

JUDICIAL INFORMATION SYSTEM COMMITTEE (JISC)

June 25, 2010

9:00 a.m. to 12:00 p.m.

Administrative Office of the Courts, SeaTac, WA

Meeting Minutes

Members Present:

Justice Mary Fairhurst, Chair
Mr. Larry Barker
Chief Robert Berg
Ms. Cathy Grindle
Mr. Jeff Hall
Judge James Heller
Mr. William Holmes
Mr. N. F. Jackson
Mr. Rich Johnson
Judge J. Robert Leach
Judge Steven Rosen
Judge Michael Trickey
Ms. Siri Woods (phone)
Judge Thomas J. Wynne, Co-chair

Members Absent:

Mr. Marc Lampson
Mr. Steward Menefee
Ms. Yolande Williams

Guests Present:

Ms. Lori Bame
Ms. Linda Bell
Mr. Shayne Boyd
Mr. Don Horowitz
Mr. Sam Kurle
Ms. Marti Maxwell
Ms. Barb Miner (phone)
Mr. Brian Rowe
Ms. Keri Sullivan
Mr. Roland Thompson

Staff Present:

Mr. Kevin Ammons
Mr. Bill Cogswell
Ms. Vicky Marin
Ms. Heather Morford
Ms. Pam Payne
Mr. Kumar Yajamanam

Call to Order

Justice Fairhurst called the meeting to order at 9:00 a.m. and introductions were made. During introductions Linda Bell was introduced as Cathy Grindle's replacement on the committee. Cathy will be retiring. Justice Fairhurst thanked Cathy for her many years of dedicated service and told Linda that we look forward to her officially joining us in August.

Approval of Special Session Minutes

Justice Fairhurst asked if there were any changes or comments to the draft minutes from the May 19, 2010 meeting. Justice Fairhurst asked for future minutes to reflect when votes are taken that motions passed as "unanimous" is noted, and if necessary that numbers are noted if a dissention or nay vote is given. Also to be noted in future votes, person who moved and person who seconded.

Mr. Jackson moved to approve, Hearing no objections Justice Fairhurst approved the May 19, 2010 minutes.

Budget Status Update

Mr. Hall reported that we are beginning to see expenditures versus obligations. The budget report that will be given in August will be a quarterly report including more details on the changes in numbers.

Operational Plan Status Update

The IT Governance process is moving forward as we are getting out and meeting with the representative groups and forming the Court Level User Groups.

AOC Service Level – Centralized or De-Centralized

Justice Fairhurst summarized that at the May 19 meeting, agreement was reached that there is a need for a basic level of service to be provided state wide. As we go forward we will need to make decisions on a case by case basis, as to whether it is “Centralized or De-Centralized”.

After discussion by the committee, it was determined that a decision could not be made now and that a sub-committee was needed to further evaluate the subject.

1. Motion: As described in Tab 4:

I move that the JISC:

- Maintain the current preference for centralized statewide JIS systems that provides a basic level of service to all courts in the state.
- Continue to develop data exchanges to connect local court applications with the statewide applications and databases.
- Define the basic level of service as the services currently invested in and provided by existing AOC JIS applications, data exchanges and services plus any customer requested changes approved for those systems, data exchanges and services.
- Work toward adopting a set of criteria to aid in future determinations of which business functions should be supported with statewide IT solutions and which functions should be supported with local IT solutions.

Moved by: William Holmes, Second: Siri Woods. Unanimously passed.

2. Motion: To create a subcommittee to address bullets, three and four in motion utilizing information coming from the RFP.

Moved by: Mr. Rich Johnson, Second: Larry Barker – Unanimously passed

IT Governance Guidelines

Mr. Shayne Boyd presented back to the committee the JISC Guidance on IT Governance Priorities and Criteria that Mr. Boyd captured from the previous JISC meeting. Infrastructure was determined to be the most important, because without hardware, network etc, support to the court communities cannot take place. Maintaining the current portfolio is next, this includes all the applications, and baseline functionality.

Moving forward, the JISC Committee will decide what work will need to be done. Determining what work will be done will be based on if the work matches the priorities as outlined by the IT Governance guidelines. Without guidelines it would be difficult for the endorsing communities and the court level user groups to know whether a given request is within the scope of the JISC and aligns with the JIS strategy and priorities. Additionally, Court Level User Groups (CLUGS) will not be able to prioritize requests without guidelines on how the available budget will be allocated. Establishing technology and data standards provides a consistent basis for making IT investment decisions and builds a high-functioning, robust and cohesive technology and application portfolio.

Motion: The JISC adopt the discussed IT Governance Guidelines to instruct and inform the IT Governance process. Moved by: Mr. Rich Johnson, Second: Cathy Grindle. Unanimously passed.

SC Management Feasibility Study

Noted that Sierra Systems and Cayzen Technologies left the room.

The primary goal of the feasibility study is to determine the feasibility of alternatives to provide calendaring and caseflow management business functionality to Superior Courts.

A decision was made at the May 19 JISC meeting that the RFP would outline the requirements as mandatory and desirable and LINX would be added as a potential solution. The information requested in the RFP will cover the requirements for calendaring and caseflow management along with other business functions that down the road might be options to enhance the productivity of the courts. The outcome of the feasibility study will tell us what market options are available, are the platforms modular and if it is possible to add other modules at a later date.

The committee discussed the current version of the RFP and there were concerns raised about the language used within the Statement of Work.

Justice Fairhurst summarized the discussion that everyone agrees we need to know what these systems offer, but as currently written it wouldn't get us other things outside of Case Management and Calendaring. If we get a product that does Case Management and calendaring we might want to determine if there are other functions that could meet the needs of other user groups. Based on the current language, it is recommendation that the Statement of Work is reworded to add another section, "we would also like to know what else you have; if you have modules, other features or add-ons", but this is not a requirement.

Brian Rowe, Access to Justice (ATJ) Board liaison to JISC, asked to have the ATJ Technology Principles included in the RFP language to evaluate the secondary requirement issues. Justice Fairhurst suggested that due to the RFP deadline it was not possible to include the principles at this time. However, Justice Fairhurst acknowledged the importance of having the principles as part of the consideration for the future and said that the criteria committee should look at the ATJ principles and incorporate them as a checklist when evaluating systems and products.

Motion: Siri Wood moved the RFP be prepared and reviewed by the committee chair (Justice Fairhurst) and processed as final draft. Motion denied unanimously.

Amended motion: Judge Trickey move to delegate to the Executive Committee, to amend the RFP to include key language from clerks, judges and JISC committee. Second: Judge Leach. Judge Rosen made amendment that the Executive Committee be guided by Justice Fairhurst reiteration of everyone's understanding. Motion passed, Cathy Grindle abstaining.

GR 30

Judge Heller explained the need for an amendment to GR 30. There are some practical problems with the rule with relation to e-ticketing. The current rule creates some practical problems with electronic signatures in these situations: documents attached to tickets, tickets sent first to prosecutors for a charging decision, and the requirement that the date and location be included according to RCW 9A.72.085. Don Horowitz raised a question about the language in subsection (d) (1) (a).

Motion: Judge Wynne moved deferring action on this subject to the August meeting and in the interim form a workgroup to draft a revision of the language for submission to the Court Rules Committee. Second: Judge Rosen. Unanimously passed.

Workgroup Volunteers: Jim Heller, Don Horowitz, Keri Sullivan, Linda Bell

Committee Reports

Mr. Rich Johnson – no update from Data Management Steering Committee.
Justice Fairhurst – Public Website Case Search, group has been meeting, will report to JISC in August.

JISC Bylaw Amendment

Justice Fairhurst summarized: The recommendation before the committee is to amend the bylaws for the JISC in that, the Vice chair for the JISC would be a judge and that person would serve on the executive committee as a representative of their court affiliation. The second point is a Rule 2 change, allowing the JISC committee members to elect a vice-chair from among the JISC members who are judges. This rule change will be submitted to the Supreme Court.

Motion: Mr. William Holmes moved that the draft language as offered in this package be accepted. Second: Jim Heller. Unanimously passed.

Agenda Items carried to August

6. JIS Policy on IT Governance
7. IT Governance Process Implementation
9. Case Management System Readiness Review
13. ISD Overview

Next Meeting

The next regular JISC meeting will be August 18, 2010, at the AOC SeaTac facility; from 9:00 a.m. – 12:00 p.m.

Adjournment

Being out of time the meeting was adjourned at 12:00 p.m.