

## JUDICIAL INFORMATION SYSTEM COMMITTEE

June 26, 2009  
9:00 a.m. to 1:00 p.m.  
AOC Office, SeaTac, WA

### Minutes

#### Members Present:

Justice Mary Fairhurst, Chair  
Ms. Cathy Grindle  
Mr. Jeff Hall  
Judge James Heller – by phone  
Mr. William Holmes  
Mr. N. F. Jackson  
Judge Glenn Phillips  
Judge Michael Trickey  
Ms. Yolande Williams  
Ms. Siri Woods – by phone  
Judge Thomas J. Wynne

#### Members Absent:

Chief Robert Berg  
Judge C. Kenneth Grosse, Vice Chair  
Mr. Rich Johnson  
Mr. Marc Lampson  
Mr. Steward Menefee

#### Guests Present:

Ms. Lori Bame  
Mr. Larry Barker  
Mr. Shayne Boyd  
Mr. Paul Chabot  
Ms. Lea Ennis  
Mr. Gary Hudson  
Mr. Michael Kucha  
Mr. Chris Shambro  
Mr. Roland Thompson  
Mr. Paul Webb

#### Staff Present:

Mr. Doug Ford  
Ms. Jody Graham  
Ms. Mellani McAleenan  
Ms. Vicky Marin  
Ms. Pam Payne  
Mr. Gregg Richmond  
Ms. Kathy Wyr

### Call to Order

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

### April 17, 2009 Meeting Minutes

Motion to approve the April 17, 2009 meeting minutes, the motion carried.

### Budget Status

Mr. Jeff Hall from AOC gave an overview of the 2007/09 biennial budget for the Information Services Division. Budget materials were provided in the meeting packet.

As we work to close out the 07-09 biennium the executive committee has approved expending current biennial funds consistent with the current budget proviso and also in support of efforts that will be engaged in the 2009/11biennium.

Looking forward to 2009-11, Mr. Hall addressed the budget proviso. There were concerns with the final language of the budget proviso. We made the decision to not seek a veto of the language after discussions with the Attorney General's Office. The concern being that if the Governor vetoed the subsections, the result may be a veto of the entire section and therefore the appropriation. We have commitment from Ms. Arnold-Williams who chairs the ISB that we will move ahead within the spirit of the legislature's intent in amending the proviso in the final days of session. A letter from the Chair of the House Ways and Means Committee detailing the legislature's intent was delivered to Ms. Arnold-Williams and Justice Fairhurst. We should be able to get this fixed in the supplemental budget in the upcoming session.

The 2009-11 budget allocations will be presented at the August 14 meeting.

### **Key Activity Status – (taken out of agenda order)**

Justice Fairhurst noted that many times we get to the end of the agenda and people miss the Key Activity Status Update. She expressed that she wants to be sure people are reading it and are aware of the day-to-day work that ISD is doing in addition to planning for the future.

Mr. Richmond reported that data exchange is the number one priority of the JISC and has been for a number of years. The Vehicle Related Violations pilot project, this is the system that electronically enters parking and photo enforcement violations into JIS, is now being pilot tested by Everett Municipal Court in the production environment. ISD will bench mark it in order to make sure that when 2010 comes around, it can be scaled to meet the needs of the toll bridges throughout the state.

The enhancement of Possible Criminal History and Case and Criminal History (PCH/CACH), a project authorized by this committee, went into production today. This application provides authorized law enforcement professionals with quick and seamless access to a person's criminal and court case history. With PCH/CACH, information from multiple criminal justice agencies is returned through a single query -- simplifying investigations, charging decisions, and sentence determinations.

The first SCOMIS data exchange (DOL name lookup) is in production. The second exchange (person search) will be implemented in July 2009.

There were 14 bills passed last legislative session that triggered changes to the system. The maintenance team is fully engaged in completing each of these prior to the required implementation date. Also, the JIS program changes needed to assess current and future juvenile interest and legal financial obligations have been completed ahead of schedule.

Ms. Vicky Marin proposed a format change for the reports. The committee was shown two formats, a new format that only includes updated information and the current format that has more background information. The group preferred to retain the current format. Vicky will be providing status updates in the months that the committee does not meet, to keep everyone current.

### **IT Governance**

Mr. Shayne Boyd from Sierra Systems presented an IT governance model and a charter developed by a work group made up of Cathy Grindle, N.F. Jackson, and Rich Johnson with the assistance of Sierra Systems. The group was assigned to develop a governance framework after the JISC approved the IT governance concept at the April 17 meeting.

Mr. Boyd explained that the objective of the IT governance model is to have a common process that is followed, and that incremental tasks are assigned to the lowest possible level in the organization. The criteria and filters to be applied, the thresholds, and the overall priorities are defined by the senior body, the JISC. Then subgroups apply those metrics in each case, so that all the information comes forward with a consistent model having been applied. The senior body makes the large decisions, for example to replace an application to solve a large-scale problem, but lower-level activities, like \$5,000 or \$10,000 would be decided lower down. Best practices, which exist in most large-scale organizations and apply to this environment, dictate that as much work as possible gets out of the senior body down to lower levels.

The process would begin with a request submitted in some form, large or small, from any source. It will be separated into either a support-type request or a project request. A support request is something you need to do your business exactly as it is done today. A project request is larger, with a greater impact. There will be gray area in the middle, but the objective is to push the request in one of the two directions. Support requests would be decided at a lower level, applying the guidance from the JISC.

Overall, the authorization has to take into account the entire budget. All of the types of requests have to be balanced against the others. Even with lower-level decisions have to keep the entire budget in mind.

Small activities may be decided by one of Gregg Richmond's managers. They make the decision and inform him; he informs Jeff Hall. If Jeff Hall is making the decision, he informs up the chain. As the decisions get larger, there's more consideration of available resources, capacity, budget. When decisions are made to work on something, defer it, or reject it—the higher level must be informed. Mr. Boyd was asked whether that inform cycle would include the requester. He replied that the expectation is that the requester could view the status as the request goes through the process.

When a request comes in, it would have a sponsor—such as a court supervisor—someone a level up, so the next level in the requesting organization is informed and supports it. If the request is rejected, then that response would be communicated to the requester.

If a request moves forward, it goes to staff to describe what the project looks like and ensure that all JISC guidelines and thresholds are applied, such as: how big and how complex is the project, what technologies will be used, what problem does it solve, what solution is proposed?

When that is done, the request goes to the next level to a committee or group to gate it. The group could look at it individually or with all other project requests, and determine what the top priorities are. The group would be applying the filters and criteria determined by the JISC.

Once the request is gated, it moves up the chain to the next level, depending on the value or cost for the organization. Different individuals and bodies would be involved in the gating process, using JISC guidelines. It's not an arbitrary process; it's one that follows the same process, with staff involved, gating activity, authorization, information, and feedback.

Mr. Boyd walked the committee through a couple of examples of how the process would work. He explained how decisions would be made at different levels for a maintenance item at a \$5,000 level vs. a \$25,000 level, and how the levels are different for application support vs. infrastructure.

Mr. Boyd explained how decisions would be made on a project request at different levels of cost and complexity, such as an enhancement vs. a new application or a replacement. He described how a committee would have to apply the criteria, such as budget, if the request fits within business processes and technical architecture, priority with other initiatives.

How frequently the committees would meet would depend on the number of requests that come in. It would be more in the earlier stages, with the backlog of ideas out there. In the first pass, they would need to get an integrated and consolidated view of all the requests that can move forward. Mr. Boyd explained that the model uses a subcommittee below JISC so that the JISC is not going through all of that work to look at priorities and make those decisions.

Mr. Boyd explained that the committee structure should include external stakeholders, the judicial community, AOC, the leadership team, and the JISC. He described the standing committees for data dissemination and code table maintenance that exist today, as well as a committee for master data management. The other committees—appellate, superior, courts of limited jurisdiction, statewide applications, person business rules, and data management—would take the requests that fit into their areas and establish their priorities. Those priorities would feed up to the Judicial Technology Advisory Committee (JTA), and they would assess them on a combined basis and provide that information up to the JISC.

He described the charter as recapping what was explained, with specifics such as the purpose of the committee, roles and responsibilities, the strategy, which reflects best practices. It's a template being provided to all the committees in each group. Once the goals, principles, and guidelines are established, the charter is limited in its structure.

The committee expressed concerns about the JTA Committee being like the JISAC committee JISC had before that did not work. The Executive Committee recommended not having the JTA Committee, to use the ad hoc committees and the JISC would do more work and make more decisions. That might result in the JISC having to meet monthly rather than bi-monthly. The committee expressed that this provides a framework that doesn't exist now, and if everyone is faithful to the process, a year or 18 months from now, we will be in a much better position; users will be more satisfied with the responsiveness, and we will be making decisions in a concerted way.

A motion was made and seconded to approve the plan as proposed, amended to eliminate the JTA, and move those dollar thresholds up to the JISC level.

Mr. Boyd explained that one function of the JTA would be to consolidate the committees' inputs to come up with a larger stacked list of initiatives, which is not something the JISC would want to accomplish as a committee of the whole.

The committee asked whether there would be a chance for someone to appeal a decision to decline a project. Mr. Boyd described that the person would have the option to appeal to the next level, up to the JISC.

The committee discussed the idea that the governance structure would not be perfect; it needs to be reviewed, but not for at least 12 months. In the past a problem has been not sticking with a model long enough. If the motion passes, the JISC would be committed to using the model for the next 12 months, and then it could be modified.

The question was called; the motion passed, 7 to 4.

Judge Wynne suggested that operational committees might be a better term to use than ad hoc committees. Justice Fairhurst agreed.

### **Proposed JISC Membership Change**

Larry Barker, of the Misdemeanant Corrections Association (MCA), pointed out that his organization serves 77 probation departments and 133 courts, and is a huge consumer of JIS data, but has no representation on the JISC. He requested that MCA be included in the decision-making process. He explained that probation departments are not necessarily part of courts of

limited jurisdiction (CLJ); some answer to the legislative branch, some to the executive branch, and some also work with superior courts. He requested that the MCA be either part of an ad hoc committee or part of the JISC. He pointed out that adding an MCA member would require rewriting the court rules.

A motion was made and seconded to propose an amendment to the Supreme Court rules to have a member of the MCA as a voting member of the JISC. A motion was made and seconded to table the motion until the next meeting. The motion was tabled until the next meeting.

## **Business Planning and IT Strategy**

Mr. Paul Chabot, of Ernst & Young, gave a presentation on key decisions that need to be made, and the importance of moving quickly on those decisions, in order to transform ISD to its future state.

Mr. Chabot described how ISD is focusing a majority of its efforts on just keeping up with complex and hard-to-maintain applications, and so very little capacity is left to support new enhancements and develop new functionality. That means that there is a growing backlog of enhancement requests that will continue to grow.

ISD doesn't have adequate resources to support its user base. Other government IT organizations have one IT staff member to support 33.8 users. In the case of ISD, there is one ISD staff member for 117 users. And that is only the 16,000 court users, not including the other 8,000 justice partners that ISD supports. That is about a 3.5 time difference in terms of workload.

In terms of funding, for comparable government peers, they spend about \$5,700 per user, whereas ISD only has \$1,600 per user. Now that the budget is shrinking, that statistic will get worse in the coming years. At that point, the question will be not which enhancements to make, but which customers to stop supporting and which applications to turn off.

Mr. Chabot declared that the committee needs to make decisions about moving forward with the strategy to bring the skills and capabilities ISD needs to efficiently serve its customer base. Most importantly, the committee needs to secure funding and resources from the legislature so ISD can effect the transformation and be successful in delivering services to the courts. Finally, the committee needs to take a hard look at the customer base, understand who the priority customers are, and focus IT services on those priority customers.

Mr. Chabot emphasized that the same level of maturity will be required, regardless of whether the solutions are COTS, custom development, or keeping and modernizing legacy systems. Maturity levels need to be elevated, new roles need to be added, and new functions need to be created within ISD. The detail is in the IT Strategy in the packet. It will require new roles like solution management, relationship management, management analysts and portfolio analysts. ISD will need a minimum of an estimated 26 additional staff by the end of the six-year transformation just to support JIS. There will also be a need for about 10 additional staff over the course of the transformation, and support from Judicial Services Division (JSD) staff.

Ernst & Young estimates the transformation to cost \$40-\$50 million over six years, which was achievable with previous years' budgets. While the IT Strategy has some contingency plans to mitigate reduced funding, those are only temporary solutions; they're not meant to transform the strategy into a ten-year strategy. That's a recipe for failure. The transformation will lose momentum; your clients will lose faith and you will no longer have their support.

The toughest decision the JISC needs to make is about prioritizing customers and services. IT governance, which is part of the strategy, will help the JISC make those decisions. The feasibility study should bring insights into ISD's total capacity to deliver services and the customer base it can realistically support and satisfy.

Mr. Chabot asked the JISC to approve the Business Plan and IT Strategy, and begin the effort to secure increased funding and resources to support the transition over the next six years.

Mr. Hall noted that changes in applications, enhancements, and replacements will begin before the end of six years, and that at the end of six years, ISD should be working at the performance level it needs to be. He noted that one of the reasons past projects have failed is because the organization was trying to mature its capacity while trying to do projects at the same time.

A motion was made and seconded to approve the JIS Business Plan and IT Strategy, and authorize the AOC to proceed with implementation of the operational plan. It was clarified that the committee was approving the plan, but that a budget in support of it would also be presented for approval and that expenditures for individual items will be subsequently gated for approval as appropriate. The Chair called the question. The Business Plan and IT Strategy were approved.

#### **Equipment Replacement (Non-JIS Court)**

Mr. Jeff Hall explained that Seattle Municipal Court had requested a modification to current JIS policy regarding equipment replacement to add non-JIS courts. Ms. Yolande Williams explained that Seattle Municipal Court is not considered a JIS court, but they use JIS systems for research purposes and they provide electronic updates of their criminal case filings, dispositions, citations and infractions, and no-contact orders into the JIS. They are requesting replacement of computers and printers only.

The committee discussed whether the policy should be amended to include only non-JIS courts, or also include violations bureaus. It was suggested that if non-JIS courts were added, they would have to contribute data to JIS with their local systems and also have their local systems reviewed and approved by the JISC prior to implementation, which is required by JISC Rule 13. It was also suggested that the policy have capacity for growth of the courts.

A motion was made to revise the JISC policy to include non-JIS courts, but not violations bureaus. There was no second.

Mr. Hall suggested the committee wait to consider the policy change when they have the new policy language, more detailed budget information, and a timing recommendation in front of them.

A motion was made and seconded to review the Equipment Replacement Policy. The motion passed. Mr. Hall indicated that AOC would prepare some information that he hoped would be ready by the August meeting, but he said it might be ambitious to think it would be ready by then.

#### **COTS Vendor Survey**

Ms. Vicky Marin explained that at the April 17<sup>th</sup> meeting, the committee directed AOC to do a high-level vendor survey to see what commercial products may be in the market that might meet the courts' needs. She emphasized that the results do not show that the products definitely will meet

courts' needs, the questions described functions fairly generally, and the survey represents the vendors' assertion about what their products can do, not AOC or the courts' research showing what the product actually can do.

She explained that the survey was sent to vendors, who were given three weeks to respond, and eight responses were received. The functions AOC asked about were those identified by the JISC as priority functions. The survey asked about technical requirements for working with the JIS system, and those questions eliminated a lot of potential vendors. Also, there are some vendors who did not respond, so there may be other products out there that might meet courts' needs.

Three vendors claim that their products can do all of the functions we asked about: New Dawn Technologies, Aptitude Solutions, and AmCad. Unlike CMS, we asked about products that can do discrete functions that could plug into our system. One company that responded only does e-filing, and one only does receipting. Only three vendors meet the technical requirements, which effectively narrow the field to three, because without those technical requirements, the products won't work. Some vendors claimed their products are implemented statewide, but their references looked like they were implemented at the local level throughout the state, which is not the same as being implemented in a system like ours. Four vendors claimed their products work across most jurisdictional levels.

Mr. Jeff Hall reported that there is interest in various places in New Dawn's product. On the surface it looks pretty good. He suggested we should get a deeper understanding of the product. In the future, this is the type of thing product managers and relationship managers within AOC will know. Part of their jobs will be to really understand the vendor market. Some jurisdictions are poised to buy a product, and it would be beneficial if they all went to the same place, and if AOC could negotiate for statewide contract prices that individual courts could use. It was suggested that AOC look into AmCad's product as well, since it also hits all the marks on the survey.

## **Committee Reports**

**Data Management Steering Committee – no report was given**

## **Next Meeting**

The next regular meeting will be August 14, 2009, at the AOC SeaTac facility; from 9:00 a.m. – 12:00 p.m.

There being no other business, the meeting was adjourned at 12:40 p.m.