Judicial Information System Committee Meeting, February 28, 2014

DECISION POINT –Reprioritize/Return ITG 27 – Expanded Seattle Municipal Data Transfer

MOTION:

I move that the JISC reprioritize or return IT Governance Request 27, the Expanded Seattle Municipal Court Data Transfer, to the CLJ Court Level User Group, and make ITG 102, the CLJ Case Management System, the top priority for courts of limited jurisdiction.

I. BACKGROUND

In 2010, Seattle Municipal Court requested a two-way data exchange with AOC's system, IT Governance Request 27. The request was endorsed by the District and Municipal Court Judges' Association (DMCJA) Board of Governors, which was the DMCJA's IT Governance (ITG) Endorsing Group at the time. On April 14, 2011, the Courts of Limited Jurisdiction (CLJ) Court Level User Group (CLUG) recommended ITG Request 27 to the JISC and gave it the highest priority on their list. The JISC authorized the request, and made it the number 5 priority, on May 6, 2011. On June 23, 2011, AOC projected that it would start work on ITG 27 on February 1, 2012 and complete work by January 31, 2013.

On July 8, 2011, the District and Municipal Court Management Association (DMCMA) submitted a request for a new CLJ case management system (CMS), ITG Request 102. The DMCMA President also sent a letter to the JISC Chair requesting that the JISC allocate resources for a new case management system.

On November 16, 2011, the DMCJA President sent a letter to the JISC Chair and Vice-Chair supporting the DMCMA request for a CLJ case management system.

The CLJ case management system request was prioritized number 2 by the CLJ CLUG on October 20, 2011, based on the knowledge that AOC planned to start work on ITG 27 in 2012, and a CLJ case management system was a longer term project that would take a number of years to complete. The JISC authorized ITG 102 (CLJ Case Management System) on December 2, 2011.

Subsequently, AOC reassessed resources, and determined that it did not have the capacity to start ITG 27 (Expanded Seattle Municipal Data Transfer) in 2012. ITG 27 has not yet been started, and it is unknown when AOC will have resources to work on it.

On February 8, 2013, AOC leadership met with the DMCJA Board of Governors, which expressed concerns about the timeline and available funding to work on a CLJ case management system. AOC agreed that business requirements gathering could start in 2014, subject to funding and staff availability.

On March 14, 2013, the DMCMA President wrote a letter to the State Court Administrator expressing DMCMA's commitment to support a commercial off-the-shelf (COTS) CLJ case management system, with the understanding that courts of limited jurisdiction could begin developing business and technical requirements in late 2013 or early 2014, subject to funding and staff availability.

On April 24, 2013, the DMCJA President wrote a letter to the State Court Administrator indicating that the DMCJA Board of Governors had prioritized support of a new CLJ case management system, and authorized support of a COTS system, allowing AOC to bypass the traditional feasibility study and speeding up its ability to provide a new case management system.

In November, 2013, AOC and the presidents of the DMCJA and DMCMA became aware that a number of limited jurisdiction courts were considering acquiring their own case management systems. The presidents sent a joint letter to their members indicating their joint support for making a statewide case management system a priority, and asking courts considering or planning to acquire their own systems to attend a meeting to discuss a strategy for working together toward a statewide CLJ case management system. That meeting was held January 24, 2014.

On February 12 and February 13, 2014, Honorable C. Kimi Kondo, Presiding Judge for Seattle Municipal Court, wrote to Justice Fairhurst and the presidents of the DMCJA and DMCMA, communicating that Seattle Municipal Court will not embrace the statewide CLJ CMS project, and that resources should be devoted to the SMC data exchange project.

On February 14, 2014, the DMCJA Board of Governors requested that the JISC withdraw ITG 27 and reprioritize ITG 102, the CLJ CMS, to number one CLJ priority.

On February 19, 2014, the DMCMA Executive Board requested that the CLJ case management system, ITG 102, be reprioritized above ITG 27, but that ITG 27 remain on the list of prioritized requests.

On February 19, 2014, the Misdemeanant Corrections Association (MCA) Board of Governors asked the JISC to reprioritize the CLJ case management system request ahead of ITG 27.

On February 19, 2014, the CLJ Court Level User Group voted unanimously to request that the JISC reprioritize ITG Request 102 to JISC Priority 4, and move ITG 27 to JISC Priority 5.

II. DISCUSSION

The ITG Framework provides that the JISC has the authority to reverse a previous decision. It can “schedule, pend, or return any request to the IT Review Committee [AKA the CLUG] for additional consideration” (ITG Framework, Page 47). The JIS ITG Policy says “requests that have been prioritized by the JISC, but not started by AOC, can be reprioritized as necessary.” (JIS ITG Policy (7)(k)).

The DMCJA, DMCMA, MCA, and CLJ CLUG have requested that the JISC either reprioritize or return ITG 27, and move ITG 102, the CLJ case management system, to the top of the CLJ priorities.

III. OUTCOME IF NOT PASSED –

If the JISC does not return or reprioritize ITG 27, AOC will be unable to start on business requirements gathering for the CLJ CMS in the second quarter of 2014.