WASHINGTON STATE JUDICIAL BRANCH
2012 SUPPLEMENTAL BUDGET REQUEST
Preliminary Decision Package

Agency: **Administrative Office of the Courts**

Decision Package Title: **Appellate Court Automation Project**

Budget Period: **2012 Supplemental Budget Request**

Budget Level: **Performance Level**

Preliminary

Agency Recommendation Summary Text

The Appellate Courts of Washington (Courts of Appeal and Supreme Court) have a business need to implement a document management system (DMS). A document management system (DMS) is a computer system (or set of computer programs) used to track and store electronic documents and/or images of paper documents. It is usually also capable of keeping track of the different versions created by different users (history tracking). It is often viewed as a component of enterprise content management (ECM) systems and related to digital asset management, document imaging, workflow systems and records management systems.

Fiscal Detail

Operating Expenditures		**FY 2012**		**FY 2013**		**Total**
Total Cost		**$ 712,091**		**$ 584,603**		**$ 1,296,694**
Staffing		**FY 2012**		**FY 2013**		**Total**
FTEs		3.0		2.3		3.0

*** Dollar amounts should not be entered in the row titled "FTEs." Please enter only the percentage of staff time being requested. 1.0 is one full time staff person, 0.5 is one half-time staff person, etc.**

Package Description

In October 2010 the Court of Appeals Executive Committee endorsed a request (ITG #45) to the Administrative Office of the Court (AOC). The request was for an EDM system to support sharing documents across all four courts, indexing, storage, retrieval, and searching of documents, and an integrated workflow and correspondence module to improve productivity and efficiency in the processing of cases.

Background

While the Appellate Courts have some basic online filing capability, they are still burdened by a paper-based system that is resource intensive. Currently most appellate court processes are manual and paper driven. Manual internal case processing methods are slow, expensive, inefficient, and lead to an unacceptable lost/misfile rate. The paper based records not only prohibit multiple internal users, but also prevent access to the trial courts, litigants, the public, other divisions of the COAs and the Supreme Court.

Current situation

The Judicial Information Services Committee (JISC) ranked this request as their number 1 priority in February 2011. Their decision was to complete a feasibility study to understand the customer requirements, costs and the contents of an RFP.
AOC began work on this feasibility study in April 2011 and expects to complete it in June of 2011. Once completed, the recommendation will be presented to the JISC for review and approval.

Proposed solution

The proposed solution depends on the outcome of the feasibility study due in June. The vision is for a central DMS that will connect the three Courts of Appeal and the state Supreme Court and also allow external users access to send and receive documents as needed.

Preliminary

Narrative Justification and Impact Statement

Reason for change

This automation is needed to improve efficiencies and contain costs. The COA's have implemented various non-integrated electronic document imaging applications to alleviate the lack of a comprehensive integrated appellate level information system. The Supreme Court still does not have an electronic document imaging application. The only integrated application the courts have is the ACORDS case management application and it is currently lacking in the ability to add functionality to meet the long term needs of the courts. For example, ACORDS currently lacks the functionality of document management and has limited correspondence/workflow capabilities or complete calendaring support. Double data entry is also required to keep the existing EDM in the COA's office and the ACORDS application in sync.

Impact on clients and services?

There will be a positive impact on clients and services due to the gains in efficiencies. Communities impacted include:

- Appellate Court Judges

- Appellate Court Clerks
- Public and Other Users

Impact on other state programs?

No.

What alternatives were explored and why was this alternative chosen?

Alternatives will be considered in the feasibility study.

What are the consequences of not funding this package?

Continued inefficiencies in the appellate courts.

What is the relationship, if any, to the state's capital budget?

na

Expenditure Calculations and Assumptions
(Rationale for costs shown)

Object Detail	**FY2012**	**FY2013**	**Total**
Staff Costs	$332,091	$254,603	$586,694
Non-Staff Costs	$380,000	$330,000	$710,000
Total Objects	**$712,091**	**$584,603**	**$1,296,694**

Preliminary