

Current Rule 13

RULE 13 LOCAL COURT SYSTEMS

Counties or cities wishing to establish automated court record systems shall provide advance notice of the proposed development to the Judicial Information System Committee and the Office of the Administrator for the Courts 90 days prior to the commencement of such projects for the purpose of review and approval.

Proposed Rule 13

~~RULE 13 ELECTRONIC COURT RECORD SYSTEMS~~

~~(a) An "electronic court record system" is any electronic court records technology system that is the source of statewide court data identified in the JIS Standards for Alternative Electronic Court Record Systems.~~

~~(b) All electronic court record systems must receive the approval of the Judicial Information System Committee. Notice of the proposed development must be provided to the Judicial Information System Committee and the Administrative Office of the Courts 12 months prior to the purchase or acquisition of software or services.~~

~~(c) Alternative electronic court record systems must comply with the JIS Standards for Alternative Electronic Court Record Systems. These standards must be met in order for a court with an alternative electronic court record system to continue to receive Judicial Information Systems (JIS) account funding or equipment and services funded by the account.~~

NOTE

S: ~~1. The JISCR 13 definition of "electronic court record system" refers to the definition of "statewide court data" in the JIS Standards for Alternative Electronic Court Record Systems. Here is that definition, for reference:~~

~~"Statewide court data" refers to data needed for sharing between courts, judicial partners, public dissemination, or is required for statewide compilation in order to facilitate the missions of the Washington Courts, justice system partners, and the AOC.~~

~~2. The titles of the Standard and Implementation Plan, and all references, will be changed to "Alternative Electronic Court Record Systems" to be consistent with the new JISCR 13 language.~~

10.2 Alternative Custom Local Systems, Interfaces, Reports and Services

10.2.1 The JIS provides case management automation to courts and maintains a statewide network providing access to the JIS database. To implement this, the JISC selects and provides equipment and services. The JISC

plans for, implements, and supports case management applications that provide baseline functionality to the courts of Washington State. The JISC acknowledges that some courts desire alternative services and/or applications to meet their local needs. Courts that implement alternative applications or services are responsible for the costs of acquiring, developing, implementing, and maintaining such systems.

-Alternative electronic court record systems must comply with the JIS Standards for Alternative Electronic Court Record Systems. These standards must be met in order for a court with an alternative electronic court record system to continue to receive Judicial Information Systems (JIS) account funding or equipment and services funded by the account.

Formatte

For those courts that do not use the statewide ~~vender~~ solution as chosen by the Judicial Information Systems Committee, **for an electronic court records system that is the source of statewide data**, Judicial Information Systems account funds may not be allocated for (a) the costs to meet the data collection and exchange standards developed by the Administrative Office of the Courts and the Judicial Information Systems Committee, and (b) the costs to acquire, develop, implement or maintain alternative court case management systems.

Formatte

Formatte

10.2.24 Access to JIS systems will only be through AOC-supported data exchange methods. Courts may create their own custom user interfaces, reports or services (including data exchanges) consistent with the standard JIS application programming interfaces (API's) for business services or the JIS enterprise data warehouse.

Last page of Edits
from WSACC

Seattle Municipal Questions on JISC Rule 13 and JIS General Policies

JISC Rule 13

1. Seattle Municipal has used a separate system for over 20 years. What approval will Seattle Municipal have to get from the JISC for MCIS, per JISCR 13(b)?

JISCR 13 has required JISC approval for alternate systems since 1976. Presumably, Seattle Municipal Court requested JISC approval when MCIS was developed.

2. JISCR 13(c) requires courts with alternative systems to comply with the data standards to receive JIS account funding. If AOC modifies the standards in the future, will courts be penalized by having equipment funds withheld if they no longer comply due to the modification?

The JISC must approve any recommended changes to the JIS Data Standards. If the JISC approves future modifications to the standards, it is anticipated that the JISC will allow a transition period for courts to meet the modified standards.

JIS General Policies

1. Policy 4.1.8 requires court employees to review the confidentiality agreement for JIS users annually.
 - a. Does this require courts to provide an annual agreement for employees to sign?

No. The annual review of the confidentiality agreement is a best practice developed by the AOC security team. The provision does not require resigning of the confidentiality agreement, though many government agencies do require annual signature. The agreement simply requires the employee to re-read the agreement annually. It is a best practice because many people do not remember the contents of an agreement they may have signed many years before and have not seen since. As part of increased security precautions, AOC requires all employees to complete annual security training and reminds them of the contents of the confidentiality agreement.

- b. How do you define annual? Do employees sign the agreements at the beginning of the year or on the anniversary of their hire date?

Each court may determine when to begin the annual period.

- c. Are we expected to maintain these forms in the personnel file or send them to AOC?

The court maintains the original confidentiality agreement signed by the employee when first given access to JIS. There is no change in current practice regarding storage of the agreements.

2. General Policy 10.2 says the JISC implements and supports case management applications that provide baseline functionality to the courts. Who decides what baseline services a non-JIS system provides. We believe MCIS currently provides baseline services and would hope that AOC would focus on building a data exchange to allow access to MCIS by other courts.

General Policy 10.2.1 addresses the baseline functionality that are or will be provided by current and future statewide systems. The level of baseline functionality was defined by the JIS Baseline Service Level Workgroup (a subcommittee of the JISC) and adopted by the JISC in 2011. The functionality of a future case management system for courts of limited jurisdiction is unknown until requirements are defined and the procurement process is complete. Policy 10.2.1 acknowledges that some courts may meet their local needs through alternative systems.

- e) GR 34 for the waiver of court and clerk's fees and charges in civil matters on the basis of indigency
- 3. A court that implements an Alternative Electronic Court Record System will continue to follow JIS rules, specifically:
 - a) [Rule 5](#) regarding standard data elements;
 - b) [Rule 6](#) regarding the AOC providing the courts standard reports
 - c) [Rule 7](#) regarding codes and case numbers
 - d) [Rule 8](#) regarding retention
 - e) [Rule 9](#) regarding the JIS serving as the communications link for courts with other courts and organizations and
 - f) [Rule 10](#) regarding attorney identification numbers
 - g) [Rule 11](#) regarding security
 - h) [Rule 15](#) regarding the JIS Data Dissemination System. The dissemination system shall be consistent with the JIS Data Dissemination System. The dissemination system shall be consistent with the JIS Data Dissemination System.
 - i) [Rule 18](#) regarding the JIS Data Dissemination System. The dissemination system shall be consistent with the JIS Data Dissemination System. The dissemination system shall be consistent with the JIS Data Dissemination System.

Comments on
Data Standard
From:
Barb Miner

B. SHARED DATA

These standards identify the shared data repository, and any other information necessary to complete necessary information to users.

es consistent with

cy record exists

ng JIS, the statewide
m database are able
rmation to users.

A court that implements an Alternative Electronic Court Record System ~~will~~ shall send the shared data identified in these standards to the JIS. The court shall comply with these standards ~~through direct data entry into a JIS system or by electronic data exchange.~~ All data elements which have been marked as "Baseline" with a 'B' in columns corresponding to the court level, in Appendix 'A' shall be effective as of the approval date of the standard. The implementation of the shared data (court applicability and timing) shall be governed by the Implementation Plan for the JIS Data Standards for Alternative Electronic Court Record Systems.

Detailed business and technical requirements for the shared data elements listed in Appendix 'A' will be provided in a separated Procedure and Guideline Document.

This subsection is divided into four parts:

PURPOSE

The purpose of this document is to provide an Implementation Plan for the JIS Data Standards for Alternative Electronic Court Record Systems.

AUTHORITY

The JIS Data Standards for Alternative Electronic Court Record Systems, as approved provisionally on October 24, 2014 by the Judicial Information System Committee (JISC), specifies that this Implementation Plan shall be followed.

BACKGROUND

JISC Rule 13 requires that courts must ~~request approval from the JISC to~~ notify the JISC of their decision to leave the centralized JIS and to use an Alternative Electronic Court Record System. Some courts are already using an alternative system and some courts might be contemplating moving to an alternative system.

The standard contains the requirements and responsibilities for trial courts to interface their Alternative Electronic Court Record System with the state Judicial Information System (JIS). These standards are necessary to ensure the integrity and availability of statewide data and information to enable open, just and timely resolution of all court matters.

PURPOSE

The purpose of this document is to provide the standards so that trial courts can meet the requirements of the JIS Data Standards for Alternative Electronic Court Record Systems.

Comments on
Implementation
Plan,

From: Barb Miner

ation plan for the
ary case management

IMPLEMENTATION REQUIREMENTS

The JISC recognizes and acknowledges that some courts have not used JIS as their primary case management system for many years, so the implementation plan addresses both courts that are currently using other case management systems, and courts that may use other case management systems in the future.

A. TRIAL COURTS USING JIS AS THEIR PRIMARY SYSTEM AS OF APRIL 4, 2014

Trial courts using JIS as their primary case management system on or after April 4th, 2014 shall provide all data specified as baseline for their court level in the JIS Data Standards for Alternative Electronic Court Record Systems on the date they stop using JIS as their primary case management system.



MUNICIPAL COURT
33325 8th Avenue South • PO Box 9717
Federal Way, WA 98063-9717
(253) 835-3000
www.cityoffederalway.com

October 17, 2014

Justice Mary Fairhurst and JISC Members
Judicial Information System Committee
P.O. Box 40929
Olympia, WA 98504-0929

RE: Proposed Data Standards and Implementation Plan

Dear Justice Fairhurst and JISC Members:

Many of our courts are hurting because of budget cuts and other constraints and need immediate help with efficiencies. Other courts are hurting because the home grown technology they developed years earlier to make them more efficient is no longer serviceable or appropriate for today's needs. Off the shelf software has become more affordable and available. Multiple vendors offer courts the possibility of streamlining operations and local legislative bodies have seen the benefits of providing funding to proceed in that direction. Grants have been awarded to assist courts in improving work processes through automation and to better track caseloads and statistics. Other courts are bubbling with creativity to make their courts an asset for their communities by adding services for the public that do not exist now.

I attach my letter of February 28, 2014 imploring you to foster a culture of cooperation as we proceed forward. My suggestion at the February 28th meeting was to develop the data elements required by JISCR 5 as a road map that will lead us to interoperability when the new CLJ CMS goes into effect.

I will summarize my proposal to build a base system for all courts that also allows integration of other local court systems through a data exchange:

1. Develop unified data elements as required by JISCR 5;
2. Use the adopted unified data elements in the development of the new CLJ CMS;
3. Include the development of a data exchange in the RFP for the new CLJ CMS;
4. Include all vendors in the data exchange development process so that they can develop interfaces that work with the AOC adopted system¹;
5. Local courts with their respective vendors could use the adopted unified data elements in the development of their local systems to reduce or eliminate interoperability issues when the new CLJ CMS is rolled out.

My proposal will unite us on a unified path to success. On the other hand, the proposed data standards and implementation plan in their present form will serve to divide us, quash creativity, and retard the

¹ Texas uses a hub and spoke model similar to what I am proposing.

development of much needed efficiencies and updates in our local courts. The courts that desire to use innovation now are all desirous of developing systems that integrate with the new statewide system. These efforts have been met with a variety of roadblocks including the exclusion of dissenting voices from voting on committees and developing data standards and an implementation plan that will deter courts from improving operations; i.e. the requirement to make dual entries on the scope and scale proposed here operates an initiative killer for many courts trying to improve their operations. It also serves the purpose of dividing us with lines in the sand that will send us on the unintended path of actually encouraging divergent systems. There would be less incentive for a local court to create a system that will eventually integrate with the new CMS if manual entries of data will satisfy AOC; i.e. there would be no need for the new system to "talk" to any other system outside of that court. How many different systems will exist that cannot communicate with each other if we do not follow the "road map" plan? No plan is perfect, but the plan I propose will work by uniting us in a common purpose.

Public safety should be the main driver in deciding what data absolutely needs to be entered into JIS while we are pursuing a replacement statewide system. Yet, the new data standards and implementation plan in many cases require minutia that is not needed by other courts for public safety purposes.

Providing information about charges, warrants, docket entries and the like are very useful, but there are ways to provide that access without requiring uploads to JIS. Links from JABS to other court websites is a viable option that is in the process of being developed for Seattle cases. Requiring courts to allow that access after making certain base entries in JIS would accomplish the ends sought. Courts would still need to follow the data road map created under JISCR 5 in developing their systems so that a merger of data could occur if the plan laid out above is followed. In the meantime, monthly reports, as required now, would give AOC the macro information it needs without requiring courts to upload minutia in JIS.

I want to build our court's system so that it works with the new statewide system. Other courts do too. Let's work together to get to our jointly desired destination.

Thank you.

~~Judge David A. Larson
Federal Way Municipal Court~~

Enc.

cc: DMCJA Board of Directors



MUNICIPAL COURT
33325 8th Avenue South • PO Box 9717
Federal Way, WA 98063-9717
(253) 835-3000
www.cityoffederalway.com

February 28, 2014

Justice Mary Fairhurst
Judicial Information System Committee
P.O. Box 40929
Olympia, WA 98504-0929

Re: ITG 27 and ITG 102

Justice Fairhurst:

I am writing in support of making it a top priority to bring the courts of limited jurisdiction into the 21st Century technologically. However, I am also expressing my concern about what this might look like and my fear that we are destined for failure unless we choose a path of mutual cooperation.

There have been recent discussions regarding the actions being taken by various courts to improve efficiencies in their local jurisdiction, including my own court. The steps being taken vary from court to court, but all of these initiatives are good faith attempts by each court to meet their local needs.

I implore you, and all in the position to make decisions regarding the direction we take, to embrace and leverage local creativity and initiative and to work with local courts to develop a model system that gives AOC the data it needs while allowing local courts flexibility to meet their local needs. I have made such a proposal and my hope is that it is given serious consideration.

Any attempt to reign in creativity and to quash local initiative in favor of a one size fits all system with no ability for local flexibility will lead us down a path of failure. Open minded cooperation is our only hope for success.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature consisting of a stylized letter 'S' followed by a diagonal slash.

Judge David A. Larson
Federal Way Municipal Court