

A National Perspective on CMS Implementation Strategies



Washington Courts JIS Retreat
24 June 2005

Perspectives on CMS Implementations

Engagement: 220958060



Trends

- **No absolute direction in CMS Implementation strategies**
 - Movement towards implementation of vendor packages – centralized and locally, but...
 - States/Courts with development history tend to re-build
- **Integration for information sharing**
 - Judicial data warehouses / data repositories
 - Participation in local, regional and statewide integrated justice environments
- **Standards**
 - Statewide licensing and certifications
 - Statewide technology standards – within and external to judicial apps

consulting

Washington Courts JIS Retreat
Engagement: 220958060
24 June 2005 — Page 1



For use of the Washington Courts.
© 2005 Gartner, Inc. and/or its affiliates.
All rights reserved.

Deployment Strategies Selected States

- | | | |
|---|---|---|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Centralized <ul style="list-style-type: none"> □ Washington □ Colorado □ New York □ New Jersey □ Illinois □ Hawaii (ACS) □ Alaska (Maximus) □ New Hampshire (Tyler) □ Delaware (ACS) □ Rhode Island (ACS) □ South Carolina (PCSS) | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Decentralized <ul style="list-style-type: none"> □ Arizona (Tiburon) □ Florida □ Georgia □ Missouri (ACS) □ Ohio □ Texas □ Connecticut | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Mixed <ul style="list-style-type: none"> □ Nevada (Maximus) □ California ■ In Transition <ul style="list-style-type: none"> □ Indiana (CA) □ West Virginia |
|---|---|---|

consulting

Washington Courts JIS Retreat
Engagement: 220958060
24 June 2005 — Page 1



For use of the Washington Courts.
© 2005 Gartner, Inc. and/or its affiliates.
All rights reserved.

Implementation Strategies Selected States

- | | |
|---|---|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Build <ul style="list-style-type: none"> □ Washington □ Colorado □ New York □ New Jersey □ Illinois □ Alabama □ Connecticut □ Nebraska □ Maine □ North Carolina | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Buy <ul style="list-style-type: none"> □ Delaware (ACS) □ Hawaii (ACS) □ Alaska (Maximus) □ New Hampshire (Tyler) □ Rhode Island (ACS) □ South Carolina (PCSS) □ Arizona (Tiburon) □ Missouri (ACS) □ Nevada (Maximus) □ Indiana (CA) □ West Virginia (selection in progress) □ Mississippi (Jano) □ Arkansas (ACS) □ New Mexico (Tiburon) □ Minnesota (Tyler) □ Wyoming (Justice Systems) |
|---|---|

consulting

Washington Courts JIS Retreat
Engagement: 220958060
24 June 2005 — Page 2



For use of the Washington Courts.
© 2005 Gartner, Inc. and/or its affiliates.
All rights reserved.

Specific Implementations

- **Ohio**
 - Decentralized case management system implementations
 - Statewide data repository system for information sharing in progress
- **Nevada**
 - Mixed implementation Environment - local and regional CMS implementations
 - Regional data sharing system (MC-JIS)
- **Delaware**
 - Centralized statewide CMS implementation in progress (vendor package)
- **Cleveland Municipal**
 - CMS package implementation in progress
 - Creative financing option proposed by vendor
- **Kansas City Municipal**
 - CMS package selection in progress
 - Creative technology options discussed for bench
 - E-Filing expected to extend to support agencies such as traffic school and mental health facilities
- **Franklin County, Ohio**
 - Troubled CMS Implementation resulted from deficiencies in planning and project management

consulting

Washington Courts JIS Retreat
Engagement: 220958060
24 June 2005 — Page 4



For use of the Washington Courts.
© 2005 Gartner, Inc. and/or its affiliates.
All rights reserved.