

Washington State Judicial Branch

2023-25 Biennial Budget

Continue Data Quality Team Funding

Agency: Administrative Office of the Courts

Decision Package Code/Title: R1 – Continue Data Quality Team Funding

Agency Recommendation Summary Text:

The Administrative Office of the Courts requests \$2.2 million per biennium in ongoing funding to continue the Data Quality Program funded in the 2022 Supplemental Budget. The recent transition from a centralized Judicial Information System (JIS) to diverging case management systems implemented by certain courts has increased the volume of data anomalies and complexity of ensuring accurate and timely court data for statewide reporting, statistical analysis, and decision making. This request will provide the continued funding for the existing staff to adequately manage the existing and emerging backlog of data quality issues to improve data quality for the Washington State court system. (General Fund – State)

Fiscal Summary:

	FY 2024	FY 2025	Biennial	FY 2026	FY 2027	Biennial
Staffing						
FTEs	6.00	6.00	6.00	6.00	6.00	6.00
Operating Expenditures						
Fund 001-1	\$1,089,500	\$1,089,500	\$2,179,000	\$1,089,500	\$1,089,500	\$2,179,000
Total Expenditures						
	\$1,089,500	\$1,089,500	\$2,179,000	\$1,089,500	\$1,089,500	\$2,179,000

Package Description:

The Administrative Office of the Courts requests \$2.2 million to continue the Data Quality Program funded in the 2022 Supplemental Budget. The recent transition from a centralized Judicial Information System (JIS) to diverging case management systems implemented by certain courts has increased the volume of data anomalies and complexity of ensuring accurate and timely court data for statewide reporting, statistical analysis, and decision making. This request will provide the continued funding for the existing staff to adequately manage the existing and emerging backlog of data quality issues to improve data quality for the Washington State court system.

The current court data environment is increasing in complexity as more court case management systems emerge across Washington's non-unified court system. Preserving a statewide view and access to accurate and complete court data is a critical function that impacts the courts and other government agencies who rely on the data for judicial decision making, criminal investigations, backgrounds checks, sentencing, and reporting. Without an overall data strategy, governance, and consistently accurate and complete data used for the activities described above, decision making, reporting, services, and public safety will be at risk.

Between 2012 and 2021, the Administrative Office of the Courts (AOC) identified more than 872 data quality issues and this figure continues to grow. These issues have multiple causes including past data conversions, technical bugs, process errors, and data entry errors. It is not always easy to identify the root cause when first noticed, and some issues have multiple root causes. Each individual data quality issue may impact millions of records and hundreds of courts, multiple systems, and some pose greater impact and risk than others. Moreover, the occurrences of data issues are on-going.

AOC developed a process in an attempt to identify and fix the highest risk issues in partnership with the over 500 courts statewide. Since 2012, only 216 (25 percent) of those issues have been resolved. However, more work on data quality issues needs to be done not only to resolve the backlog but also to proactively monitor the new state and complexity of the court data systems.

Fully describe and quantify expected impacts on state residents and specific populations served:

The risk of poor data quality for court data impacts the citizens of Washington State as court data extends to other state and federal agencies through exchanges of data. An erroneous record may travel to Washington State Patrol background check data, firearms, Department of Licensing, and Federal Bureau of Investigations which can potentially impact the public negatively downstream.

Below are a few examples of court data provided to and used by other state agencies:

- Department of Licensing
 - Uses Convicted Felon Notification data for concealed pistol license revocations.
 - Uses the Judicial Access Browser System (JABS) to review case data when looking at records/change requests to determine if the change can be made. DOL also has various exchanges where it gets conviction data, failure to appear notices and adjudications, or vehicle holds and releases to add to or remove to its records for drivers or vehicles.
 - Receives reports directly from the county clerk on superior court judgments with no payments arising from an uninsured collision, RCW 46.29.310.
 - Adult Criminal DV-Related Misdemeanor Convictions – DOL Firearms for concealed pistol license revocations.
- Washington State Patrol uses charge disposition data to update criminal background information for which WSP is responsible.
- Washington State Institute for Public Policy (WSIPP) receives criminal and juvenile case information plus juvenile probation risk and needs assessment information from AOC's Assessment Research Database for research purposes. WSIPP also receives local and state law table updates.
- Office of Financial Management (OFM) receives an extract of juvenile records from the Court Contact and Recidivism database.
- Department of Licensing and FBI's National Instant Criminal Background Check System (NICS) Denied Person Database receives Mental Health Commitments for Treatment reports related to possession of firearms.
- Department of Social and Health Services receives data in fraud-related convictions for the purposes of recovering costs due the state of Washington.
- Dependency case data is compiled and reported in the Dependency Dashboard available to the public. This data is also used to compile dependency interactive reports for dependency case managers for managing dependency timeliness requirements (state and federal). Dependency case data is also used to prepare the Timeliness of Dependency Case Processing Practices pursuant to 2007 legislation to information policy makers in creating and shaping dependency laws to improve outcomes for children in dependency actions.
- Department of Children, Youth & Families receives a weekly report of all approved Orders of Dependency entered in superior courts.

Explain what alternatives were explored by the agency and why they were rejected as solutions:

Over many years, the AOC has attempted to resolve the known on-going data quality issues using existing staff resources. This has not been successful primarily due to the following reasons:

1. Lack of dedicated specialty staff specifically to work on data quality issues, and;
2. Lack of tools and skillsets to proactively process huge volumes of data side-by-side to more efficiently identify anomalies.

Court data is complex, and as a reflection of the real-world, those complexities involve changes throughout time, statute changes, code changes, court process changes, court levels, regional variation and the general patterns reflecting complexities involved in day-to-day court cases and operations. Any changes made to the data must be done working closely together with all 500+ courts individually.

What are the consequences of not funding this request?

Data quality issues will continue to occur and contribute to the growing and unresolved backlog that currently exists. The risk to the public and downstream organizations will only continue to magnify in both number and complexity.

Is this an expansion or alteration of a current program or service?

No expansions or alterations are included in this request. This simply continues funding that was originally appropriated on a one-time basis in the 2022 Supplemental Budget.

Decision Package expenditure, FTE and revenue assumptions:

Staffing Assumptions

In the 2022 Supplemental Budget, the Legislature funded a Data Quality Program for one year. The original request was for ongoing staff dedicated to resolving data quality issues and establishing a proactive, statistically-based data quality monitoring approach between related systems to mitigate risk going forward. Beginning July 1, 2023 and ongoing, AOC requires salary, benefits, and associated standard costs for:

Senior System Integrator. 1.0 FTE to perform data quality analysis supporting the operations and management of the Data Quality Program framework for all data stored in the AOC's case management systems, the enterprise data repository (EDR), and data warehouse.

System Integrator. 1.0 FTE to develop data-centric solutions supporting data quality processes.

Business Analyst. 2.0 FTE to focus on court business data for all court levels: Superior, Juvenile, Courts of Limited Jurisdiction, and Appellate.

Senior Court Program Analyst. 1.0 FTE to develop and support a data governance framework.

IT Solutions Architect. 1.0 FTE to modernize AOC's data architecture, create a data strategy, and participate in the development and support of the data governance framework.

Other Non-Standard Costs

None

Expenditures by Object	<u>FY 2024</u>	<u>FY 2025</u>	<u>FY 2026</u>	<u>FY 2027</u>	<u>FY 2028</u>	<u>FY 2029</u>
A Salaries and Wages	633,400	633,400	633,400	633,400	633,400	633,400
B Employee Benefits	202,000	202,000	202,000	202,000	202,000	202,000
E Goods and Services	22,800	22,800	22,800	22,800	22,800	22,800
G Travel	15,000	15,000	15,000	15,000	15,000	15,000
J Capital Outlays	9,600	9,600	9,600	9,600	9,600	9,600
T Intra-Agency Reimbursements	206,700	206,700	206,700	206,700	206,700	206,700
Total Objects	1,089,500	1,089,500	1,089,500	1,089,500	1,089,500	1,089,500

Staffing

Job Class	Salary	<u>FY 2024</u>	<u>FY 2025</u>	<u>FY 2026</u>	<u>FY 2027</u>	<u>FY 2028</u>	<u>FY 2029</u>
SYSTEM INTEGRATOR	101,100	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
SENIOR SYSTEM INTEGRATOR	111,500	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
IT SOLUTIONS ARCHITECT	117,500	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
BUSINESS ANALYST	101,100	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00
SENIOR COURT PROGRAM ANALYST	101,100	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
Total FTEs		6.00	6.00	6.00	6.00	6.00	6.00

Explanation of standard costs by object:

A - Salary estimates are current biennium actual rates at Step L.

B - Benefits are the agency average of 31.89% of salaries.

E - Goods and Services are the agency average of \$3,800 per direct program FTE.

G - Travel is the agency average of \$2,500 per direct program FTE.

J - Ongoing equipment is the agency average of \$1,600 per direct program FTE. One-time equipment (for facilities and information technology) is \$9,000 for the first fiscal year per direct program FTE.

Agency Indirect is calculated at a rate of 24.73% of direct program salaries and benefits and is shown as Object T.

How does the package relate to the Judicial Branch principal policy objectives?

- **Fair and Effective Administration of Justice.**

When judicial decision-makers have reliable data to inform their professional judgment, the outcomes improve life, liberty and property.

- **Accessibility.**

When we identify where data errors exist in the systems, we can make corrections and prevent inaccuracies and judicial errors due to poor information. Monitoring court data systems for data quality issues reduces risk and improves trust in the justice system.

- **Access to Necessary Representation.**

Better quality data helps produce better and more accurate research, which in turn provides insights into better judicial system functioning and fairness.

- **Commitment to Effective Court Management.**

Good data quality leads to a more accurate understanding of judicial needs, court operation needs, justifies funding for judicial system needs, and enhances accurate understanding of judicial system outcomes.

- **Sufficient Staffing and Support.**

Currently the AOC maintains all JIS systems. Since these systems are linked together, ensuring that the data in them is timely, accurate, and consistent is of utmost importance. Court data is a representation of real-world events and it is imperative that any human error found is corrected immediately to avoid consequences that may impact life, liberty, or property.

The AOC currently has one operationally funded Data Quality Coordinator and no dedicated staff to work with courts and perform data quality duties on the scale that is needed. A Data Quality Process has been tested and applied with success, however it is still a largely a reactive process and resources are often shifted to other priorities. In order to fully carry out the framework of the Data Quality Process and provide the desired outcomes, the AOC needs dedicated staff to move the agency towards the ideal future proactive state.

Are there impacts to other governmental entities?

Yes. If data quality issues remain unresolved, other state agencies will be impacted due to inaccurate and incomplete court data resulting in poor or erroneous judicial decision making, criminal investigations, backgrounds checks, sentencing, and reporting.

Stakeholder response:

As noted in the Impacts Section above, the AOC provides or exchanges data with the following state agencies: Washington State Patrol, Washington State Department of Licensing, Washington State Institute for Public Policy, Washington Secretary of State, and provides data to requesting entities through data dissemination requests. The AOC believes that these agencies and data requesters will be supportive in receiving complete, accurate and timely court related data.

Are there legal or administrative mandates that require this package to be funded?

There are no legal or administrative mandates that require that this package be funded.

Does current law need to be changed to successfully implement this package?

No changes to current law are required to successfully implement this package.

Are there impacts to state facilities?

This request does not impact any state facilities.

Are there other supporting materials that strengthen the case for this request?

Not at this time.

Are there information technology impacts?

There are no information technology impacts as a result of this request.

Agency Contacts:

Christopher Stanley, 360-357-2406, christopher.stanley@courts.wa.gov

Angie Wirkkala, 360-704-5528, angie.wirkkala@courts.wa.gov