, which would be finished at the end of December 2007. He went on to say that phase two would be all the information incorporated within CMS. He said that once that is known, both would be combined and that would be the EDW.

Ms. Grindle commented that she thought staff would need to be retrained on BOXI if it was still going to be a couple of months before staff would start using the program.

Mr. Richmond said that an e-mail was going out that day with an exact date that user's could start using the new EDW. He went on to say that the warehouse would be built, then acceptance testing had to be completed, and upon completion of testing another e-mail would go out telling court user's to start using BOXI.

Mr. Johnson said that Jeff had made a valid point that it is unknown how many data exchanges need to be built. He went on to say that at one point in time there were two project teams of exchange writers, with two staff per team, committed to data exchange. Mr. Johnson said that data management had to be the prioritization vehicle for the JISC as far as the exchanges, once it was established which data exchanges needed to be built, data management would have to decide which ones go first and that would be driven by resources. He added that the resources needed to be identified and to begin building project teams based on the resource limitation.

Justice Bridge said the exchange issue was something that needed to be reported to the Executive Committee meeting at their January 23, 2008 meeting.

Mr. Jackson asked about data dissemination and courts getting access to case type 7. He said that would bring up a dilemma in all superior courts regarding the JIS database search, where courts cannot look across county lines and see voluntary mental commitments. He asked if data dissemination had dealt with that need and did the cross-county lines need to be opened up to be able to see sealed case types.

Judge Wynne said that it had not been dealt with, but it probably needed to be because involuntary mental commitments were not covered by JIS record checks.

Core Case Management System Steering Committee

Ms. Grindle reported that many workshops were going on in regards to accounting, calendaring, and warrants. She went on to say that when the RFP went out with Appendix C it was assumed that a vendor would be found with a full fledged accounting package that would integrate into their system, but the accounting piece is actually being built as they go along. She said that decisions would be made shortly regarding case number formats for all court levels. She said that they were looking at February for completion to get the other pieces and start testing.

Ms. Williams said she was participating in the accounting exercise and had asked a question about the accounting development, the design of the accounting application, and whether or not it was conforming to the RFP requirements, Appendix C, or if it was referring to the BPE process that she and others had gone through in August 2007. She said that no one could answer that question for her. She went on to say that she assumed the BPE, since it was the most current, should be driving the process. She said it sounded like that was not happening and they were told the accounting application, that was being designed, guaranteed those that are using the JIS accounting functionality the same level of functionality, but if there were any business processes that fell outside of that JIS accounting functionality, then the local courts

would have to pick that up. She asked Jeff, Butch, and Gregg if that was a decision that had been made by the AOC.

Mr. Richmond said the accounting requirements came from Appendix C, D, K and the outflow of the BPE process. He went on to say the current functionality was where the requirements were coming from but if a court had some other type of functionality then that would fall outside of that scope.

Ms. Williams said that according to Appendix C, there were expectations for collections and cashiering to receive functionality.

Mr. Hall said that any current functionality for collections would be in the new system. He asked Ms. Williams if she could provide more detail on which requirements in Appendix C she thought were not being met. He said that they need that information as Appendix C was drafted to select a product out of the box and a product was selected that required a fair amount of development on the accounting side and did not in recognition of that change or set what the requirements were for development. He went on to say that, they did not select a product that did those things already so now they were being developed. He said the requirements were not at a level that they would normally be if they were being developed. Mr. Hall said they are dealing with questions of what the scope is and how big the box is.

Mr. Hall said that he thought the user group would give the okay on screens and then present that to CMS.

Ms. Williams said that her concern was that the okay would be given on screens and not a developed product that would have the functionality that courts needed.

Mr. Hall said that by January 2008, the business logic would start to be built behind those screens and then the users would be brought in again to ensure that the functionality would do what needs to be done.

Ms. Grindle spoke about an invitation to submit an education session proposal to the 2008 Annual Judicial Conference planning. She went on to say that it needed to be submitted by January 18, 2008, and if anyone had suggestions, she would work with Jeff and Gregg on it.

OTHER BUSINESS

Ms. Miner presented Justice Bridge with a flower arrangement on behalf of the Clerks Association and thanked her for all her work.

Mr. Stussy also presented Justice Bridge with a flower arrangement on behalf of the AOC and thanked her for her work.

There being no other business, the meeting adjourned at 12:00 p.m.