Superior Court Level Management Feasibility Study

Request for Proposal (RFP) No.

Time Sensitive Material

1.0 Introduction

1.1 Purpose

At the direction of the Judicial Information Systems Committee (JISC), the Washington State Administrative Office of the Courts (AOC) is initiating this Request for Proposal (RFP) to solicit responses from Vendors interested in preparing a feasibility study regarding the acquisition and implementation of an automated system in support of the calendaring and caseflow management business functions of the Superior Courts in Washington State.

The feasibility study shall also address the retirement, in whole or part, of any legacy systems which provide additional business functionality to the Superior Courts and/or County Clerks that is replicated in the best-few alternatives identified in the feasibility study. These systems include, but are not limited to, the Courts Automated Proceedings Systems (CAPS), Superior Court Information System (SCOMIS) and the Judicial Receipting System (JRS).

AOC is looking for ***Expert*** level contractor support to define technical and functional requirements for a calendaring and caseflow management system and to develop a feasibility study and identify viable alternatives. Depending on the alternative selected, the vendor may be requested to continue with the second phase of the project: to write an RFP for the procurement of a selected system or service alternative that meets AOC requirements, and to provide evaluation criteria for assessing the RFP responses and selecting the most qualified vendor/proposal. The vendor must bid their proposal in two phases to allow for this decision point.

1.2 Project Background

The Administrative Office of the Courts (AOC) was established by the 1957 Legislature and operates under the direction and supervision of the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court, pursuant to Chapter 2.56 RCW. The mission of AOC is to advance the efficient and effective operation of the Washington Judicial System.

The AOC provides significant support to the Washington Courts across a variety of business areas including the provision of information technology systems which support the business functions of the state's appellate and trial courts and serve as the repository of state-wide court data accessed by the courts and other local, state, and federal justice system partners.

In the provision of information technology services to the appellate and trial courts, the AOC operates under the oversight and direction of the Judicial Information System Committee (JISC) as established by the Judicial Information System Committee Rules (JISCR) adopted in 1976.

Several prior studies and efforts have been undertaken to improve the level of calendaring and caseflow management business functionality provided to the trial courts, including the development and implementation of the Courts Automated Proceeding System (CAPS) in the Yakima County Superior Court in 2004. Neither the CAPS solution nor other efforts have resulted in the broad provision of calendaring and caseflow management functionality to the state's trial courts.

In 2008 the JISC contracted with Ernst and Young to produce a series of strategic, business and operational plans to guide the JISC and AOC in the development and implementation of new information technology solutions and, where appropriate, the retirement and replacement of legacy applications. This feasibility study represents the first effort under the plans to extend the level of business functionality provided to the courts and implicates the potential retirement of one or more legacy applications.

Under the governance model adopted by the JISC, the Superior Court Judges' Association has requested that the JISC pursue the acquisition and implementation of an information technology solution in support of their calendaring and caseflow management business functions. The Superior Courts in Washington State are the courts of general jurisdiction. The Superior Courts have exclusive jurisdiction over felony crimes, real property rights, family law, probate, guardianship, mental illness, juvenile, and civil cases over $50,000. The Superior Courts operate in 32 judicial districts, with 27 judicial districts comprised of a single county and 5 districts comprised of either two or three counties.

By virtue of their office, each of the 39 elected or appointed County Clerks also serve as the Clerk of the Superior Court in their respective County, with responsibility for maintaining the Court's files, creating the official docket, recording minutes of court proceedings and the collection and receipt of all funds required to be paid or held in trust by the Court.

AOC knowledge of the potential vendor community suggests that the products available on the market which provide calendaring and caseflow management business functionality also provide business functionality currently provided to the Superior Courts and County Clerks in AOC developed and hosted legacy applications. Consistent with the IT Strategic, Business and Operational plans adopted by JISC, the retirement of legacy systems and the simplification of the JIS portfolio and technology infrastructure is a primary consideration in the acquisition and deployment of new systems.

1.3 Project Scope and Objectives

The AOC seeks proposals from persons and organizations qualified to identify and analyze potential calendaring and caseflow management solution alternatives and to provide feasibility analysis expertise and consulting.

For the purposes of this feasibility study, the JISC has directed that the content and form of the study shall be consistent with the feasibility study guidelines as described in the Washington State Information Services Board Policy 202-G1.

These services are required for approximately a [three] [four] month period to cover both phases of the project from the start date of the contract. The project cost shall be based upon deliverables identified in the Statement of Work (Attachment XX) at the bid-upon fixed price, with a not to exceed total project cost of $250,000.

Phase 1 of the project is covered by tasks one (1) through six (6), inclusive, of the Statement of Work (Attachment XX). Phase 2 of the project is covered by tasks seven (7) and eight (8) of the Statement of Work (Attachment XX).

Bidders must submit a written proposal to respond to this RFP. Bidders must comply with all requirements of this RFP, or AOC may reject your proposal as non-responsive.

Attachment xx

Statement of Work

The contractor will provide the services and deliverables below:

Phase 1:

1. Work with AOC staff to develop a project schedule and work plan, to be approved by the AOC, for completion of tasks and deliverable outlined in this statement of work.

2. Work with AOC staff and the court community to refine functional and technical requirements, with definitions, necessary to support the calendaring and caseflow management business functions of the Superior Courts, the business functionality provided by the SCOMIS system for the County Clerk's, and the financial and accounting functionality provided by the Judicial Receipting System for the County Clerks. An initial draft of requirements and interfaces are in Attachment XX.

3. Work with AOC staff to identify and assess alternative solutions to provide calendaring and caseflow management business functions of the Superior Courts, the business functionality provided by the SCOMIS system for the County Clerk's, and the financial and accounting functionality provided by the Judicial Receipting System for the County Clerks.

4. Work with AOC management and subject matter experts to select a proposed solution from the best-few alternatives.

5. Work with AOC staff and management to develop an overall systems migration approach for implementation of the best-few alternatives in a logically sequenced fashion, to include retirement, in whole or part, of any legacy systems that provide duplicate functionality to that provided by the best-few alternatives.

6. Prepare a formal written study to determine the feasibility of a project to implement a system or service which provides calendaring and caseflow management business functions of the Superior Courts, and may provide the business functionality provided by the SCOMIS system for the County Clerk's, and the financial and accounting functionality provided by the Judicial Receipting System for the County Clerks. The feasibility study must contain required elements as detailed in the Feasibility Study Guidelines for Information Technology Investments (ISB Policy No. 202-G1). A current list of elements is as follows:
    - Executive summary
    - Project background and business case
    - Project objectives
    - Customers, stakeholders and organizational entities impacted by the project
    - Organizational effects
    - Proposed solution
    - Major alternatives considered
    - Relationship to the agency's business and IT strategic plans and IT portfolio
    - Relationship to and impacts on the agency and state technology infrastructure
    - Project management approach and organization
    - Quality assurance plan

- Estimated timeline and work plan
- Cost/benefit analysis, including basis for any assumptions
- Risk assessment and mitigation strategy
- Summary statement assessing the feasibility of implementing the selected alternative within the business environments of AOC and the Superior Courts.

The following **specific guidance** shall be incorporated in the analysis and discussion of the *Proposed solution*, *Major alternatives considered*, and *Cost/benefit analysis*:

- The stated preference for commercial-off-the-shelf and/or best-of-breed solutions over custom build efforts as contained in the IT Strategic, Business, and Operational plans.
- Provision of calendaring and caseflow management business functionality as an enterprise solution hosted at the AOC.
- Provision of calendaring and caseflow management business functionality hosted by individual courts or groups of courts from an established list of approved vendor products with the capability of exchanging data with the state-wide data repository.
- To the extent that the best-few alternatives do implicate, in whole or in part, retirement of legacy applications, a comparison of business functionality of the best-few alternatives and the legacy application(s). In particular, an assessment of the docketing business functions in terms of workflow and keystrokes to complete similar work.
- The feasibility of beginning deployment of the best-few alternative solutions to one or more courts on or before July 1, 2011.

Phase 2:

7. Develop a Request for Proposal (RFP) that clearly states the requirements and vendor responsibilities for implementing the selected alternative solution, which can be submitted to the vendor community in order to procure the proposed solution. The RFP must meet all State and Agency procurement requirements.

8. Develop the assessment criteria and RFP evaluation process necessary to support selection of the proposal that best meets the system and program requirements defined in the RFP.

Project Management:

This position will perform project management duties associated with Phases 1 and 2 of the feasibility and RFP development services and manage follow-on approval and procurement activities for the selected alternative, including but not limited to:

- Develop, implement and maintain project management plans and planning documents utilizing standard ISD project management tools and templates where possible. Work closely with contracted resources and key stakeholders in developing these plans. Actively monitor and manage the project utilizing these plans.
- Set, maintain and manage the project schedule (work plan) utilizing MS Project as the primary tool.

- Actively manage issue, risk and change management processes. Provide leadership in the identification, documentation and resolution of project issues and change requests using defined processes.
- Manage communications with contracted resources, stakeholders and management to ensure effective and timely communications occur. Develops and implements communication strategies.
- Report project progress using standard AOC project reporting formats, supplemented by routine project status reports.
- Consult with administration and vendor staff on solution design.
- Coordinate acceptance of design deliverables within impacted stakeholders.
- Lead the development of approval documents for external sources, such as the Judicial Information Systems Committee, and the leadership Associations of the primary Superior Court level stakeholders.
- Direct staff in a matrix management scenario to complete assigned tasks as outlined in the work plan.
- Ensure project quality standards are met.
- Oversee and manage the project budget.
- Provide implementation coordination and support.
- Develop measurement and monitoring methods.
- Evaluate findings and recommendations of the Quality Assurance consultant. Develop and implement corrective actions as needed.

2.19 Reference Definitions

Caseflow Management

"Caseflow management is the court supervision of the case progress of all cases filed in that court. It includes management of the time and events necessary to move a case from the point of initiation (filing, date of contest, or arrest) through disposition, regardless of the type of disposition. Caseflow management is an administrative process; therefore, it does not directly impact the adjudication of substantive legal or procedural issues."
"Caseflow management includes early court intervention, establishing meaningful events, establishing reasonable timeframes for events, establishing reasonable timeframes for disposition, and creating a judicial system that is predictable to all users of that system. In a predictable system, events occur on the first date scheduled by the court. This results in counsel being prepared, less need for adjournments, and enhanced ability to effectively allocate staff and judicial resources."
Caseflow Management Guide, Page 1, State Court Administrative Office of the Courts, Lansing, Michigan, Undated.

Case Management System

A case management system supports caseflow management through establishment and compliance monitoring and enforcement of case deadlines and events, whether those deadlines and events represent requests for hearings to be held, the conduct of hearings before the court, activities that occur outside the direct purview of the court (i.e., mediation, settlement offers or efforts), exchange of information between parties and the filing of certain documents.

A case management system generally provides reports or screen based information used to manage individual cases and groups of cases the caseload level by case type. A case management system generates reports, letters, forms, and other documents necessary to communicate approaching or missed deadlines (compliance and enforcement).

A case management system supports different sets of general case events by type of case, and sub-type of case.

Calendaring (resource scheduling) System

Calendaring is the activity of scheduling cases for hearings before the court and consists of the coordination of case actors (judges, attorneys, litigants, interpreters, etc.) and physical resources (court rooms, AV equipment, etc.) based on a set of conditions that include case type, hearing type, required actors, and required physical resources. For example, a request for a motion hearing in a domestic case before Judge A (conditions) would result in the hearing being set on the next future date that Judge A is scheduled to hear domestic case motions).

A calendaring system supports calendaring through automation of case hearing scheduling based on a set of rules (conditions). A calendaring system produces reports that details all cases scheduled for a particular date, time, and place and reports that detail all of the scheduled hearings for a particular case. A calendaring system generates notices to individuals regarding the scheduling of hearings in a particular case.

Calendaring is a sub-activity of case management. That is, you may have a calendaring system without having a case management system. A case management system presumes the existence of a calendaring system as either part of the case management system or through the exchange of data with a separate calendaring system.

Docketing Systems

Docketing is the creation and maintenance of the legal record of court actions taken and documents filed in a particular case. A docketing system is the creation and maintenance of that legal record in electronic form.

As a general rule and practical matter, calendaring and/or case management systems are highly dependent upon the data and information in a docketing system. For example, a summary judgment motion is filed and the official record of that document is created in the docket. The motion also serves as the request for court time to be calendared. The motion also serves as the date marker relative to a case management rule regarding the sequencing and timing of the request and scheduling of the hearing for purposes of compliance monitoring and enforcement.