

JUDICIAL INFORMATION SYSTEM COMMITTEE (JISC)

May 19, 2010

9:00 a.m. to 3:00 p.m.

Administrative Office of the Courts, SeaTac, WA

Special Session Minutes

Members Present:

Justice Mary Fairhurst, Chair
Mr. Larry Barker
Ms. Cathy Grindle
Mr. Jeff Hall
Judge James Heller
Mr. William Holmes
Mr. N. F. Jackson
Mr. Rich Johnson
Mr. Marc Lampson
Judge J. Robert Leach
Mr. Steward Menefee
Judge Steven Rosen
Judge Michael Trickey
Ms. Yolande Williams
Ms. Siri Woods
Judge Thomas J. Wynne

Guests Present:

Ms. Lori Bame
Mr. Shayne Boyd
Ms. Vonnie Diseth
Mr. Chris Shambro
Ms. Marti Maxwell
Ms. Barb Miner
Mr. Rowland Thompson
Mr. Mike Zanon

Staff Present:

Mr. Kevin Ammons
Mr. Bill Cogswell
Ms. Vicky Marin
Mr. Dirk Marler
Ms. Mellani McAleenan
Ms. Heather Morford
Ms. Pam Payne
Mr. Ramsey Radwan
Ms. Kathy Wyer
Mr. Kumar Yajamanam

Members Absent:

Chief Robert Berg

INTRODUCTORY ITEMS

Call to Order

Justice Fairhurst called the meeting to order at 9:00 a.m. and introductions were made. Mr. Jeff Hall made a special introduction of Ms. Veronica (Vonnie) Diseth, as the new CIO/ISD Director for AOC beginning on June 1, 2010. Her leadership skills and the ability to build and maintain relationships made her the top candidate and the correct choice for the position.

Approval of April 23, 2010 Meeting Minutes

Justice Fairhurst asked if there were any changes or comments to the draft minutes from the April 23, 2010 meeting. Ms. Yolande Williams commented on Page 3, under the Superior Court Level User Group Recommendations, Item #10-03:001, recalling discussion to change the language from "Bench Focused" to a better term. Mr. N.F. Jackson suggested it say, "Court Business Focused" and the committee agreed on that amendment.

Moved, seconded and carried: to approve the April 23, 2010 minutes with the amendment.

Elect Vice Chair

A decision was made at the May 19, 2010 JISC meeting that the vice chair should be one of the judges. Justice Fairhurst spoke with all of the committee members either by voice mail or directly about the vice chair position. It was the consensus of the committee that Judge Tom Wynne should be appointed as vice chair and he is willing to serve in that capacity.

Moved and seconded and voted on. **Motion passed.**

Justice Fairhurst thanked Judge Wynne for taking the charge, and added that this appointment included the duty of chairing the Data Dissemination Committee.

DISCUSSION ITEMS

JISC Policy Direction-AOC Statewide IT Service Level to the Courts - *Centralized or Decentralized Model?*

Mr. Jeff Hall presented a brief historical review of the original intent and thinking behind how JIS is derived from the two plans that were distributed from the early 1980s: the Automated Data Processing (ADP) Plan and the Permanent Funding Plan. The presentation included a review of some of the legislative history on the sources of funding for JIS, and how the funding sources have changed through the years to where we are today.

Mr. Hall asked the committee as an outcome of the discussion today to develop a set of criteria for figuring out in the future what business functionality should be maintained at the state level, using the state IT pool. What business functionality is appropriately covered and paid for, what is produced, whether we maintain all the data locally, and how do we make those choices in the future?

Mr. Hall summarized (slide 11 of the presentation) the overall goals for JIS from the ADP plan, which include: timely and accurate information for the expeditious administration of justice; improve court knowledge and responsiveness through greater data detail, currency and reliability; enhance the cost effectiveness through standardization of procedures, data elements and the use of technology for data collection handling and retrieval; and finally to increase the effectiveness of judicial process by enhanced availability of court related information.

In those plans, two conclusions were reached: 1) a statewide system application would be the most cost effective, with a return on investment, and 2) a statewide system would be the most likely to achieve the stated benefits or goals that they had laid out. We have continued to ask these questions through the years and through today.

The picture of today is a good depiction of what we all get from the JIS account itself: local equipment (laptops, desktops, printers), infrastructure, mainframes, inter-governmental network charges, routers, benefit from the statewide data and reporting that occurs, the business application layer (SCOMIS, DISCIS, etc.). That's where the data exchange becomes so important; so that they can provide out here on their own the functionality that they need and push the data back into the major systems. Even with the smaller, less complex courts, they do have their own little homegrown applications here and there that feed off of JIS data.

The question being then, the applications that feed that data reside at the local level and how is that funded? (Local, or look to the JIS account to support local acquisition of applications that contribute to a statewide data set)?

The committee then further discussed the topic with Mr. N.F. Jackson pointing out that there might be a third question, a hybrid of the two and Mr. Hall agreed.

Ms. Siri Woods wanted it recognized that a basic service should be provided to every single court in recognition for what they're paying in for it.

Judge Trickey than asked the committee what are the minimal functions that the state will provide?

The group agreed that JIS should provide some basic functionality to all courts.

Justice Fairhurst said that as I think about the discussion, it's figuring out what needs to be part of a system and what really is unique to you that you want to continue doing. We have to be sure that the information that's being gathered or used is very helpful to the people in the system, but also is

helping us because our funding from the legislature and our making our case is all going to be based on this information. I agree with Mr. Hall that it will be really important for us to have some of this criteria coming out of this.

It was brought up by Judge Wynne and Judge Trickey that we have to establish some credibility and that's hard to do given the history.

Justice Fairhurst recognized the frustration levels. I think there is frustration on both sides and a desire by both sides to achieve. So, I think in fairness, I would like to have that conversation. Maybe we can have it in June. So, while there's frustration perhaps on the case management side, there is recognition that JIS does serve a purpose and that we are the game that is the statewide game, and we are the one that at least to date has continued to have this recognition. So, my goal is that we can really come up with a plan under Vonnie's leadership and all of our leadership and our dedicated effort.

Mr. Jeff Hall said that we touched around the edges a little bit about the fact that Washington is a decentralized state versus what things look like in a centralized or unified state. I think that the question is really transparent and almost irrelevant in the end to our discussions. From my perspective, it doesn't matter if you're a unified system or you're a decentralized system like Washington State. If you don't have leadership and communication and commitment at the individual judge and court level, you're going to fail.

Judge Rosen wanted the committee to know he has not come close to making up his mind, and the reason is because he feels a little rushed. He sat down with about 10 or 12 judges at the municipal court level and asked them this question – do we want a centralized or decentralized system? The response from all of them was, we can't have a decentralized system. We have to be able to search and get good information.

Mr. N.F. Jackson pointed out that he's hearing a consensus that there should be some level of basic services, and our test as Judge Heller just said it, is to discern where basic rises to, and whether or not tracking drug of choice is within basic or above the line, which needs to be handled independently.

Judge Wynne added that when we get to the feasibility study that should include some of the discussion topics here in terms of cost-effectiveness of centralized versus decentralized case management and calendaring.

Justice Fairhurst concluded that we're at a good point right now, if I were to summarize (which I think N.F. and William and a few others have) is that there is general agreement that we need to have some centralized system that serves all the courts at their levels with basic functions. And that we need to have data exchange to assure that information that is not covered by the basic system but that needs to either be collected or needs to be pushed and pulled, is being captured and that information is going. And that we need to spend some time developing the criteria or asking the questions that will help decide which way it goes as we go forward. Is that somewhat capturing the discussion? [yes]

Outcomes of Centralized/Decentralized Discussion

- There should be a centralized system that provides some level of basic service to all the courts.
- Local courts with more sophisticated systems should be able to provide data to and receive data from the statewide database through data exchange.
- Defining the basic level of service was not decided.

- The JISC should develop a set of criteria for deciding which business functions should be provided at the state level with JIS funding, and which should be maintained locally.
- The JISC needs more information about economies of scale and the cost/benefit of the two approaches before deciding on the basic model.

Enterprise Architecture

Mr. Kumar Yajamanam presented on Enterprise Architecture (EA) as one of our key transformation initiatives. We are trying to set up Enterprise Architecture in a way that can support the centralized or the decentralized models. We want to ensure that the technology, the infrastructure, the standards, everything that is developed is done the way we want to progress and based on the decisions that we want to make. Some decisions will be made today; some decisions will be made in the subsequent meetings. But everything should be planned for and the Enterprise Architecture is meant to do that.

The presentation has three key principles we want to set up the EA here at the Washington State Courts. Those principles will be approved by this committee, as we move forward to the set up of the EA and help move our technology roadmap ahead.

Enterprise Architecture provides a way by which we can manage technology solutions. We can develop the standards that are necessary to not only get the business agility that's required, but also ensure that it's provided in a way that's cost effective, it's beneficial, and it maximizes the benefit.

The model that was designed adds on to the federal EA model by adding a new domain, which is security. We want to ensure that security is handled as a separate domain. The Business Architecture is all about how we do the business processes, what our business capabilities are and how we have a consolidated standard across the enterprise. Application architecture is the way by which you have access to the information, while providing the business capabilities.

Mr. Yajamanam then presented the three primary EA principles to be approved by the JISC. They are Stewardship, Objectivity and Transparency.

Mr. Jeff Hall stated that our EA significantly informs local EA in other decisions, because not only does it provide the standard, but it provides a view into what business areas either are in or are going to go in. One of the things we care about here, is as we develop our EA and our standards, is that they are consistent with the Information Services Board and the state executive branch EA standards. My direction to AOC staff has been that we should be consistent with the ISB architectural standards and where we decide not to, we should be able to clearly articulate the reason why we are not going to be. There are a lot of good business reasons for us, as we exchange data across state government that we should be consistent with the standards and the architecture that they've developed at the state level.

Motion – Mr. N.F. Jackson – These are principles which we were asked to endorse. They are high level, a framework to give the roadmap for arriving at standards. It is the official adoption of business drives ISD. *I move the approval of enterprise architecture principles for JISC. Judge Rosen; seconded.*

Justice Fairhurst; At this point, we're only looking at the three principles that were asked about, and then as Kumar said, we will continue to as this develops, these will become just a standard presentation at our meetings as to where we are.

Seconded and voted on. **Motion Passed.**

IT Governance

Discussions lead by Shane Boyd Sierra Systems

Shane Boyd lead the discussion of the committee through identifying and documenting the “cultural knowledge” about challenges, current priorities and future priorities as they relate to IT governance. Shane indicated that coming out of the previous discussion today the committee began to describe inclusions and started to have the discussion about what goes into our dialogue and what stays out. The outcome of today will give us a starting point to define what really matters and what we value moving forward – determining that when we spend money what we will get out of it. Mr. Boyd continued with an example using Superior Court Case Management.

Governance – Current Priorities Discussion

Mr. Boyd then led the discussion for the committee to identify current priorities. Mr. Boyd suggested that we need to look at the whole area of data to information to tracking and identify the high-level priorities.

Mr. Boyd clarified by saying that what we will be able to deliver will always be constrained by time, resources, and access. Certainly a current priority is the ability to make an informed decision with as complete of data as possible using what you have access to.

In discussion of the current priorities, the committee brought up the ability to implement and differentiate case management, maintenance of current applications, research to help define what our courts are, making a decision with complete information, use info that we have to tell others what we do, greater increase of information available to the public, shifting from case focus to person focus, how information is summarized and presented, the scope, strategy and goals of AOC, and the ability to be nimble and flexible.

Mr. Boyd asked if there was anything else under high-level priorities and heard no dissention.

Mr. Boyd presented to the committee the following items to be validated in relation to the discussion of current priorities. The committee said [yes] these were valid.

- Baseline Functionality
 - Case scheduling
 - Case management
 - Past, present, future & court levels
- Statewide data standards
 - Diverse sources
 - Broad use

Governance - Future Priorities Discussion

Mr. Boyd asked the committee, “what comes next in our future priorities?”

The committee further discussed future priorities and touched on; the need to have some form and way to address enhanced identification/biometrics, document viewing, statewide eFiling, systems replacement, replacing JRS, Risk Assessment as it relates to in-person assessment by judge of information not an outside assessment, not just information but the knowledge that goes with the information provided, tools for probation and special courts.

Jeff Hall pointed out that many of these items will be coming to us from outside the court through Access to Justice and others, for example electronic filing from pro se/family law, small claims and so forth. He added that the demands are likely to increase.

Another discussion in the committee continued around Commercial Off the Shelf (COTS) applications. Rich Johnson stated that centralized COTS is tied to whether we have a baseline. Mr. Johnson asked how do we reconcile solutions, are they all COTS, some COTS, not COTS. If we have to wait and see the evolution and we put out a RFP that says COTS, it affects the outcome of the RFP. Jeff Hall referred back to the Ernst & Young plan where they recommended COTS being the preferred at this time because it has the best chance of success and would be the most cost-effective. There was further discussion around COTS.

Siri Woods asked to see the COTS language re-written, that it is considered first as a preferred approach, then other alternatives are looked at. That COTS is an instance by instance basis.

Mr. Boyd summarized that the inclusions that we've captured from the discussion today on future priorities are;

- EA Standards
- Reporting Capabilities, record keeping and statistics
- Record keeping/statistics
- Centralized COTS

Mr. Boyd recommended that governance is an evolutionary process. Somewhere over the next month, JISC will take as a discussion – the criteria that we talked about this morning. How will the committee refine those ideas and state them so that they are really applied?

Governance - Exclusions Discussion:

Mr. Boyd identified the exclusions that had come up in the course of the discussion. Those being the things that were part of the dialog earlier today identifying exactly will we will not spend any money on.

The exclusions identified;

- If it's all about local data
- If it's about only a local practice.

Mr. Boyd concluded the discussion by saying that's the list we wanted to get through today. There has been a lot of other dialog and as a committee, you will need to come back to revisit those on an ongoing basis.

Justice Fairhurst asked if we needed a decision point and Mr. Boyd said no, not today.

Superior Court Judges' Request for Case Management/Calendaring – Feasibility Study

The draft RFP for the Superior Court Management Feasibility Study was discussed. Sierra Systems representatives left the room to avoid any conflict of interest.

Mr. Bill Cogswell presented a draft RFP for a calendaring and case management system. It was indicated that the first draft was complete as far as purpose, background, scope and objectives. The RFP includes two phases; one to review and validate the requirements and the second optional phase to have the vendor produce an RFP to be used to procure. The intent of the presentation was to discuss these topics and get agreement on the structure and content to move forward with the RFP.

Discussion about whether the scope was agreeable to the group followed. While calendaring and caseload management were the primary areas, the RFP also included business functionality for county clerks, including financial and accounting requirements.

Mr. Jeff Hall reviewed the actual Statements of Work in the draft. He indicated AOC had worded them to provide specific guidance on what they should include in the analysis and discussion of the proposed solution, including major alternatives, requirements fit, and the cost benefit analysis.

Mr. Hall indicated that the study purpose is to have the vendor provide the recommendation along a buy/build/best of breed type approach.

There was a discussion about the suitability of the scope defined in the RFP. Mr. Hall stated that AOC was familiar with the vendor community and their applications. The RFP requirements were broadened to include additional items AOC knew were generally available in various packages.

The stated preference for commercial off the shelf and/or best of breed solutions over custom built efforts was noted. This is consistent with the IT Strategic Business and Operational Plans from Ernst and Young and the recent motion and vote from the Superior Court Judges' Association.

There was discussion about the relevance of the July 1, 2011 date coming from the SCJA and included in the draft. There was also discussion of the inclusion of the LINX system. The question was asked by Mr. Hall if LINX could be picked up as is and installed and implemented statewide to solve the calendaring and caseload management needs for the superior courts. Mr. Hall indicated that there appeared to be need to re-platform LINX and those costs should be taken into consideration.

Justice Fairhurst stated there is a need for clarification from the SCJA as to whether they meant LINX as it currently exists or as LINX envisions itself in the future, because it is time for them to update their program.

Judge Wynne stated his understanding from the SCJA's Board that it was intended only to consider a product that was ready to be implemented and installed as of July 1, 2011.

Mr. Jeff Hall read the wording of the request regarding deployment of the solution to one or more courts on or before July 1, 2011. Mr. Hall pointed out that the statement does not exclude a system that does not meet this date, but rather to have the vendor answer the question of "is this a feasible date in response to the question from the judges".

Motion – Mr. William Holmes made a motion that the JISC authorize AOC to initiate a feasibility study on a calendaring and case management solution for superior courts to include the identified core elements, requirements, and expectations to include today's clerk's concerns if the verbiage can be adjusted to adequately reflect that, and to include that the LINX system analysis be considered. The request was to include all of what is in the draft RFP, and the clerk's concerns with verbiage adjustment was to be added along with consideration of the LINX system.

The motion was seconded.

Justice Fairhurst clarified her understanding that the clerk verbiage would be specifically for a calendar and case management system, but would capture other functionality the vendors may offer. This would give the JISC a view of the products; however the main focus is on the calendar and case management system, with a desire to not have anything in the RFP exclude LINX.

Mr. Rich Johnson offered an amendment to the motion to cap the amount of the RFP at \$250,000.

Seconded and voted on. **Motion Passed.**

Ms. Marti Maxwell asked if a business process mapping was being considered. Mr. Hall responded that the intent is to validate the requirements that we have today.

Justice Fairhurst concluded that there was more work, but this feedback allows AOC to go forward. She expressed that it might be helpful for the Executive Committee to review the revised RFP before it goes out for the next JISC meeting on June 25th.

Jeff requested formal approval from the JISC to follow the Information Services Board (ISB) feasibility study guidelines. He noted that they include a very specific set of financial sheets and a way we get the information back consistent with standards in state government.

Justice Fairhurst indicated that the group should formally adopt that approach as it provides a good opportunity to see if the ISB format is beneficial. If so, the JISC might decide to make it a standard going forward, or revise it if it is not helpful to us.

Motion – Justice Fairhurst moved that we adopt Mr. Hall's proposal to follow the feasibility study guidelines.

Seconded and voted on. ***Motion Passed.***

PMO Snapshot

Mr. Dirk Marler gave an overview of the Project Management Office. Mr. Marler explained that the project management office is part of the ISD Standards and Policies section at AOC. The PMO has two primary objectives: 1) to support the IT governance by providing this initial assessment of concepts and projects and ideas that you float through the Information Services Division, either through this formal process that we're now beginning to institutionalize, or through the back door (or less formal processes that we've been utilizing for years and now we're trying to formalize that process in the IT with the IT governance process), and 2) one of the roles of the project management office then, is to do an initial high level assessment of the requests that come through, initial sizing, and then eventually scheduling of projects that may be approved, and monitor and show progress on the projects as they move through the system.

The feeling at this body and the court community is that we weren't doing an adequate job at AOC in managing our projects. That we weren't doing a good enough job about being accountable and being transparent in doing that. We are learning and getting better as we refine and practice the discipline.

We have, as of today, about 12 projects that the PMO is working on and they include the various transformation initiatives that have been referred to, the Data Exchanges, and working on the feasibility study that we've talked about today. Then, those additional projects that may float through the governance process once we get that fully stood up and operational here over the next few weeks.

JIS IT Governance Policy

Mr. Dirk Marler described that what you see in your materials is the first very rough draft of what the JIS IT Governance policy may look like. We're trying to get to a more consistent format for what those look like, what the hierarchy is between what is a policy, what is a standard, what is a guideline, and a central place to go and find those things when you have questions that need to be addressed. What you see in your materials very much replicates the practice of the Information Service Board. We would solicit, either now or between now and the next meeting, your feedback on not just the content of this draft policy on the IT Governance that we're working on for your eventual approval, but the format and whether or not this is something that you believe may meet your needs.

If you have comments, questions, feedback on that format, the approach, or the content, please get those to basically any of us, although Vicky Marin is the prime.

Further discussion will be held until the June meeting.

OTHER BUSINESS

Next Meeting

The next regular JISC meeting will be June 25, 2010, at the AOC SeaTac facility; from 9:00 a.m. – 12:00 p.m.

Adjournment

There being no further business of the JISC, the meeting was adjourned at 3:00 p.m.

ACTION ITEMS

- The committee is requested to provide feedback on the JIS IT Governance policy to Vicky Marin by the June 25, 2010 JISC meeting.